

ways been too high on most railroads, and the owners of the soil benefitted, have long ago paid for all benefits they have received or will receive for many years to come. Again, a great deal of the produce shipped by railroads comes from points remote, where the railroads could not affect the values of the land. Should the owners of this land be forced to pay for something they never received? We think not. The rates, especially here in Nebraska, are high enough, they are too high, and should be lowered instead of advanced.

The British possession, Canada, has long been a safe harbor for criminals from this country. If a crime had been committed; if the offender had escaped the clutches of the law and had reached Canada in safety, he could not be molested; for although the arm of the law is strong, it could not reach the criminal and mete out justice to him for his crime unless England gave her consent. This she would not do, however, for she regarded the surrender of fugitive criminals as a concession to foreign states and of course was unyielding. This feeling of restraint was gradually relaxed, and in 1842 a treaty was concluded between Great Britain and the United States which provided that criminals guilty of any one of seven most serious offences could be extradited and brought home for trial. This was surely a move in the right direction, but why allow the greater criminals to be punished and let the minor ones go free? What need to have a treaty between two countries that allows a gang of men to leave England, go to Belgium and rob the mails, then return to England and escape all punishment by law? For a crime committed in Belgium could not be tried in England and a treaty between the two countries forbade England giving up her subjects.

It is certainly proper that any crime committed against a state should be punished, but as long as a place of refuge shall be provided for criminals of this kind there will be an inducement for them to continue in their misdeeds, and will only aggravate an evil that we are trying to remedy. Justice should not be satisfied after she has extradited a man from a foreign state to try him for a certain crime, to let him go because that crime could not be fastened upon him, although she could have proven him guilty of another offence. She should so arrange her laws that no matter for what offence a person is extradited, he could be tried for any offence he has committed.

The new extradition treaty between this country and Great Britain, although somewhat tardy when compared with those of other countries, makes a decided advance on former treaties. It adds some nine or ten crimes to the list as extraditable, among them being embezzlement, larceny, perjury, burglary and some others. Thus the absconding bank cashier will have no place of safety to which he may resort. Those who commit any of the other crimes on the list with the hope of reaching Canada before the law overtakes them will have their hopes shattered. In all probability this treaty will be the means of preventing much crime, but there are a few things that seem to us important that have not been changed; these are, that for a political offence the offender is not to be extradited. This seems to leave the treaty still in an unfortunate condition, but it is, nevertheless, a step in the right direction.

In almost every criminal trial in which large interests are at stake, the cry is given that the jury has been bribed. This cry is reached all over the country and as a consequence the blame falls on the jury system. The principle upon which the jury system is based can not be assailed, but as any public institution will become derogatory if abused, so the jury sys-

tem, by misuse, has become a tool for men in power to use to enhance their own interests instead of using it for the good of all. In Chicago during the great Cronin trial it was alleged that the jury had been bribed. Several of the offenders were apprehended and tried, but there was not sufficient evidence to convict all, while it was found that the leading man in the conspiracy had escaped. This was the officer who had in charge the selecting of jurymen to try the cases that should come up in court. The conspirators, realizing the power vested in this officer succeeded in bribing him to name jurors in their favor. When this rascality was brought to light the officer escaped the clutches of the law by decamping. This is one of the ways in which the jury system may be made ineffective. Another way is in allowing the lawyers to ask the questions when selecting jurors. In this way a great many intelligent and competent jurymen are cast aside for men that may be influenced by bribery or some other external pressure brought to bear upon them. Judge Horton of the criminal court saw the havoc that was wrought among jurors in this manner. He departed from the old custom and examined the men who were to serve on the jury himself. If the lawyers had any questions to ask they had to ask them through him; if he thought the question was proper and right he asked it of the juror. His plan caused a great deal of disaffection among the lawyers for it weakened their power in getting satisfactory jurymen. To support his actions he showed that the law and decisions of the supreme courts of their states sustained him and that the supreme court of his own state never claimed that a lawyer was entitled to ask the questions himself. In this ruling Judge Horton should be upheld by the people, for it does away, in great part, with one of the evils connected with our jury system. If the people will see that the officers who have in charge the impaneling of jurors are honest men, the other evil will be eradicated, the jury system will resume its old time significance, and miscarriages of justice will not be so numerous.

MISCELLANY.

There was a man in our town,
And he was wonderous wise—
But one day he walked down street, and,
meeting a poor, unsuspecting fellow
sprung a McGinty gag on him;
a brick block fell on the wise man,—
And he now rests in the skies.

* * *

Those students who failed to hear Sol Smith Russell in "A Poor Relation," at the Funke the 11th, missed a rare treat. Indiscriminate going to all the shows that come along should certainly be deplored. In fact it becomes a positive evil. But when a man like Mr. Russell is to be heard students who appreciate an excellent portrayal of American character and who have a desire to see something that is refining as well as entertaining should make an effort to attend. The play given by Mr. Russell has not an objectionable feature. It tells a simple story in a simple, pleasing way. The characters are all perfectly natural. The audience which greeted the great comedian included some of the prominent ministers of the city. Boycott the horse play shows that come to the city and attend the good ones.

* * *

One of the dear Kappa Kappa Gamma girls don't like to go with the university boys. "They don't know anything about 'ettfket'." A barb girl standing near gently remarked, "I should think those dear little frat boys did." This is too