

THE OMAHA DAILY BEE.

Published every morning. Terms of subscription: Daily (without Sunday), One Year, \$2.00...

WAITING FOR THE PRESIDENT.

When congress adjourned last Friday it was with the expectation that President McKinley would communicate with that body today in regard to the Cuban question...

There is no intimation as to what the nature of the presidential message will be, but it is safe to expect that it will relegate the Cuban question wholly to congress...

Spring planting has just been begun by the political farmers who never turn a spade or guide a plow. In the offices of corporation lawyers and political hucksters the seed is being put into packages...

When the republican party was firmly entrenched in power in Nebraska it was justly denounced for ignoring the tillers of the soil and giving preference to lawyers and professional politicians...

When the populists broke away from the old parties in the hope of achieving reforms which they believed could not be secured in any other way, they organized themselves into the people's independent party...

Whatever may have been the situation in the beginning the party could hardly have gotten further from its original moorings than it is today. Not only has it been brought under the arbitrary rule of the most dictatorial close-corporation ring...

What can the harvest be under such conditions? How can the farmers and producers who were led to expect reform from the populist party look for relief from corporate domination from a political machine more securely dominated by the corporations than any that has gone before?

Grave charges were preferred before Governor Holcomb against three members of the Board of Fire and Police Commissioners on Monday, March 28, and the governor respectfully requested to set a time and place for a hearing of the testimony in support of the impeachment...

On Thursday, March 31, he notified the complainant by telegraph that he had selected a substitute to make the investigation which the law expressly requires him to make personally...

Instead of giving this protest due consideration the governor wired a night message, declaring that he would ignore the remonstrance and that the substitute would appear at Omaha in the morning to proceed with an investigation...

The inauguration of the exposition promises to be a gorgeous affair. With the governors of thirty states surrounded by their military staffs arrayed in superb uniforms at the head of the procession and the fantastic orientals of the Midway bringing up the rear, the show will beat anything ever witnessed west of the Mississippi.

Chief of Police Gallagher denies that there is more crime in Omaha than usual. If so, why is the chief asking for an enlarged force on the ground that the present department is unable to cope with the ever-increasing number of crooks attracted to Omaha by the assurance of immunity offered by incompetent and inefficient police officers?

error's chief of police that there is absolutely no ground for any demand on the part of our citizens for better police protection.

We violate no confidence in assuring the people of Omaha, including the long and short man and all the crooks, thugs and gamblers who have congregated here out of respect for the reform police commission, that the report of the governor's substitute will be a complete exoneration of the Herdman-Peabody-Gregory police board tripartite, the chief of police, and all the hold-up gang operating under their wing.

And the organ which Judge Gregory has repudiated will continue to play the same old tune at the same old stand.

BAD BANK DIRECTORSHIP.

A short time ago one of the principal national banks of Philadelphia failed. Recently the cashier of the institution has been arrested, the investigation made by the bank examiner having disclosed a condition of affairs justifying this course.

There is no such thing as an anti-pass law prohibiting city officials from accepting free privileges from street railways. The only legislation on that subject is a section of the new city charter which makes it an offense for city officials or employees to accept any valuable favor from the franchised corporations.

The man who showed up the boodle gambling bill scandal in which Herdman was inextricably scorching and Howell and Ransom burned their fingers is not running away from the impeachment charges he has preferred against Herdman and his police board pals.

Speaker Gaffin is reported as being busy putting in a crop of wheat and expressing the opinion that there is more money in a crop of wheat than in a crop of politics. That depends entirely upon how the farming is done.

It is true that there has been business of importance in Washington for every congressman the past few weeks, but that fact has not prevented the democratic senator from California from being the central figure in numerous political conferences in Utah, Colorado and other states where fusion plans were talked over.

A RETRACK FOR REMONETIZATION.

The British government has hit silver another blow and perhaps a final one. Last week the secretary of state for India made a statement showing the impossibility of reopening the India mints to silver, under present conditions, whereupon the House of Commons appointed a committee, with practically all the powers of a royal commission, to inquire into the practicability of the Indian government's proposal for a gold basis.

While this great wave of patriotism is sweeping over the country it is curious that the government in India has been compelled to sponge out the offenses of deserters and offer to re-enlist them without prejudice.

Excluding our coastwise trade with North America, the total number of American vessels engaged in foreign trade has cleared from our ports in 1897 was 739 sailing vessels and 458 steam. During the same time 2,171 foreign sailing vessels and 5,511 foreign steamers cleared from our ports.

The attitude of the India government in favor of establishing the gold standard in the only portion of the British dominions in which that standard does not exist will undoubtedly bring about that result at no very remote time, thus making the whole empire monometallic and its gold policy probably unchangeable.

For several days the deepest thinkers in the domain of thought have felt urged that something was wanting to their completeness and their happiness. They have tossed at night on uneasy couches. By day they have passed fevered hands over their foreheads. There was a lesion somewhere. A link had snapped, a wire had burned off, a button was gone, a screw was loose.

Somebody ought to keep a sharp eye on Germany while the United States and Spain are busy. The report from Liberia is to the effect that the officer of a German gunboat tried to collect a bill from the Liberian government, and, failing in this, offered to cancel the bill if the president would recognize the German right to a protectorate over the country.

United States to care for orphan republicans in the bygone world, but this conduct of Germany is not in keeping with German professions of good intentions.

As the people have had time to think over since the rejection of the treaty of annexation, became a certainty the sentiment in favor of acquiring Hawaii, which was quite strong in California at the outset, appears to be on the decline.

The proposal that wheat flour with which corn starch has been mixed shall be sold only under some name indicating that it is a mixture cannot do harm to any legitimate business interest, but there can be no excuse for requiring that a special tax shall be paid for the privilege of using such mixed flour.

There is no such thing as an anti-pass law prohibiting city officials from accepting free privileges from street railways. The only legislation on that subject is a section of the new city charter which makes it an offense for city officials or employees to accept any valuable favor from the franchised corporations.

The man who showed up the boodle gambling bill scandal in which Herdman was inextricably scorching and Howell and Ransom burned their fingers is not running away from the impeachment charges he has preferred against Herdman and his police board pals.

It is true that there has been business of importance in Washington for every congressman the past few weeks, but that fact has not prevented the democratic senator from California from being the central figure in numerous political conferences in Utah, Colorado and other states where fusion plans were talked over.

While this great wave of patriotism is sweeping over the country it is curious that the government in India has been compelled to sponge out the offenses of deserters and offer to re-enlist them without prejudice.

Excluding our coastwise trade with North America, the total number of American vessels engaged in foreign trade has cleared from our ports in 1897 was 739 sailing vessels and 458 steam. During the same time 2,171 foreign sailing vessels and 5,511 foreign steamers cleared from our ports.

The attitude of the India government in favor of establishing the gold standard in the only portion of the British dominions in which that standard does not exist will undoubtedly bring about that result at no very remote time, thus making the whole empire monometallic and its gold policy probably unchangeable.

For several days the deepest thinkers in the domain of thought have felt urged that something was wanting to their completeness and their happiness. They have tossed at night on uneasy couches. By day they have passed fevered hands over their foreheads. There was a lesion somewhere. A link had snapped, a wire had burned off, a button was gone, a screw was loose.

Somebody ought to keep a sharp eye on Germany while the United States and Spain are busy. The report from Liberia is to the effect that the officer of a German gunboat tried to collect a bill from the Liberian government, and, failing in this, offered to cancel the bill if the president would recognize the German right to a protectorate over the country.

COMMENT ON BARTLEY REHEARING. Crete Vidette (rep.): We were in hopes that the Bartley case would be settled, but it appears that the supreme court has decided to rehear the case.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

Crete Vidette (rep.): We were in hopes that the Bartley case would be settled, but it appears that the supreme court has decided to rehear the case.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

Crete Vidette (rep.): We were in hopes that the Bartley case would be settled, but it appears that the supreme court has decided to rehear the case.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

Crete Vidette (rep.): We were in hopes that the Bartley case would be settled, but it appears that the supreme court has decided to rehear the case.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.

When Judge Sullivan asked for rehearing in the Bartley case he exceeded no privilege nor lawfully his, yet why he should want it recalled in his honor is a question which, with that of the other two judges, confirmed the sentence of the lower court is not readily understood.