

ESTABLISHED JUNE 19, 1871.

OMAHA, TUESDAY MORNING, JANUARY 24, 1905—TEN PAGES.

SINGLE COPY THREE CENTS.

TERMINAL TAX BILL

Foster Introduces the Measure in the Lower House of Legislature.

IDENTICAL WITH ONE KILLED LAST SESSION

Douglas Delegation Ready to Make a Fight for Such a Measure.

LANCASTER MEN ARE NOT SO ACTIVE

Strong Force in the Legislature Will Fight It to a Finish.

STANDS IN WAY OF ANOTHER MEASURE

Not in Harmony with Scheme to Consolidate City as County Taxing Machinery Desired

By (From a Staff Correspondent)

LINCOLN, Jan. 23.—The terminal tax bill introduced in the lower house of the legislature today is identical with the one introduced last session.

The Douglas delegation is ready to make a fight for such a measure.

The Lancaster men are not so active in the legislature.

A strong force in the legislature will fight it to a finish.

The bill stands in the way of another measure.

It is not in harmony with the scheme to consolidate the city as a county taxing machinery.

The bill is identical with the one introduced last session.

The Douglas delegation is ready to make a fight for such a measure.

The Lancaster men are not so active in the legislature.

A strong force in the legislature will fight it to a finish.

The bill stands in the way of another measure.

It is not in harmony with the scheme to consolidate the city as a county taxing machinery.

The bill is identical with the one introduced last session.

The Douglas delegation is ready to make a fight for such a measure.

The Lancaster men are not so active in the legislature.

A strong force in the legislature will fight it to a finish.

The bill stands in the way of another measure.

It is not in harmony with the scheme to consolidate the city as a county taxing machinery.

The bill is identical with the one introduced last session.

The Douglas delegation is ready to make a fight for such a measure.

The Lancaster men are not so active in the legislature.

A strong force in the legislature will fight it to a finish.

The bill stands in the way of another measure.

It is not in harmony with the scheme to consolidate the city as a county taxing machinery.

The bill is identical with the one introduced last session.

The Douglas delegation is ready to make a fight for such a measure.

The Lancaster men are not so active in the legislature.

A strong force in the legislature will fight it to a finish.

The bill stands in the way of another measure.

It is not in harmony with the scheme to consolidate the city as a county taxing machinery.

The bill is identical with the one introduced last session.

The Douglas delegation is ready to make a fight for such a measure.

The Lancaster men are not so active in the legislature.

A strong force in the legislature will fight it to a finish.

The bill stands in the way of another measure.

It is not in harmony with the scheme to consolidate the city as a county taxing machinery.

The bill is identical with the one introduced last session.

The Douglas delegation is ready to make a fight for such a measure.

The Lancaster men are not so active in the legislature.

A strong force in the legislature will fight it to a finish.

The bill stands in the way of another measure.

EXPECT VLADIVOSTOK FLEE

Vice Admiral Kamimura and His Squadron Watching for Its Advent.

TOKIO, Jan. 23.—(U. P. m.)—Vice Admiral Kamimura led today to rejoin his fleet.

The Japanese sacrificed seventeen vessels while blockading Port Arthur.

The Russians sank nine transports and lost other vessels.

Three hundred officers and 1,500 men were taken prisoners of war.

A majority of the prisoners have been sent to Tengencha and Hamatera.

GENERAL STOSSEL IS CRITICISED

Russian Admiral Says the Surrender Was a Disgrace.

TOKIO, Jan. 23.—A Russian admiral who has just joined the prisoners from Port Arthur now in Japan has given to the correspondent of the Associated Press an extended statement covering the defense and surrender of the fortress.

He characterizes the Russian general Stossel as having reached its extremity as a disgrace.

Stossel's conduct is criticized by the Russian press.

The admiral says that Vice Admiral Makarov, who commanded the Russian squadron at Port Arthur, and who went down with the battleship Petropavlovsk on April 13, dictated the policy of inactivity on the part of the fleet.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral admits that bitter friction existed between the army and navy.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral says that Vice Admiral Makarov, who commanded the Russian squadron at Port Arthur, and who went down with the battleship Petropavlovsk on April 13, dictated the policy of inactivity on the part of the fleet.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral admits that bitter friction existed between the army and navy.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral says that Vice Admiral Makarov, who commanded the Russian squadron at Port Arthur, and who went down with the battleship Petropavlovsk on April 13, dictated the policy of inactivity on the part of the fleet.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral admits that bitter friction existed between the army and navy.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral says that Vice Admiral Makarov, who commanded the Russian squadron at Port Arthur, and who went down with the battleship Petropavlovsk on April 13, dictated the policy of inactivity on the part of the fleet.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral admits that bitter friction existed between the army and navy.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral says that Vice Admiral Makarov, who commanded the Russian squadron at Port Arthur, and who went down with the battleship Petropavlovsk on April 13, dictated the policy of inactivity on the part of the fleet.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral admits that bitter friction existed between the army and navy.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral says that Vice Admiral Makarov, who commanded the Russian squadron at Port Arthur, and who went down with the battleship Petropavlovsk on April 13, dictated the policy of inactivity on the part of the fleet.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral admits that bitter friction existed between the army and navy.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral says that Vice Admiral Makarov, who commanded the Russian squadron at Port Arthur, and who went down with the battleship Petropavlovsk on April 13, dictated the policy of inactivity on the part of the fleet.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral admits that bitter friction existed between the army and navy.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral says that Vice Admiral Makarov, who commanded the Russian squadron at Port Arthur, and who went down with the battleship Petropavlovsk on April 13, dictated the policy of inactivity on the part of the fleet.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral admits that bitter friction existed between the army and navy.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral says that Vice Admiral Makarov, who commanded the Russian squadron at Port Arthur, and who went down with the battleship Petropavlovsk on April 13, dictated the policy of inactivity on the part of the fleet.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral admits that bitter friction existed between the army and navy.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

The admiral says that Vice Admiral Makarov, who commanded the Russian squadron at Port Arthur, and who went down with the battleship Petropavlovsk on April 13, dictated the policy of inactivity on the part of the fleet.

He says that the Russian fleet was not to be engaged in any way.

FIRST PRESIDENCY SUPREME

Senator Smoot Under Fire of Cross-Examination at Hands of Prosecution.

SENATORS OF APOSTLE THATCHER'S CASE

Says that Politics Was Not Principal Cause of Trouble Between Candidate and the Church Authorities.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 23.—The senate investigation into the charges against Senator Smoot will be closed this week.

The cross-examination of the respondent continued earlier than expected and several key witnesses for the defense were examined.

It was announced just before adjournment by the committee on privileges and elections that only a few more witnesses would be put on the stand.

Some documentary evidence, the investigation may conclude tomorrow.

The cross-examination of Senator Smoot resulted in an absolute refusal to testify in regard to the endowment ceremonies.

He also asserted that it was his business to call to account President Smith of the Mormon church, because Mr. Smith had admitted to the committee that he was living in violation of the laws of the land.

Three other witnesses refused to divulge the character of the endowment ceremonies.

Relative to the trial of Apostle Amos Thatcher following his differences with the church over politics, Senator Smoot said he would not want to say that politics was the principal cause of the trouble.

He said that the church was getting out of its proper function in interfering in functions of the state.

Judge Taylor asked if the fight against Thatcher was not led by the church and the witness replied that the church was the church of the state.

The church of the state, charged that Thatcher's candidacy was "anti-church."

Judge Taylor took up the political manifesto, or the rule which required officials of the church to obtain leave of absence, which Apostle Thatcher had disapproved and which he refused to obey.

As it was read, clause by clause, Senator Smoot endorsed the statements made by Thatcher in that connection.

Judge Taylor asked if Senator Smoot saw any criticism in the statement of Thatcher that the church was getting out of its proper function in interfering in functions of the state.

First Presidency Supreme.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

"That would be wrong and most reprehensible."

"The first presidency is supreme in everything pertaining to the church," said Senator Smoot.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

"That would be wrong and most reprehensible."

"The first presidency is supreme in everything pertaining to the church," said Senator Smoot.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

"That would be wrong and most reprehensible."

"The first presidency is supreme in everything pertaining to the church," said Senator Smoot.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

"That would be wrong and most reprehensible."

"The first presidency is supreme in everything pertaining to the church," said Senator Smoot.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

"That would be wrong and most reprehensible."

"The first presidency is supreme in everything pertaining to the church," said Senator Smoot.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

"That would be wrong and most reprehensible."

"The first presidency is supreme in everything pertaining to the church," said Senator Smoot.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

"That would be wrong and most reprehensible."

"The first presidency is supreme in everything pertaining to the church," said Senator Smoot.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

"That would be wrong and most reprehensible."

"The first presidency is supreme in everything pertaining to the church," said Senator Smoot.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

"That would be wrong and most reprehensible."

"The first presidency is supreme in everything pertaining to the church," said Senator Smoot.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

"That would be wrong and most reprehensible."

"The first presidency is supreme in everything pertaining to the church," said Senator Smoot.

"I do not think there was any charge that the church was trying to influence the action of the legislature," answered Senator Smoot.

BRYAN HAS NOT LOST HOPE

Sees Signs of Democratic Victory in the Next Campaign.

NE WHAVEN, Conn., Jan. 23.—William J. Bryan was the guest of honor at a dollar banquet given tonight in Warner hall.

Mr. Bryan made it an occasion for indicating the reason why the democratic party was so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

"Taking away the personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign there would be much left in the results to encourage the democratic party."

Mr. Bryan said that the democratic party was not so overwhelmingly defeated in the last campaign and also stated what seemed to him signs of promise for a democratic victory in the next presidential campaign.

He said in part:

NORECESS FOR RUSSIAN DEAD

Mr. Baker's Resolution to Adjourn Voted Down in the House.

MARYLAND REPRESENTATIVE IN A SWOON

Proposition to Control the Railroads in the Matter of Rates is Discussed by Burgess of Texas.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 23.—The session of the house today was devoted entirely to consideration of bills relating to the District of Columbia.

There was an echo of the disturbances in St. Petersburg yesterday when Mr. Baker of New York moved that an adjournment be taken out of respect to those who were killed in the clash with the Russian troops.

The only affirmative vote was recorded by Mr. Baker himself.

Mr. Peary of Maryland intervened by Mr. Peary of Maryland being seized with a nervous condition, necessitating a brief recess.

He soon revived and was conveyed to his home. The proposition to control the railroads in the matter of rates was discussed at length by Mr. Burgess of Texas and briefly by Mr. Hepburn of Iowa.

Hepburn on Railroads.

Summing up his remarks, Mr. Burgess said that an opportunity was now presented for members of the house to rise as a party to legislate which will restrict the railroads.

The matter, he said, resolved itself into the question, "are you with Roosevelt or are you with the railroads?"

Criticizing the house for its refusal to adjourn in respect to the memory of the people killed in St. Petersburg yesterday, Mr. Baker (N. Y.) said he could not conceive how the house could be indifferent to such a condition of affairs.

The house, he said, had devoted the day to "the little, petty district squabbles in the city of Washington."

While it had ignored what he termed the Russian horror, "a crime so unpunished, so wanted and so shameless and cruel that the whole civilized world stands aghast."

Mr. Hepburn (Iowa) took issue with Mr. Burgess regarding a portion of his remarks on railroad control.

He congratulated Mr. Burgess for pledging democratic support to such a measure.

Mr. Hepburn vigorously asserted that every shred of legislation now on the statute books regarding the control of railroads was the result of republican and republican bodies.

He charged that the democrats on one occasion had two years in which to amend the law, but that no recommendation of any kind or character was made by their committee on interstate commerce.

Mr. Littlefield (Maine) said congress must do one of two things—reduce appropriations or increase the revenues.

At 5:30 p. m. the house adjourned until tomorrow.

NO VOTE ON STATEHOOD BILL

Senate Passes Fortifications Bill After Rejected Amendment.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 23.—The senate today made another ineffectual effort in the senate today to have a time fixed for voting on the statehood bill.

The opposing senators expressed an unwillingness to vote in the bill until the amendments were disposed of.

Mr. Beveridge would not consent to a vote on them without an agreement extending to the bill itself.

The fortifications bill was passed after rejecting the amendment striking out the provision for regular fortifications.

When the senate met Mr. Perkins (Cal.) presented the credentials of Mr. Frank P. Flint.

The credentials of Mr. Lodge (Mass.) and Winthrop Murray Crane (Mass.) and McCumber (N. D.) were also presented.

A house bill was passed creating a new division of the circuit and district courts in the Eastern district of Missouri.

Mr. Spooner presented a joint resolution appropriating \$7,000