

THE OMAHA BEE

DAILY (MORNING)—EVENING—SUNDAY
FOUNDED BY EDWARD ROSEWATER
VICTOR ROSEWATER, EDITOR

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is a member, is authorized to use for publication of all news dispatches...

BEE TELEPHONES:
Private Branch Exchange, Ask for the Department or Particular Person Wanted.
For Night or Sunday Service Call: Tyler 1000.

OFFICES OF THE BEE:
Home Office, 15th and Farnam.
Branch Office, 4110 North 24th St.
Branch Office, 2114 North 48th St.

Subscription rates:
Daily 64,611—Sunday 61,762
Annual circulation for the month subscribed and sent to by E. H. Reason, Circulation Manager.

You should know that
Omaha is one of the few cities in the United States owning a municipal auditorium.

Why was Paul Sutton put back?
Back on sugar rations again; how do you like it?
Going to the fair at Lincoln today? It is Omaha's special.

New Zealand ratified the peace treaty. Will this count as the third nation?
Railroad telegraphers are now asking \$1 an hour. They deserve it if anyone does.

The soviet party has been born. Its promoters plan to make America just as happy as Russia.
Commercial relations between France and Germany have resumed. The war must be over.

Building operations show an enormous increase in money, but not much in volume over last year.
The worst of Austria's situation is that all her able-bodied note-writers have gone into retirement.

Congress is planning to show Pershing a real good time. The whole nation will join in this enterprise.
Uncle Sam is going to open a big grocery store here. First thing on the list should be an ample supply of sugar.

Sir Edward Carson is hunting trouble again. It will be a pity if the British government does not accommodate him.
A defendant in a breach of promise suit counters with a claim for damages resulting from shock. New field for legal exploitation.

King Albert and Queen Elizabeth of Belgium will be with us this month, and will learn how a real democracy looks on the most gallant of his line.
Mexican marksmen must choose other targets than Uncle Sam's birdmen, or they may belie Senator Carranza's protestations of neutrality and amity.

One of our British friends says his country can keep pace with the United States in shipbuilding. Wait until the race gets fairly started, and then see.
Final conferences at the White House suggest that the boss does not want any "boners" pulled while he is away. Safety first means stay at home for him.

For the second time the Alabama legislature has refused to ratify the woman's suffrage amendment. By and by folks will begin to understand that Alabama means it.
The cost of living is forcing onto the market a number of old English family estates, and Baron Astor is threatening to sell his New York holdings, merely proving the rich are also having some trouble in stemming the tide stirred up by war.

The Edith Cavell Execution
Humanity's revulsion against the execution of Edith Cavell by the Germans is not mitigated one jot by the minority report of the committee on military law of the American Bar association, which says the execution was in accordance with the laws and usages of "civilized warfare."

Whatever the merits of the case in the tests of law considered in a detached way, the decent element of mankind will not overlook the fact that the German army has neither a legal nor a moral right to be on Belgian soil, and that fact properly is taken into account in either a legal or moral appraisal of Germany's execution of this heroic, self-sacrificing woman.

When Germany carried out this execution decree Germany already had become an armed burglar and murderer and despoiler of womanhood on forbidden Belgian soil, in the judgment of all those who hold that it is an imperative duty of a nation or an individual to keep the written or spoken word. Getting down to the rock bottom of fact and right, Germany had no more proper business in Belgium at that time than she had in Maine. She was a cruel trespasser without the shadow of accepted justification for her presence there.

How then are we to reconcile this world verdict, concurred in by many Germans themselves, with an opinion now put forth by an American legal authority that the slaying of this good woman was admissible under "the laws and usages of civilized warfare?"—Minneapolis Tribune.

AUSTRIA AND THE WORLD WAR.
Along with the peace treaty goes a formal note to Austria, charging responsibility for the world war. It is set forth plainly that the plea in avoidance set up by the legates of the late empire can not be given serious consideration. While the intrigues that preceded and followed the ultimatum to Serbia, the match that touched off the train leading to the great explosion emanated from the circles closest to the Hapsburgs, it is equally true that the people of Austria welcomed the war. In all their history they were never more submissive or loyally attached to the fortunes of the Hapsburg dynasty and the Austrian aristocracy than in the days after the world war was set in motion.

The Czechs and the Slavs alone are freed from this indictment. They had ties of blood with the Serbs and the Russians, as well as their own grievances, and it was known by some then as it is known by all now, that the Bohemians and other of the Slavic races held in bondage in the Austrian empire would be a source of trouble to the German alliance. The military put forth its utmost efforts to suppress the disaffection and throttle the patriotic impulse of these unwilling subjects of the Hapsburgs, with only the result that the hardships naturally incident to war were greatly increased in Bohemia, for example, by reason of the vicious enforcement of military orders.

But the Germans and Magyars under the emperor and his successors were for the war. Now they are presented with the bill, and must settle. Terms have not been made easy for them; they are expected to take the loser's end. Impossibilities are not asked, only such things as may be done by dint of diligence and economy. The throne of the Hapsburgs has been swallowed in the dust of the empire it represented, but the sins committed by its occupants will haunt their subjects for generations.

Hitchcock's Defense of the Treaty.
Senator Hitchcock, administration spokesman for the Versailles treaty, has made his long-advertised defense of that document. It consists of a series of assertions, rather than a connected argument, and presents no real reason for ratification. Dealing with Shantung, he resorts to the same form of avoidance as characterized the president's course. Instead of an intelligent discussion of what is involved in the provision, with its manifest injustice to China, the senator tells us that England and France are willing to ratify the deal with Japan, and asks if the United States can afford not to go along with them.

The real question is, Can the United States afford to become a party to the transaction, which on its face bears the marks of treachery to China, and the negotiation of which is the outcome of that secret diplomacy against which all Americans are set? Will our self-respect be maintained if for expediency we give assent to the unscrupulous grab by which Japan gets the richest province of China, along with 40,000,000 Chinese?

The "immense benefits" to be forfeited in event the treaty fails consist of Germany's consent to submit to justice in the matter of reparations and damages. As the United States has laid claims only to such reparation as covers private claims for damages, it is not plain where any escape for Germany is provided. As to the acts of the alien property commissioner, these will stand on their merits, regardless of whether we have German approval or not. The work was done in conformity with law, and its endurance requires no validation by the German government. That provision of the treaty is formal only, and in no sense vital.

Vital questions in connection with the League of Nations were not considered by the senator, probably being reserved for another time—after the president has made his personal appeal to the country. The position of the treaty has not been greatly strengthened by the latest effort of its most distinguished champion.

Extensive School Building Program.
Omaha folks have again been handed a pleasant surprise by the energetic school board, which has outlined a building program contemplating the expenditure of \$5,000,000. The extent of this proposed enterprise may give some idea of the growth of the city, particularly in those elements that make demands on the public schools. It is apparent, however, that the building schedule anticipates needs of the future, and its discussion must to some extent turn on this. The "junior" high school idea, to which Superintendent Beveridge is so devoted, looks ahead to a situation not yet wholly developed, and which must be stimulated to a considerable degree. Taxpayers have been of the opinion that with the existing high schools the demand for the advanced or special work among the older pupils was quite well taken care of, or will be when the new commercial-technical building has been erected. Omaha has always had pride in its city schools, and its people have never been niggard in providing for their support, and this long-time policy will be continued for the future. This very fact is sufficient warrant for careful scrutiny of the plans now before the board, and will justify the elimination of any features that may be dispensed with at no expense to the efficiency of the public service.

The Canadian gentleman who has survived thirty-five years of unsatisfied longing for Yorkshire pudding, and now seeks an "old country" cook who can provide him with his coveted delicacy deserves success. If he can be as true to his wife as he is to his appetite, their marriage will survive many shocks.

The people of the United States will be much more inclined to lend their credit to the bankrupt Europeans after the latter have shown some sign of becoming self-supporting. As long as the principal industry over there is politics, directed by bolshevism, just that long will our folks want to hold back.

Prohibitionists are undecided as to whether to continue as a national party. Considering the success achieved for their principles without any real representation in office, they ought to find their answer easy enough.

"Shoot him! Kill him!" yelled the "detective," and the murder was done, all in the name of law and order. How much longer can this persist?

New York's striking actors are showing that a play may be put on without a manager. That may solve the whole difficulty.

"English A" in France

Robert P. Utter in The Review.

"English A"—is it necessary to define the term? "Freshman English" the students called it. The catalogue described it as "Elementary composition, prescribed for all first-year men in the university. If you ever get close to a freshman year in an American university, you know all about it. You remember paying good money over the counter for tuition, and then trying to slip out of the shop without carrying off the goods, thinking it a huge joke on the storekeeper. You didn't like the way the goods were put up. They came in packages of an hour each in the presence of a languid or a nervous young instructor who read you his own undergraduate themes, interspersed with passages from Walter Pater and Theodore Dreiser, by way of illustrating matters you never took the trouble to grasp because you knew they were quite unessential. If you got as far as the graduate school, you know still more about it. By that time you were the instructor. You called it a "section-hand," and described the course as "Decomposition and Illustration, with Special Studies in the Theme Side of Life," and agreed enthusiastically with the colleague who described the professor in charge of the course as having "an admirable talent for organizing sawdust."

When we got to France and looked into our old kit-bags (the original ancestor of which must have belonged to Pandora) we were surprised to find English A there along with everything else. It was like the goblin on the load of furniture that was being removed from the haunted house—we did not know it was going with us. It must have been woven into the very fiber of our beings, for we carried no books nor any notes; we did not know when we started whether we were going to teach or sell cigarettes. We were told to include only bare necessities in our baggage, and it never occurred to us that English A fell in that category. But it did. We included it without hesitation or discussion in our preliminary list of English courses for the A. E. F. university. Naturally we must have a beginners' course of some kind; perhaps each heart did recall a different name, but all sang English A—to be sure, it was English A, by the time it got into print, but that was the registrar's doings. Then, between the acting of the dreadful thing and the first motion, we wondered what it would be like. There were, we indeed, the same old teachers in spite of our uniforms, and there would be they, the same old students. Yes, but think what they had been through since they left our class rooms. "Ecce homo," he states all inferno,—"what will he say to unity, mass, and coherence, these three? What will he do to English A? Catch it and throw it back at us like a hand grenade? And if he does, will it explode, or is it a dud?"

That was at the planning stage, and vague planning it was of necessity; we couldn't make definite plans without knowing who was to carry them out and in what rooms. "Ecce homo," he states all inferno,—"what will he say to unity, mass, and coherence, these three? What will he do to English A? Catch it and throw it back at us like a hand grenade? And if he does, will it explode, or is it a dud?"

So without any tinkering whatever we set up the old machine at Beaune, cranked it, and were delighted to find that it ran more smoothly in its new surroundings than ever before. Through no provision of ours, the surroundings had been adapted to it in three main particulars (English A always works by the rule of three). First, the sawdust had been properly organized for the first time in the history of the course—the army had done the trick better than the originator of the English A—it was spread under our feet in the class rooms to keep the earthen floor from churning into mud. At the sight our hearts leaped up; for once we could keep it all together, and no longer, pressed into the mud; if it could sprout in that soil whence spring the vines of France and milk of Burgundy, then we might accept its juice as the growth of God. Second, the men had not paid for what we had to offer them, and therefore did not feel obliged to neglect it. On the contrary, being paid \$30 a month and found for attending the university, they seemed to feel obliged to carry off all they could get. It became a habit in the A. E. F. to take anything anybody will give you. You see a line of men patiently standing, and automatically you attach yourself to the end of it, not knowing whether you will get a month's pay, a pair of pajamas, or a shot in the arm. It isn't that you get something you want; you get something for doing nothing. And you are compelled to stand in the line if you were it would be a formation, and you would dodge it if you could.

Doubtless the old English A of the organized sawdust is a thing of the past, at least in the sense in which the originator of a phrase meant it, the organization of all possible "errors" in the use of language into categories and hierarchies, and the preference of the rule with all the pomp of "Sound off!" and "Pass in review!" It is a joy that soon palls, this teaching innocent freshmen to blush at a pleonasm and shudder at a split infinitive. One soon begins to question the utility of teaching students whole categories of errors they never dreamed of, and turns to the more positive process of trying first to bring them to work by the rule, and then to write something, and then trying to help them express themselves. The sawdust method is much easier; it is a comparatively simple thing to take a body of organized material assumed to be fact and pile it neatly in minds made vacant for the purpose, but it has no rewards worth winning.

Popular Japanese Shade Tree.
After growing for 10 years, the Japanese cypress, one of the smallest specimens of the horticultural world, reaches the size of a golf ball. As if exhausted with this tremendous effort, the next 10 years see it increase only by a fraction, when it practically stops growing altogether.

TODAY

The Day We Celebrate.
Luther L. Kountze, born 1874.
Gen. Count Luigi Cadorna, the victorious commander of the Italian armies in the late war, born at Pallanza, 69 years ago.

Simon Lake, whose latest submarine boat invention makes it possible for a person to walk on the ocean bed, born at Pleasantville, N. J., 53 years ago.

Harold McGrath, author of numerous popular stories, born at Syracuse, N. Y., 48 years ago.

Henry Lefavour, president of Simmons college, born at Salem, Mass., 57 years ago.

C. Bascom Slem, representative in congress of the Ninth Virginia district, born in Lee county, Va., 49 years ago.

Thirty Years Ago in Omaha.
A special car from Lincoln bringing state, county and city officers and other prominent citizens, arrived in Omaha to take in the attractions of the week.

A heavy rain made it necessary to postpone the Merchants' ball at Exposition hall was a brilliant affair. Thomas Kilpatrick was chairman of the reception committee.

One hundred traveling men from Beatrice took part in the Drummers' parade.

Our Free Legal Aid

State your case clearly but briefly and a reliable lawyer will furnish the law or advise in this column. Your name will not be printed.

Let The Bee Advise You.
Motor Vehicles.
F. C.—Please answer through the column of your paper under the head of "Legal Aid" the following questions:

1. Is there any law in this state that prevents a child under legal age from running an automobile, if so, what is the age provided for?
2. Does the automobile have to stop before passing a street car at the usual stopping place provided the automobile can pass passengers getting on or off such street car without doing them any harm?
3. Is there any provision as to kind of lights that an automobile has to have?
Answer: 1. Any person who permits a child under the age of 16 to drive a motor vehicle is guilty of a misdemeanor.
2. Under section 28, chapter 190 Session Laws, 1919, it is provided as follows: "Upon approaching any public highway, every person operating a motor vehicle shall bring such vehicle to a full stop and shall not again start until said street cars have started. Provided, in cities or villages where provisions shall have been made by ordinance for safety zones where street cars stop, and where such zones are clearly marked on the street, persons operating motor vehicles may pass outside such safety zone without stopping; and provided further, the speed limit in such section shall not apply to physicians, or surgeons, or police, or fire vehicles, or ambulances when answering emergency calls demanding quick speed."
3. Section 31, Chapter 190, Session Laws, 1919, provides as follows: "Every motor vehicle while in use on public highways shall be provided with good and sufficient brakes and also with a suitable bell, horn or other signal, and shall have exhibited during the period from one hour before sunset to one hour before sunrise one or more lamps showing white lights visible within a reasonable distance from the direction in which such vehicle is proceeding, and such lights shall be of the reverse direction, provided further it shall be unlawful to use on a vehicle of any kind operated on the public highways of this state any lighting device of over four candlepower equipped with a reflector, unless the same be so designed, deflected, or arranged that no portion of the beam shall be reflected into the eyes of any person within a distance of 75 feet or more ahead of the lamps, shall rise above 42 inches from the level surface on which the vehicle is being operated, and shall not be used except when projecting their rays directly on the ground and at a distance not exceeding 30 feet in front of the vehicle."

Women Suffrage Amendment.
B. W.—Did the last legislature pass a resolution requesting Senator McCook to vote in favor of the women suffrage amendment?
Answer: It did.

Drainage Ditch.
G. E. M.—A drainage ditch was constructed in such a manner so that the surface water which it collected was discharged upon my property. Notwithstanding a drainage district employed a competent engineer, yet I can establish by the best kind of evidence that the plans of the ditch were faulty and that the ditch could have been constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters. Was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of such negligence casts the burden of proof upon me to establish that the ditch was not constructed in a manner so as to relieve me from the discharge of such waters, was not the ditch supposed to be a drainage ditch? Is it guilty of negligence in the construction of its ditch and by reason of