

THE OMAHA DAILY BEE.

E. ROSEWATER, Editor. PUBLISHED EVERY MORNING. TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION: Daily (Without Sunday), One Year, \$1.00...

Omaha: The Bee Building, South Omaha, Bimber Bldg., C. P. N. and Mt. St. Council Bldg., 19 East Street.

STATEMENT OF CIRCULATION. State of Nebraska, Douglas County, The Bee Publishing Company...

Table with 2 columns: Date (1897) and Circulation figures (Total, Paid, Free).

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 1st day of March, 1897.

THE BEE ON TRAINS. All railroad newsboys are supplied with enough Bee to accommodate every passenger...

INSIST ON HAVING THE BEE. There is no question as to the intensity of the public interest in the impending city campaign.

Mr. Hanson evidently likes to hear himself talk a great deal more than do his fellow senators.

The cohesive power of patronage and plunder is the explanation of the new demo-populist fusion.

The confusion ticket headed by Ulrich Hoop Howell is like unto Joseph's many-colored garment.

Ransom's explanation of his duplicity with the exposition bill only emphasizes his shameful betrayal of trust.

Frank Hanson fooled the people of Omaha and Douglas county once, but fooling them a second time will be a different thing.

Sensors and representatives may carry away the bill files, but they are expected to refrain from taking the carpet from the floor.

The Howell charter has legislated a great many people out of office, but it does not follow that it will legislate Howell into office.

When the work of the sifting committee has to be sifted before action by the house it is a sure sign of approaching adjournment.

Every democrat on the confusion city ticket had to subscribe to the initiative and referendum as a condition precedent to the support of the Yoiserites.

The United States regular army is on the move, but it is the move of the officers who are being called for promotions and not any general advance against an enemy.

Cecil Rhodes has started on his way back to South Africa, and may look for an enthusiastic reception if he accidentally lands in the jurisdiction of his old friend, Oom Paul Kruger.

It is perfectly right for Nebraska to take up its natured bonded indebtedness, but it ought to use its credit as far as possible to keep down its floating indebtedness and thus reduce its total interest charges.

There is still lots of room for additional names on that exposition stock subscription list. Every one who has property or business interests in Omaha or vicinity should make it a matter of pride to sign for as much stock as he can afford.

It is announced that the senate committee on finance is busily engaged reviewing the new tariff bill and the measure will have to look at its photograph twice after it is reported out of the committee if it wants to make sure of identifying itself.

It might not be a bad idea for members of the legislature to glance over Governor Holcomb's message once again, if only to post themselves upon a few of the proposed measures which the governor denounced as wrong in theory or impracticable for enforcement.

That gambling trap seems to have caught nothing but two republicans, says the World-Herald. The evidence shows that two good silver democrats, more or less widely known, had a finger after the cheese. One of the democrats is the committee clerk and campaign manager for a Douglas county senator.

Governor Holcomb's message contained unmistakable expressions of disfavor toward all blanket ballot projects which aim to make straight party voting easier than under our existing Australian ballot system. Yet the lower branch of the legislature has insisted on passing a bill embodying precisely those provisions to which the governor took such vigorous exception.

THE CITY TICKETS.

The municipal tickets placed in nomination for the elective positions created by the new city charter will for the next two weeks absorb the attention of the voters. The candidates presented by the republicans will not merely be favorable comparison with their opponents on the conglomerate fusion combination, but also commend themselves to popular support by reason of their superior qualifications and fitness for the positions to which they aspire.

Colonel Frank E. Moore is a gallant veteran of the union army, a public-spirited citizen whose loyalty to every interest tending to contribute to the up-building of Omaha has been attested upon all occasions, and who moreover is in position to devote his whole time to the duties devolving upon the mayor.

Fred J. Sackett, the candidate for the second place on the ticket in point of importance, has all the qualifications that are desirable for a tax commissioner. His experience in the real estate business and familiarity with property values, tax lists and revenue laws, gained during four years as clerk of Douglas county, will enable him to discharge the duties of that office as efficiently if not more efficiently than any other man who could have been named.

The other candidates, A. G. Edwards for treasurer, John N. Westberg for comptroller, Beecher Higley for clerk, and S. L. Gordon for police judge, have been renominated to serve out the terms for which they were elected, but out of which they have been legislated by the enactment of the new charter. They have been filling their respective positions satisfactorily to the people and there is no reason why they should not be continued in office.

The ticket nominated by the spoilsmen of the democratic, populist and silverite combination has for its standard-bearer Edward E. Howell, who looks to his inglorious career in the state senate as a stepping stone to the mayoralty. Mr. Howell served in the city council for four years, two of them as president of that body, and is a fair representative of weather-vane politics.

His associates on the fusion ticket will need introductions to the public. George E. Gibson, nominee for tax commissioner, is an erratic genius who has been engaged without marked success in various occupations. J. H. Schmidt, for treasurer, is a druggist and reputed to possess fair business ability. C. E. Erickson, candidate for comptroller, was formerly business manager of a Swedish paper and is looked upon as a young man of good character. John O. Yoiser, candidate for clerk, is a political Jeremiah who sees terrible things ahead of him at all times. He now fills a seat in the legislature to which another man was elected, and boasts having introduced a greater number of reform bills than all the other impracticable reformers together. C. P. Halligan is a lawyer who needs an office very badly and is willing to be police judge if he has to profess conversion to democracy, popocracy, plutocracy, snobocracy and every other orcery.

The candidates for the council on the republican ticket have been selected from among the men who are now serving in the council and whose terms of office have been curtailed by the Howell charter. Their opponents, with the exception of T. J. Flynn and Frank J. Burkley, who are members of the present council, Samuel Reed, who has served on the school board, and C. O. Lobeck, who served one term in the legislature, are for the most part unknown quantities, chosen under the joint traffic agreement.

Coming as it does on the heels of a national campaign and forced by partisan legislation, the coming city election will necessarily see party lines drawn more sharply than usual in average city elections. But the independent voter will nevertheless exercise his franchise in the interest of good government by casting his vote for candidates who are best qualified and most likely to make the best public servants.

DESPERATE SPOILSMEN.

A resolution has been introduced in the house of representatives to revoke all the orders issued during the Cleveland administration extending the civil service regulations. It is very questionable whether congress has the power to do this, the general understanding being that the executive department of the government has exclusive authority in regard to the civil service law and that its action is not subject to congressional interference. This view, if we are not mistaken, has been enunciated by members of the Civil Service commission and we recall no previous proposal in congress to undo executive action in extending the application of the law.

CURRENCY AFTER THE TARIFF.

It appears to be understood that the republicans in congress will take up the currency question after the tariff is disposed of, though this will not be done at the extra session. Two bills for reforming the currency have already been introduced in the house by request, but as there is no committee to which to refer them and Speaker Reed is not likely to appoint the banking and currency committee before the regular session, these measures will probably receive no consideration earlier than next December. It may be said of them that they are based on the Indianapolis plan of currency reform.

It seems to be the general impression that congress will authorize a currency commission and it is quite possible that this will be done at the extra session, so that a commission would be able to submit a report and a currency bill to congress at the assembling in regular session. The president and secretary of the treasury are favorable to a currency commission, but nothing will be done that might retard action on the tariff bill. Still as a simple resolution for the appointment of a commission would be sufficient there does not appear to be any good reason why this matter cannot be disposed of while the senate finance committee is considering the tariff bill and without in the least interfering with such legislation.

As we have heretofore said we do not think there would be any great benefit from a commission, but it may be, as was said by Mr. McKinley, an experiment worth trying. If such a commission could give congress and the country any new and valuable light on the question it would certainly be a good thing, but we can see no reason to expect this. The ideas and influences which would probably dominate a currency commission are the same that produced the Indianapolis conference plan of reform and this has received a by no means widely extended popular endorsement, because its cardinal feature is the elimination of the legal tender notes from the currency—a scheme which a majority of the people are unalterably opposed to and which we do not think the republicans in congress will assume responsibility for. On the other hand any plan of so-called currency reform which does not embrace

THE PERMANENT RETIREMENT OF THE LEGAL TENDER NOTES IS CERTAIN TO BE DISCREDITED AND ANTAGONIZED BY THE BANKING INTEREST.

Hence in any event we believe that no practical benefit is to be attained from a currency commission.

WHAT WILL THEY INVESTIGATE?

After frittering away more than sixty days the legislature has voted \$100,000 to be expended by a committee instructed to investigate the conduct of the state treasury and all other state offices. The investigating committee has been appointed by the speaker and lieutenant-governor with the understanding that no work is to be done until after the legislature shall have adjourned.

Assume that the committee is composed of men who honestly desire to go to the bottom of all questionable transactions in the various executive departments, can they accomplish any tangible result unless clothed with full power to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers and books? Can they exercise any authority whatever after the adjournment of the legislature, which to all intents and purposes is extinct unless animation is revived by a call of the governor for an extra session? If the committee has no power of compulsory process in the conduct of the investigation, what will it accomplish that cannot be equally well and more economically performed by the state officers in charge of the various executive departments? These officers were elected on the fusion ticket and can have no interest in covering up any delinquencies of their predecessors in office. They have access to all the public documents and would encounter no difficulty that would not also be encountered by the legislative investigating committee.

UNDER SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES WHAT ARE THE CITIZENS AND TAXPAYERS OF NEBRASKA TO GAIN BY EXPENDING \$100,000 FOR A LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATION?

AN EXCESS OF RECEIPTS.

Last month was a favorable one for the treasury. The receipts were in excess of the expenditures. The returns from customs were larger than for any previous month for several years. But this result is not to be taken as evidence of the adequacy of the present tariff law. It was due to the heavy withdrawal of merchandise prompted by the fear of importers of legislation requiring them to pay the higher duties of the new tariff bill. An immense amount of goods was taken out of bond in March for this reason, swelling the receipts from customs to nearly \$2,000,000, which was \$9,000,000 in excess of the receipts for the corresponding month of last year. This scare having passed it may safely be expected that the customs receipts for the current month will fall off to about the extent of last month's gain, with a resulting deficit that will maintain the monthly average thus far in the current fiscal year. It will not be surprising, however, to find this excess of revenue for March extensively referred to as proof that there is no necessity for the new tariff bill or for any change from the present law.

THE DEMOCRATS AND THE TARIFF.

It is good party policy for the democrats in both houses to stand aside and allow the republicans to carry out a law. There will be some delay in the senate, but it should not be chargeable to the democrats. Some of the old republicans in that body are not so ready to acquiesce in their own account and cackle over them. They should be allowed to do so, and then the bill should be permitted to go right through.

THE TARIFF AND THE BONEYARD.

It is thought that the evicerated, lacerated Anglo-American arbitration treaty will fall of ratification in the senate. As the treaty stands now, after senatorial amendment, it is a bloodless, bloodless cipher. It might as well be knocked in the head and sent to the boneyard. The quality of the amendments proposed yesterday night is the quality of the little souls who are engineering that treaty.

ASKING TOO MUCH.

Spain wants a revision of its treaties with the United States which will make two years' residence by a naturalized American citizen of his birth equivalent to abandonment of his citizenship. Turkey would like a similar treaty. So long as America is not a republic, she will not be a friend and former adversary of the Turk. The only way to convince a Greek with a gun that he represents an armed peace is to end the rule of the Turk in Europe. The sultan broke by conquest and should have been bundled out long ago.

POST-BELLUM WARRIORS.

In view of the approaching dedication of the new building of the Century, it is highly interesting to "blue and gray friendship" which existed between General Grant and General Simon B. Buckner. General Buckner, who died in 1863, was a Confederate general. Previous to this he had visited Grant at Mount McGregor, and as Grant could not then speak he wrote a message to his friend and former adversary (reproduced in fac-simile by the Century for the first time), in which occurs a sentiment which is most suggestive of the "dying letter" of the man who said "let us compromise." Referring to certain post-bellum tongue-warrings, Grant wrote: "We have since both of us and we are both of us as much as they wished, or did not get warmed up to the fight until it was all over."

CROSS AND CRESCENT.

Indianapolis Journal: The powers should learn from their failure with Greece that they will not be safe hereafter for them to embark upon a policy without first ascertaining upon what ground the subject rests.

Denver Republican: The trouble on the frontier is growing more and more serious, and it looks as though it were impracticable to prevent a war which would involve Greece and Turkey. The only way to convince a Greek with a gun that he represents an armed peace is to end the rule of the Turk in Europe. The sultan broke by conquest and should have been bundled out long ago.

Chicago Record: One shudders to think of what might have happened to those Turkish officers at Iseddin, when the walls fell and had not the intruder war correspondent been "occupied at the time in protecting them at their request."

New York World: According to the London Times, the czar has ordered the concentration of 200,000 men in South Russia and they look very much like war. It is not to be forgotten that they sometimes serve to prevent it.

New York Times: Greece and Turkey are actually at war in Macedonia. What may come of this no man can forecast. But it is perfectly plain that the concert of Europe, which was to preserve peace and to have given for convicting at all manner of outrages for the sake of peace, has failed of its purpose. It is to be regretted that there is any republican in congress so un-mindful of his party's position and repeated pledges regarding civil service reform as to introduce such a proposition and seriously advocate it.

Among other reforms which ought to be inaugurated in the state house without delay is a revision of the system of audit upon the state treasurer. Under the Bartley regime the auditor never checked up the treasurer's accounts to the extent of verifying the cash bal-

ANCESS AND DEPOSITS IN APPROVED BANKS AND THE PUBLIC COULD PLEDGE IGNORANCE OF ALMOST EVERY INSTANCE OF MISCONDUCT IN THE TREASURY OFFICE.

If we are to have a state auditor it ought to be one who will audit and whose auditing will be a protection to the taxpayer. The auditor ought not only to check up the receipts and disbursements periodically but the balance sheet ought also to be given prompt and widespread publicity.

REPROBATE RANSOM WANTS IT DISTINCTLY UNDERSTOOD THAT HE DID NOT SANDING THE EXPOSITION BILL AS IT CAME TO THE SENATE FROM THE HOUSE, BUT THAT HE ONLY KNIFE THE AMENDMENTS BY WHICH THE APPROPRIATION WAS TO HAVE BEEN INCREASED AND THE STRINGS CUT OFF.

When it is borne in mind that the original bill which carried with it an appropriation of \$300,000 had been ostensibly favored by Ransom and that its reduction in the committee to \$200,000 was the lowest amount which Ransom had pledged himself on the stump to secure, his admission that he labored secretly to cut it to \$100,000 unmasks the impostor in all his hideousness.

A CHOLLY'S BREAK.

A young man of Omaha, presumably belonging to the first circles of that town, recently called on a jeweler there and asked to see a nice pair of self-links for his cuffs.

DRAG CHAIN OF PROPRIETY.

The duke of Wellington once called the House of Lords the drag-chain of the constitution. Adapting the figure to the senate and the republican theory of good times, we may now describe the senate as the drag-chain of propriety.

PERFECTING THE TREATY.

Senator Hoar has amended the arbitration treaty so as to exclude from its view questions of national policy. Now, if the senators will only examine all questions on which there may arise a disagreement between this country and Great Britain, the treaty will be complete.

ADVISED TO READ UP.

Senator Allen has made the startling discovery that congress has no power under the constitution to enact a tariff bill for any purpose except that of revenue. The Nebraska populist should read the history of the tariff bill passed by the first congress and signed by George Washington.

THE DEMOCRATS AND THE TARIFF.

It is good party policy for the democrats in both houses to stand aside and allow the republicans to carry out a law. There will be some delay in the senate, but it should not be chargeable to the democrats. Some of the old republicans in that body are not so ready to acquiesce in their own account and cackle over them. They should be allowed to do so, and then the bill should be permitted to go right through.

ASKING TOO MUCH.

Spain wants a revision of its treaties with the United States which will make two years' residence by a naturalized American citizen of his birth equivalent to abandonment of his citizenship. Turkey would like a similar treaty. So long as America is not a republic, she will not be a friend and former adversary of the Turk. The only way to convince a Greek with a gun that he represents an armed peace is to end the rule of the Turk in Europe. The sultan broke by conquest and should have been bundled out long ago.

POST-BELLUM WARRIORS.

In view of the approaching dedication of the new building of the Century, it is highly interesting to "blue and gray friendship" which existed between General Grant and General Simon B. Buckner. General Buckner, who died in 1863, was a Confederate general. Previous to this he had visited Grant at Mount McGregor, and as Grant could not then speak he wrote a message to his friend and former adversary (reproduced in fac-simile by the Century for the first time), in which occurs a sentiment which is most suggestive of the "dying letter" of the man who said "let us compromise." Referring to certain post-bellum tongue-warrings, Grant wrote: "We have since both of us and we are both of us as much as they wished, or did not get warmed up to the fight until it was all over."

CROSS AND CRESCENT.

Indianapolis Journal: The powers should learn from their failure with Greece that they will not be safe hereafter for them to embark upon a policy without first ascertaining upon what ground the subject rests.

Denver Republican: The trouble on the frontier is growing more and more serious, and it looks as though it were impracticable to prevent a war which would involve Greece and Turkey. The only way to convince a Greek with a gun that he represents an armed peace is to end the rule of the Turk in Europe. The sultan broke by conquest and should have been bundled out long ago.

Chicago Record: One shudders to think of what might have happened to those Turkish officers at Iseddin, when the walls fell and had not the intruder war correspondent been "occupied at the time in protecting them at their request."

New York World: According to the London Times, the czar has ordered the concentration of 200,000 men in South Russia and they look very much like war. It is not to be forgotten that they sometimes serve to prevent it.

THE BEE'S CHARGES OF CORRUPT INFLUENCE FULLY SUSTAINED BY THE EVIDENCE IN THE CASE.

Senator G. A. Murphy, chairman of the senate committee appointed to investigate the Bee's charges of corrupt influence in connection with the gambling bill passed by the senate, spoke as follows in opposing the resolution offered by Senator Schaaf, censuring the editor of The Omaha Bee in the state senate Thursday, April 1:

"Mr. President: I desire to say in explanation of my position that I am opposed to voting a vote of censure on the editor of The Omaha Bee for that editorial. I am favored by this resolution to pass a vote of censure against Mr. Rosewater, for what? For having the courage editorially to uncover the foulest and most damnable plot ever conceived in the womb of corruption in this state. For tearing off the mask of secrecy in the gambling den of Omaha to corrupt this legislature in securing legislation favorable to those pirates. I am asked to censure the man that made it public and that throttled the consummation of that vile conspiracy.

"Mr. Rosewater was in possession of evidence that was indubitable and irrefutable, that he submitted to our committee to the effect that a corruption fund was raised to place senate file 231 on the statute books of this state. An act that should have been entitled 'An act to license gambling in Nebraska.' He had evidence that would lead any prudent man to the conclusion which Mr. Rosewater reached that 'something was rotten in Denmark' with reference to senate file 231. He uncovered an exposed and corrupt committee that charged the prices of gamblers in Omaha, had employed corrupt means to secure the passage of a law that would make every honest moral man in this state blush for shame, and with the use of that fund had his agents at work to carry his devilish plot into execution. And the evidence discloses that this brazen bill found its way into this senate with that corruption fund behind it.

"But for the integrity and honor of members of this senate this corruption fund would have accomplished its fiendish work and Omaha would have become 'a den of thieves.' After the first agents employed under this fund had failed to place senate file No. 231 before this body, the evidence offered to the committee shows how the gamblers struck another lead, and one Louis Taylor, an employe of this senate, clerk of the committee on municipal affairs, was enlisted to procure the passage of this infamous bill. And the evidence offered by Mr. Rosewater before our committee shows that this gamblers' corruption fund was the inspiration behind Mr. Platt.

"Consider thus the manner in which the bill was rushed behind the senate without explanation or consideration, and does any senator feel surprised at the statement by the editor of The Bee, that the gamblers' boodle had influenced the passage of the bill? No, from the evidence in his possession and the fact that the bill passed as it did, any one must have logically reached that conclusion. The evidence falls to show any complicity on the part of the senate or any members thereof, and both reports of the committee exonerate the senate to even the remotest degree from the passage of the bill. I say that from the evidence in the possession of Mr. Rosewater the president of this senate or any other member of the senate must have reached the same conclusion that he did.

"The minority report shows why all the evidence desired by Mr. Rosewater to be produced before the committee was not given. He might have made a stronger case had not these conspirators at Omaha taken like rats to their holes when they were wanted before the committee. They scattered from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their guilt? The guilty who can run and hide are the worst of all. They scatter from their haunts of sin and iniquity as soon as the investigation was fairly begun and left the state at the approach of the officer in search of them. Does this not show their