

SOME of the Democratic papers say that Blackburn, of Kentucky, is a "nincompoop" and "jabbering idiot."

AS USUAL Weston came out behind—he always does—in the walking match, in England, last week.

"OLD PROBABILITY"—Gen. Myers has gone to Europe, which accounts, perhaps, for the fickleness of the weather.

MISTHER KEARNEY has received another drubbing. This time he was whipped in San Francisco for some of his blackguard slang.

OUR of one hundred and thirty-two soldiers in the present Congress eighty-eight of them were the Confederate gray. Treason is odious—in a horn.

"FARMER" PATTERSON, late superintendent of public grounds at Harrisburg, has been appointed to a clerkship in Secretary of Internal Affairs Dunkel's office.

THE boy murderer, Jesse Pomeroy, made an unsuccessful attempt to escape from prison a few days ago. He had the bars of his cell window cut off when discovered.

BENJAMIN RUSH CLARK, Republican Representative from the Fifth District of Iowa, died suddenly at his quarters at the National Hotel in Washington, on Monday, after an illness of only a few hours' duration.

CHAIRMAN SPEER has called a meeting of the Democratic State Central Committee at the Bolton House, in Harrisburg, on the 7th inst., for the purpose of fixing the time and place of holding the State Convention of that party.

THE Democrats in the lower house of Congress propose to remove the bath-rooms so as to make an enlargement of bar room in the restaurant. Does this come under the head of Democratic reform? More room to drink and none to wash!

GEN. GRANT appears to be troubling a majority of the Democratic editors in this country, just now; but, then, this is nothing, he always was troublesome and caused a heap of annoyance when he was thrashing their friends "way down South in Dixie."

GEORGE EINSIG, who was convicted in York, on Friday last, for the murder of his wife, cheated the gallows by committing suicide in his cell, on Sunday morning, by cutting his throat with a razor and then hanging himself with a piece of rope and a towel.

THE editor of the Okolona States indignantly denies that he is an Ohio car-peddler. He says he was born and reared in the South, and wants to live there while life lasts, he buried there when he dies, and to keep where no Republican Yankee takes up their residence.

AN ACT granting an annual pension of \$75 to surviving veterans of the Mexican war from Pennsylvania who have resided in the State for more than twenty years prior to the passage of the bill, and also to widows of deceased soldiers and sailors of said war, has passed both branches of the Legislature.

THE Messrs. Skinner, editors of the Fulton Democrat, have just passed through the ordeal of a libel suit and came out with a verdict of not guilty, but were mulcted in half the costs. The action was brought by Rev. Benj. Speck, the Republican candidate for Assembly in Fulton county last fall.

THE butcher Richards, who was convicted of the murder of nine people, was hung at Minden, Nebraska, on Saturday last, in the presence of 25,000 spectators. This is the first execution of his kind since the time of his arrest. Just before he was swung off he said he had faith in Christ and expected to go to heaven.

PHILADELPHIA is just now disturbed by a social sensation, growing out of the fact that a millionaire's daughter ran away with and married the son of a New York tradesman. Old money bags followed the young couple to New York and succeeded in inducing his daughter to accompany him home. The only trouble seems to be that one is rich and the other poor.

THE "ten-dollar boys" have had their pay stopped until they pass the necessary appropriation bills to keep the wheels of the State government moving smoothly. Had this been done long ago there would have been more work and less fooling done. To "raise the wind" several of the members sold their postage stamps at a large discount. A friend of ours purchased about \$200.00 worth from a couple of Solons.

WHILE Edwin Booth was playing in McVicker's theatre, Chicago, on Wednesday night, two pistol shots were fired at him from the balcony, neither of which struck the tragedian. The would-be assassin was promptly arrested, and gives his name as Mark Gray. He says that for two years and a half he has been seeking an opportunity to kill Booth, and seemed surprised and put out that he was not successful in his attempt to do so. The poor creature is evidently insane.

SENATOR WALLACE puts the case in a nut shell when he says the people want free elections, without the shadow or substance of military power, whether State or National.—Democrat and Register.

He knows more about putting bogus naturalization papers in a coffee-pot when he wants to carry his party through fraud, and as he is so extremely anxious for the repeal of all laws having to do with their object free elections, we are inclined to think that he has been giving his Southern brethren an insight into how he died in the wilds of Clearfield about a decade ago, when he defied the will of the people by the use of his coffee-colored papers.

A RIGHTEOUS VETO.

The President Sustains the Republican Position.

The President's veto of the Army Appropriation bill was sent to the House on Tuesday. The message recites that the bill provides in usual form for the support of the army, and if it contained no other provisions it would receive his prompt approval. It includes, however, further legislation which attached as it is to appropriations which are requisite, involves questions of the gravest character.

The President quotes at length from existing laws to show that sufficient restrictions are already placed by law on the presence of troops at the polls, except for the purpose of preserving order. He also quotes from debates in the Senate and House to show that under existing laws there can be no military interference with elections. He then calls attention to a significant and vital clause in this bill which if adopted would deprive the civil authorities of the United States of all power to keep the peace at Congressional elections. This the President says concerns the entire country. Each political party has a right to enjoy its legitimate share of power and it is the right of every citizen to cast one unimpeded ballot and to have it honestly counted. Experience has shown that National Legislation to provide safeguards for free and honest elections is necessary to secure the right of suffrage to the colored man in the South and prevent fraud in the large cities of the North. The constitution authorizes such legislation. The fifteenth amendment also guarantees the right of suffrage to every citizen and provides that Congress shall enforce such guarantee by appropriate legislation and this doctrine has been affirmed by the Supreme Court.

He then quotes from the revised statutes, showing the authority given by law to the Government to punish fraud and violence at federal elections and to enforce its own laws and declares he can see no reason why the United States should be denied necessary authority to protect national elections. The laws now in force should not be repealed except in connection with enactment of better measures to accomplish the same end. The President feels impelled to withhold his signature again, since the proposed bill makes a vital change in election laws in no way connected with the use of the army. It prohibits under heavy penalties any person engaged in the civil service from having any force at the polls to preserve order, to make arrests, or in any manner to enforce the laws. This is altogether foreign to the purpose of an army appropriation bill. He deprecates abuses and the great waste of public money which has followed the practice of tacking irrelevant matter on appropriation bills and declares that public opinion is against such practice. It was not the intention of the framers of the Constitution that any single branch of the Government should dictate to another. This doctrine maintained would result in unchecked despotic power in the House of Representatives. The grievance complained of now is an act of Congress protecting elections, but on the principle the House may determine that a treaty, a nomination or a decision of the Supreme Court, is a grievance, and that the measure of redress is to withhold appropriations for support of the offending branch of the Government. The President concludes by urging a return to the wise and wholesome usages of the earlier days of the Republic, which excluded from appropriation bills all irrelevant legislation.

The Tramp Act.

The following is the tramp act just passed both branches of the Legislature and awaiting the signature of the Governor. If the Governor signs it, it will go into effect on the 15th of August next:

SECTION 1. Be it enacted, &c. That any person going about from place to place begging, asking or subsisting upon charity and for the purpose of acquiring money or a living, and who shall have no fixed place of residence or lawful occupation in the county or city in which he shall be arrested shall be taken and deemed to be a tramp and guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction, shall be sentenced to undergo an imprisonment by separate and solitary confinement, at labor in the county jail or workhouse, for not more than twelve months, in the discretion of the court. Provided, That if any person so arrested can prove to the satisfaction of the court, that he does not make a practice of going about begging or subsisting upon charity for the purpose aforesaid in the manner above set forth, he shall not be deemed guilty of the offense hereinbefore described, and upon such proof shall be discharged from arrest, either by the magistrate before whom he is committed or by the court upon hearing of the case upon writ of habeas corpus.

Sec. 2. Any tramp who shall enter any dwelling house, against the will or without the permission of the owner or occupant thereof, or shall kindle any fire in the highway or on the land of another without the owner's consent, or shall be found carrying any fire arms or other dangerous weapon with intent unlawfully to do injury to or intimidate any other person, which intent may be inferred by the jury trying the case, from the facts that the defendant is a tramp and so armed, or shall do or threaten to do any injury not amounting to a felony to any person, or to the real or personal estate of another shall, upon conviction, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be sentenced to undergo an imprisonment by separate or solitary confinement at labor for a period not exceeding three years.

Sec. 3. Any act of beggary or vagrancy by any person described by the first section of this act, shall be prima facie evidence that the person committing the same is a tramp within the meaning of this act, subject to the proviso contained in section one of this act.

Sec. 4. Any person upon view of any offense described in this act, may apprehend the offender and take him before a justice of the peace or alderman, whose duty it shall be, after hearing the evidence, to discharge or to commit for trial, as in the case of other misdemeanors.

Sec. 5. This act shall not apply to any female, or minor under the age of sixteen years, nor to any blind, deaf or dumb person, nor shall it be applicable to any maimed or crippled person who is unable to perform manual labor.

Sec. 6. This act shall take effect on and after August 15, 1879, and all acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

TILDEN'S "bar!" is knocking Wallace's coffee-pots out of the way.

SIX MINERS and a boy, who were imprisoned for five and a half days in mine of the Lehigh and Wilkes-Barre Coal Company, were rescued on Monday morning alive and well. Their imprisonment was caused by the caving in of a portion of the mine and cutting off their escape. The brave men who rescued the imprisoned miners had to cut through 1,200 feet of rock, slate and coal before they reached their subterranean prison. During their imprisonment they subsisted on mule flesh, fortunately one of these animals being with them when the mine caved in. When found a portion of the men were cooking mule steaks for breakfast, while the remainder of them were hard at work changing the direction of an air course. They were in good spirits and said they could have held out for two weeks longer if it had been necessary. The stockholders of the company presented each of the imprisoned miners with one hundred dollars, and a concert is on foot for their benefit. Their escape from a terrible death is due to the herculean efforts of the men who worked night and day to rescue them.

IT IS NOW positively known that certain gentlemen of Allentown have purchased over 5,000 acres of land in Marion county, Kansas, for the purpose of organizing a colony. The title to the land has been secured by Morris L. Kauffman, esq.

ADVERTISING CHEATS.—It has become so common to write the beginning of an elegant, interesting article and then run it into some obscure newspaper, that we avoid all such cheats and simply call attention to the merits of our Bitters in as plain honest terms as possible, to induce people to give them one trial, as no one who knows their value will ever use anything else.

A Dangerous Torpor.

Torpor or inactivity of the kidneys is seriously dangerous to those organs, since it is the precedent of diseases which destroy their substance and endanger life. This sluggishness may be overcome by stimulating them, not excessively, but moderately, an effect produced by Hostetter's Stomach Bitter, a general invigorant and alterative, possessing diuretic properties of no common order. The impetus which this admirable medicine gives to their excretory system, counteracts any tendency to congestion which may exist in their tissues. Both liver and their associate organ, the bladder, are invigorated as well as gently stimulated by this medicine, and enable it to withstand malarial epidemics, to which when exposed it might otherwise succumb.

DEMORALIZING DISEASE.—With kidney trouble a general demoralization. Restoration to perfect health can be attained by the use of Kidney-Wort. It cures the dull distress in the back and side, and removes the deposit of uric acid. It is catarrhic but does not debilitate.

IF YOU want to be Strong, Healthy and Vigorous, take E. F. Kunkel's Bitter Wine of Iron. No less vigorous remedy is available. It is the immediate and miraculous change produced by taking E. F. Kunkel's Bitter Wine of Iron in the diseased, debilitated and shattered nervous system. Whether broken down by excess, weak by nature, or impaired by sickness, the relaxed and unstrung organization is restored to perfect health and vigor. All persons, whatever may be their physical condition, and dealers everywhere.

Nervous Debility! Nervous Debility!

Debility, a depressed, irritable state of mind, a weak, nervous, exhausted feeling, no energy of animation, confused head, weak memory, the consequence of excessive mental overwork. This nervous debility finds a sovereign cure in E. F. Kunkel's Bitter Wine of Iron. It is a powerful tonic, and restores the mental vigor and energy, and rejuvenates the entire system. Sold only in \$1 bottles. Get the genuine. Take only E. F. Kunkel's, it has a yellow wrapper, with his photograph on outside. Sold by your druggist. E. F. Kunkel, Proprietor, No. 259 North 2nd Street, Philadelphia, Pa. For circular, or advice free. Try my great remedy. Get it of your druggist, six bottles for \$5.00. It cannot fail. It is guaranteed to do as is recommended.

WORMS! WORMS! WORMS!

E. F. Kunkel's Worm Syrup. Near falls to remove all kinds of worms. Seat, Pin and Stomach Worms are readily removed by Kunkel's Worm Syrup. Dr. Kunkel is the only successful physician in the country for the removal of Tape worms. He removes them in 2 to 3 hours, with head and all complete, alive, and no fee until head is passed. Common sense teaches that Tape worms can be removed, all other worms can be readily destroyed. Ask your druggist for a bottle of Kunkel's Worm Syrup. Price \$1.00 per bottle. If it never fails, if it has not, but he has it, or send to Proprietor, E. F. Kunkel, 259 North 2nd Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (Advice at office, free, or by mail.)

"I FEEL VERY PROUD"—A married lady says: "I feel very proud since coloring my old faded and shabby hair with Dr. Williams' Pink Pills for Pale People. My hair is now as black and glossy as when I was young. I was almost no trouble at all to color and they look like new."

Our Washington Letter.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1879. Senator Windom, of Minn., yesterday did a very neat and adroit thing, and fairly unhorsed the Confederates in his position on the Army bill. He offered this amendment to the Democratic clause prohibiting troops at the polls: "And 'any person who shall, with intent to hinder, obstruct, or prevent the free exercise of the right of suffrage, appear armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court." What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since any boldfaced man who has the intent proved against him, he should be punished for undoubted criminality? Mr. Windom keenly remarked: "The majority has voted that it should be a criminal offense for 'any person to be armed with a deadly weapon of any description, either concealed or displayed, within a mile of any polling place where an election for Representatives in Congress is being held, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or with imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or with both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.'" What could be more reasonable than that, since