

Republican State Convention.

By direction of the Republican State Committee, the Republican State Convention, heretofore called to meet at Harrisburg on the 29th day of August next, is hereby postponed, to meet in Harrisburg, at noon, on Wednesday, September 5, 1877. This postponement is made at the request of a large number of delegates elect, who have engagements to be present at a triennial convocation of Knights Templar, which assemblies at Cleveland, Ohio, on the 29th day of August next.

By order of the Committee.
HENRY M. HOYT, Chairman.
A. WILSON, Secretary.

Don't get things mixed; the leaders of the mob are not workmen.

WORKMEN were busy in Philadelphia last Saturday night, organizing a new party.

The Washington Cabinet concluded not to sell fire arms to belligerent Indians.

Col. Gibbon had a hard fight with the Nez Percés Indian in Montana, Aug. 9th in which many were killed on both sides.

The late disturbances in the States, and disturbance on the Indian, and Mexican border will in all probability lead to the increase of the army.

The Prohibitionists of this State are called to meet at Harrisburg on the 12th day of September, to nominate a State ticket.

WORKMEN in Ohio are organizing for a new party. On Sunday last a large picnic was held at Cincinnati, for the purpose of raising campaign funds. About \$1000 were raised.

Establish military posts in all of the riotous districts until the people there can govern themselves. It was a dose that was given to the South. Now that we need it in the North, let us take it without a crooked face.

Texas is a large element in Georgia and Virginia actively at work to bring those States up to the work of repudiation of all State papers that were issued while, what are called reconstruction measures, were applied to those States.

Up at Saratoga the strikers drove all boatmen away. Down in Maryland, the boatmen joined the strikers. Obstruction of canal navigation was the result in both cases. At Saratoga the boys in blue opened the blockade, at Hancock the boys in gray, who used to sing Maryland! My Maryland! opened the blockade with a vim.

The Republican State Convention of Maine met last Thursday. Selden Connor was nominated for Governor. A resolution endorsing President Hayes, after the manner of the Ohio Republican Convention, was offered, but it was rejected, and the convention simply said nothing for or against the policy of Mr. Hayes. Mr. Blaine was chiefly instrumental in influencing the convention to adopt the saying nothing policy as the course of President Hayes.

The uniforms of State troops are to be fashioned in appearance after the uniforms of United States troops. A few more general strikes, and then an everlasting good-by to the doctrine of State rights in the Republic.

Within a generation Royalists have not experienced so deep a thrill of delight as when the late riotous demonstrations took place in the United States. They believe it to be evidence of a state of discontent and corruption that knows no bounds outside of obedience to military rule, and military rule means strong government, and strong government means Royalty.

They maintain that a few more strikes or communistic demonstrations, and military rule will be an absolute necessity, and thence the step to Royalty will be short and easy. Once the moral force of the Republic is dead—killed in the house of its friends—Royalty will be securely seated for a thousand years to come. Certainly no one who believes in man's capability of self-government desires directly or indirectly to assist in bringing about such a state of society; but riotous disorders lead to military rule, and military rule leads to "strong governments," and strong governments lead to Royalty.

SECRETARY SCHURZ has been an eager advocate of civil service reform, and among other things that have been said of him, is the saying that "he is opposed to paying anything for political campaign purposes," such as paying public speakers, &c., during the progress of a political campaign.

The civil service changes that it is said Mr. Schurz proposes to make or have adopted, have brought out a number of political gentlemen, who allege that Mr. Schurz was as eager as any man they know to take money for making speeches. Kemble, of Pennsylvania says the books of the Republican State Central Committee of Pennsylvania show that Mr. Schurz got five hundred dollars for making a few speeches in this State, and that therefore he, Mr. Schurz, should be the last man to talk about not paying for services during a political campaign. It is difficult to say to

what degree Mr. Schurz has been misrepresented, if misrepresented, as to his views on civil service reforms; but he is much or he is little, or he is all true, when summed together it will surely suffice for such publications as Mr. Kemble has been sending out.

If the doctrine of the commune can cure all the moral, religious, and political evils that afflict people, the commune should make it clear to their benighted fellow-men— They should not keep their light under a bushel, or when they do let it shine, it should show a better side than robbery, murder and arson, as was shown during the late strike. The strikers say they did not do the fiendish work; they blame it on the commune. The commune is said to be a large society; why not move to one of the territories, and there practice what they preach. In that way the world may be enlightened as to what they preach and practice.

Conflict of Civil and Military Authority in Saratoga.

Last week we gave an account of the attack upon the Mayor of Saratoga, and the manner of the dispersion of the mob by the Mayor's posse, which the reader doubtless remembers. The mob was dispersed by the posse firing into it. A number of the rioters were killed.

Since then the Coroner of Saratoga held an inquest on the bodies of the mob that were killed by the Mayor's posse, and the result or verdict of the inquest is, "Willful murder," against the members of the Mayor's posse.

Commitments were gotten out for the arrest of the Mayor's posse, the object of which was to put them in jail. The military was informed of the arrests, and at once a detachment of soldiers was sent to take charge of the men who had been charged with "willful murder" by the civil authority of Saratoga. Their protection by the military was deemed necessary, as it was feared the mob would kill the members of the posse once they got hold of them.

The Mayor of Saratoga says that he is responsible for giving the order to his posse to fire in the mob: "About 10 o'clock I was in my office holding court when information came that the mob were driving the men away from the company's shops and furnaces. In company with Lieutenant Browne, of my police force, I started toward the stores, and in passing Washington avenue I saw a large and excited crowd around the shops. Here also a young employe met me with a request from Mr. McKinney, saying that his daughter had been taken from the company's shop, and that the building should be rescued. I walked hastily down through the crowd some 800 feet, and found the door fastened. The young man then said that it was all right. As I was going through the crowd I ordered them to disperse, and when I found the door fastened I attempted to return. I had proceeded about fifteen steps when a lot of half-grown boys began to jostle me and one of them struck me in the face. Immediately, however, upon this several of the working men whom I knew as personal acquaintances formed a cordon, as it were, about me, but they, too, were about becoming overpowered by the pressure of the yelling mob when Father Dunn came up. Immediately he threw the authority of the priesthood about me and ordered the men to stand back and do me no harm. In this way we made about a hundred feet toward the avenue, the crowd yelling and hooting all the time. The leaders of the mob, then, seeing the determined spirit of the priest, made a rush at him, caught him and took him bodily away from my side. I was then about three hundred feet from the avenue, every approach to which was jammed with a mob of excited people. In the meanwhile I had been pressed by the crowd so much that I gave the signal to one of my men to ring the alarm bell, which was the sign to the armed men under my orders to turn out. Before reaching the avenue the cord of friendly workmen which had protected me thus far from bodily harm became disintegrated, and I was left in the hands of the mob. But at this moment also I saw my posse, armed with forty rifles, marching down the street, headed by Lieutenant Browne, an old Confederate soldier. The crowd then surged up against me with even more violence, and I was struck several times. When, however, the posse was immediately opposite me in the street, and within twenty-five feet of me, I got the worst blow of all on the back of my head. Shots were then being fired at my men, and one of them dropped at the mercy of the mob. I was shot. Then I gave the order to fire as well as I could. I am perfectly willing to assume the responsibility of giving the command to fire."

The men—the Mayor's posse—charged with murder, have given bail for their appearance to answer the charge in court.

Rioters Dispersed.

Intelligence from Pottsville last Wednesday says: At Malanoy City this morning a number of men and boys with drums entered the town, trying to get up a meeting. The object was to inaugurate a strike at the mines in that vicinity. Being on the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Company's property they were refused to leave, and, after doing so, the sheriff's posse promptly ordered them to disperse, which they quickly did, running in all directions.

Richard North and Michael Dooly, the two principal leaders, were arrested and put under bail. The men had arranged to meet the miners as they went to their work, and were determined to prevent them from entering the mines. The sheriff's force, with a number of citizens, will remain on duty for the present to protect the men who are willing to work.

Fifty thousand tramps harass Iowa.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that the strikers had received legal advice on the subject before the strike occurred. In commenting on this fact his Honor remarked that the lawyer who advised the men they were not rioters, was a fool or a knave. To constitute a riot, or prove a party guilty of riot, he said, it is not necessary, not essential that a word be spoken. If three or more persons assemble together to prevent by force the performance of a lawful act, or to compel the doing of an unlawful act, it is riot. If a crowd gathers in front of a man's house and threatens to beat him if he emerges, and remain there, though not a hand is uplifted, it is riot. These men had been told they were not beating the employes or creating a tumult it was not riot. It is not necessary to show active participation in the outbreak. Every man who will not assist to quell a riot ought to go to his home at once. His presence lends moral support to it, and is a guilty participation in the act. He is equally penal on the 22d of last March, and explained that under this act to find a man guilty it is not necessary that he be actually present during the time of riot. If, for instance, the accused at any meeting of the employes of a road gave advice, innocent though it might appear, which tended to encourage the men to prevent the running of trains, he would be just as guilty in the eyes of the law as the men who followed the advice. If a man then flies away from the scene of the riot advises men to go and participate in it, he is liable to be indicted, convicted, and punished, and holding this interpretation of the law, he bound over the accused for a further hearing. The Pittsburg lawyer who counselled the strikers may not be smart enough to keep himself out of the clutches of the law, provided his name can be ascertained. He ought to be shown up, so that Pittsburg may know to whom in part they are indebted for the disgrace which has fallen upon their city.—North American.

Who are Rioters.

Several Pittsburg rioters have been before Judge Thomas Ewing, President, of the District Court of Allegheny county. During the testimony on behalf of the accused it came out that