

rang as sharp and clear as bugle notes, and were obeyed with the precision with which they were given. When the long blue column came marching back to the grand stand the cheers were so long and loud that a few drops of rain fell. There is no doubt that if Company B had repeated the drill Nebraska would have been blessed with a rain which would have meant universal salvation.

Next came the individual drill between the four best drilled men of each company.

The boys held their places nobly, but the sixteen were soon diminished to six, and the six to three. Those three stood it out together for a long time, but at last there were only two, Sergeant Weeks of Company A and Sergeant Pullis of Company B. Both men did some fine work, and Sergeant Pullis missed being first by almost an accident. The gold medal went to Sergeant Weeks, the silver medal to Sergeant Pullis.

After the markings had been figured up by the inspectors Lieutenant Wright, adjutant Second Infantry; Lieutenant Penn, commandant at Omaha High School and Lieutenant Hardin, instructor at Doane, Mrs. R. E. Giffen, Mrs. James A. Canfield, Mrs. E. H. Barbour and Mrs. and Governor Crouse descended into the plain. The batallion lined up in dress parade and Adjutant General Westerman announced the prizes.

The drill of companies resulted in a victory for Company B, with a mark of 90.2. D Company secured second place, obtaining a mark of 86.3. The winning company will be in possession of the Omaha cup and the University colors. The individual artillery first prize, consisting of a gold medal, was won by Corporal Benjamin, Company D, and Sergeant Weeks of Company A, won second prize. The artillery detachment drill was won by Company B.

The officers of the winning company are John W. Dixon, captain; W. A. Richmond, first lieutenant; Howard Ricketts, second lieutenant; Charles Elliott, first sergeant, and Joe Beardsley, second sergeant.

WOMEN AND POLITICAL ECONOMY.

In a former communication to the College press, reasons were given why women should study political economy; or, to put the matter more explicitly, it was attempted to be shown that there is an absence of reason why women should not study political economy. It has come to stay; it needs no defense; and the burden of proof lies on those who claim that any normal motive excludes any portion of the student-world from its benefits.

It may interest the women of the University of Nebraska to learn to what extent the prejudices of sex-differentiation have disappeared in the case of their sisters in other universities. For the purpose of gratifying the desire for this much needed information, the following data are given, personally furnished by the professors of the respective institutions, to whom acknowledgements for their kindness is hereby proffered.

Although not expressly so stated, except in the case of Bryn Mawr, it may be safely assumed that all the work mentioned is elective.

At Wellesley, out of a total of 760 students, some 30 are studying economics. No course is offered in sociology.

At Bryn Mawr, out of 250 students, 70 are studying political and economic science. Of 46 graduate students, 10 are included in the above 70.

At Leland Stanford, Jr., are 975 students. Of these, 297 are women. Of 56 students taking economics as a major study, 4 are women. "The total registration of all classes in this department is 255, of whom 38 are women."

At University of Chicago, out of a total (estimated) of 900 students, 241 are women. Of the latter, during the past winter quarter, 9 were studying political economy; 13, political science; and 1 was studying social science. Deducting names inserted twice, we have 17 studying political and economic science. These probably all are graduate women, who number altogether 72.

At Vassar, economics are only open to