

thanking, the hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the diocese of New York. A retrospect of the past century...

The diocese of Baltimore embraced the whole territory of the United States until 1862. In that year it was divided into two dioceses...

EARLY LEADERS OF CHURCH HERE. Here the Cardinal gave, in turn, an account of the labors of each of his predecessors...

Archbishop Hughes was the man for the occasion. Like Archbishop Carroll, he was providentially raised up to meet the exigencies of the time...

Commenting on Cardinal McCloskey, he said that prelate was "weak, gentle, retiring from the world, and Hughes was "active, bold, vigorous, aggressive..."

It is quite unnecessary in this assembly to dwell at any length on the life of the late Archbishop Hughes. His life was a life of good deeds...

TRIBUTE TO ARCHBISHOP FARLEY. Then his eminence paid a beautiful tribute to the present Archbishop of New York. "It would ill become me," he said, "to enlarge here in his presence on the merits and labors of the popular prelate who now happily presides over the destinies of this flourishing archdiocese..."

MODERNISM DISCUSSED. Archbishop Glennon Preached Sermon at Pontifical Vespers. St. Patrick's Cathedral was filled again last evening with pontifical services...

KISSELBURGH ARRAIGNED. Deputy Attorney General Admits One Hotel Check Was Not Good. William E. Kisselburgh, a deputy Attorney General, accused of defrauding the Hotel Marie Antoinette out of more than \$1000...

GROWTH OF CHURCH HERE. The Cardinal then spoke of the causes that contributed to the growth and expansion of Catholicism in New York and said that "under God" for the work accomplished the Catholics of New York were "chiefly indebted to the tide of immigrants that for the last century has steadily flowed to your harbor..."

ORDWAY TO HEAR BERMEI CHARGES. Albany, April 28.—Governor Hughes appointed today Samuel H. Ordway, of New York, as commissioner to hear testimony on the charges filed against President Joseph Bermei of the Borough of Queens in connection with the sale of Klatsen Park...

NO ROAD BUILDING THIS YEAR.—SKENE. Albany, April 28.—The State Engineer and Surveyor sent a circular letter today to each of the eight counties and the city of Albany, announcing that, in view of the fact that the appropriation only \$1,000,000 was available for the additional improved highways and an additional \$2,000,000 to be available in October next, it would be impossible this year to advertise for proposals and award contracts for a single road...

THE CRIMINAL LAW. Regarding the administration of criminal law Mr. Taft said: Some of the causes for the lack of administration of the criminal law may be found in the

land has enlarged her boundaries, the Irish mission has proclaimed her laws, he has preached the Gospel; wherever England has erected a house of prayer, and missionary England has planted the banner of St. George, the Irish missionary has raised the Cross, the symbol of salvation.

In closing, the Cardinal admonished the assemblage to work in harmony with their beloved archbishop. "Take an active, loyal, personal interest in all that concerns the temporal and spiritual welfare of your beloved country," he said. "No man should be a drone in the social beehive. No one should be an indifferent spectator of the social, economic and political events occurring around him. As you all enjoy the protection of a strong and enlightened government, so should each man have a share in sustaining the burden of the commonwealth. Above all, take an abiding and a vital interest in all that affects your religion. Let the words of the royal psalmist be your inspiring watchword: 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand be forgotten. Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I do not remember thee, if I make not Jerusalem the beginning of my joy.'"

PAPAL BENEDICTION READ. When the Cardinal finished speaking, Archbishop Farley occupied the pulpit and, in a few happy words, thanked the visiting prelates and read the following message from Pope Pius X:

To our Venerable Brother, John M. Farley, Archbishop of New York. Health and apostolic benediction. The recurrence of the memorable events in the history of any diocese is at all times an occasion of joy, and the one hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the diocese of New York, your diocese has been extraordinarily, must call forth unusual rejoicing because of the many and noble testimonies that the highest expectations have been abundantly fulfilled. In view of these consoling results, that on the solemn centennial celebration of the diocese of New York, we have joyfully imparted to you and to your faithful people the apostolic benediction. Home, the month of April, 1908, in the fifth year of our Pontificate. (Signed) P. IUS X, Pope.

The Archbishop received numerous letters of congratulation from public officials, among them one from President Roosevelt, which has been printed in The Tribune. At the close of the solemn ceremonies the entire assemblage, both clergy and laity, stood and sang the hymn of thanksgiving.

Holy God, we praise Thy name, Lord of All, we love before Thee. As the two Cardinals slowly marched into the sanctuary the edifice resounded with, Infinite Thy vast domain, Everlasting is Thy name.

After the services the clergy of New York gave a dinner to the distinguished visitors in the Cathedral College. Monsignor Mieris was the toastmaster. Addresses were made by Cardinal Logue, Monsignor McCready, Monsignor Paicento and others.

MODERNISM DISCUSSED. Archbishop Glennon Preached Sermon at Pontifical Vespers. St. Patrick's Cathedral was filled again last evening with pontifical services...

KISSELBURGH ARRAIGNED. Deputy Attorney General Admits One Hotel Check Was Not Good. William E. Kisselburgh, a deputy Attorney General, accused of defrauding the Hotel Marie Antoinette out of more than \$1000...

GROWTH OF CHURCH HERE. The Cardinal then spoke of the causes that contributed to the growth and expansion of Catholicism in New York and said that "under God" for the work accomplished the Catholics of New York were "chiefly indebted to the tide of immigrants that for the last century has steadily flowed to your harbor..."

ORDWAY TO HEAR BERMEI CHARGES. Albany, April 28.—Governor Hughes appointed today Samuel H. Ordway, of New York, as commissioner to hear testimony on the charges filed against President Joseph Bermei of the Borough of Queens in connection with the sale of Klatsen Park...

NO ROAD BUILDING THIS YEAR.—SKENE. Albany, April 28.—The State Engineer and Surveyor sent a circular letter today to each of the eight counties and the city of Albany, announcing that, in view of the fact that the appropriation only \$1,000,000 was available for the additional improved highways and an additional \$2,000,000 to be available in October next, it would be impossible this year to advertise for proposals and award contracts for a single road...

THE CRIMINAL LAW. Regarding the administration of criminal law Mr. Taft said: Some of the causes for the lack of administration of the criminal law may be found in the

lenient, happy-go-lucky character of the American people, absorbed in business, and realizing the tremendous evils of their community that such a condition is a certain and essential to secure the rights of the individual against possible abuses by the government, but that to employ the most able lawyers and to take advantage of every technical necessity presented by the rules obtaining in the trial of criminal cases.

POWER OF RICH DEFENDANT. The theory of legislatures and, indeed, of the popular mind seems to be that it somehow works for the benefit of the public if the power of the jury in a jury trial is greatly reduced and the power of the jury greatly magnified; and we discover this legislative tendency more and more as the lower-class Western and Southern States. Under such conditions the advantage that the wealthy defendant has in the employment of the best legal counsel, and the means to secure acquittal, can hardly be exaggerated, and it becomes a difficult task for the most able legislatures to weaken the power of the court and increase the power of the jury, and to increase the advantage and the inequality enjoyed by the wealthy when brought before the bar of the court.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

lenient, happy-go-lucky character of the American people, absorbed in business, and realizing the tremendous evils of their community that such a condition is a certain and essential to secure the rights of the individual against possible abuses by the government, but that to employ the most able lawyers and to take advantage of every technical necessity presented by the rules obtaining in the trial of criminal cases.

POWER OF RICH DEFENDANT. The theory of legislatures and, indeed, of the popular mind seems to be that it somehow works for the benefit of the public if the power of the jury in a jury trial is greatly reduced and the power of the jury greatly magnified; and we discover this legislative tendency more and more as the lower-class Western and Southern States. Under such conditions the advantage that the wealthy defendant has in the employment of the best legal counsel, and the means to secure acquittal, can hardly be exaggerated, and it becomes a difficult task for the most able legislatures to weaken the power of the court and increase the power of the jury, and to increase the advantage and the inequality enjoyed by the wealthy when brought before the bar of the court.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

lenient, happy-go-lucky character of the American people, absorbed in business, and realizing the tremendous evils of their community that such a condition is a certain and essential to secure the rights of the individual against possible abuses by the government, but that to employ the most able lawyers and to take advantage of every technical necessity presented by the rules obtaining in the trial of criminal cases.

POWER OF RICH DEFENDANT. The theory of legislatures and, indeed, of the popular mind seems to be that it somehow works for the benefit of the public if the power of the jury in a jury trial is greatly reduced and the power of the jury greatly magnified; and we discover this legislative tendency more and more as the lower-class Western and Southern States. Under such conditions the advantage that the wealthy defendant has in the employment of the best legal counsel, and the means to secure acquittal, can hardly be exaggerated, and it becomes a difficult task for the most able legislatures to weaken the power of the court and increase the power of the jury, and to increase the advantage and the inequality enjoyed by the wealthy when brought before the bar of the court.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

One very salutary provision which ought to be included in the statutes of every state and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be to require that a trial in a criminal case should be held in the presence of the jury, and that the jury should be present at the reading of the verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

Another cause is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tendency of the legislatures to admit as jurors persons accredited as criminals and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to be used in excess of those allowed by the state. In my own state of Ohio, for a long time, the law was that the state was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant two or three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate by panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a jury of weak and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the case.

D. L. Loo's PERFECT Tooth Powder Cleanses, preserves and beautifies the teeth, and Purifies the breath A superior dentifrice for people of refinement Established in 1866 by J. H. Lyon, D.D.S.



"Electrics" A luxurious necessity—the most useful, and at the same time, the most pleasurable vehicle for about town and suburban use. For shopping and calling it is the ideal vehicle for women.

As a real utility for business trips about town, for the man who realizes the value of time and fresh air, the STUDEBAKER ELECTRIC is a necessity.

Can be driven by every member of the family, requires no chauffeur, is safe, convenient and economical. Can be charged automatically at your home. Write, phone or call.

STUDEBAKER BROS. CO. OF N. Y. Studebaker Building, B'way and 46th St., N.Y. City Telephone 3347, Bryant.

BLOW AT RACE BETTING TO BE PUT IN PLATFORM. Conference of Republican Leaders Said to Have Decided It.

Timothy L. Woodruff, chairman of the Republican State Committee, Senator Raines and Francis Hendricks, the Onondaga leader, were in conference yesterday at state committee headquarters concerning the special session of the Legislature called by the Governor to consider the racing bills and other measures not acted on by the last Legislature. As a result of the talk it is practically certain that the platform of the state convention next fall will contain a definite pronouncement in favor of legislation to do away with betting at racetracks.

Mr. Woodruff, Senator Raines and Mr. Hendricks are not particularly in sympathy with the Governor's reform measures. It is a fact, however, that all three realize that the Governor has raised an issue that will not be settled until it is settled right. The Republicans in the fall campaign shall not be put on the defensive either by the Democrats or the Hearst men on account of a failure to declare strongly against gambling evils such as race track betting and bookmaking.

Mr. Woodruff has had the Agnew-Hart bill compared with the present racing law against race track gambling. At state headquarters it was said that Mr. Woodruff was convinced that the Agnew-Hart bill was no improvement on the present law, and that something better would have to be devised sooner or later than the Agnew-Hart bill. Senator Raines said:

"The special session of the Legislature will be called to consider the racing bills on May 11 and later to the Governor's message informing the members, in accordance with the constitutional provisions, what measures they may consider. The measures will be referred to the proper committees and considered carefully. Then the members will vote on them according to the dictates of their individual consciences." Some of the delegates told Mr. Woodruff that Senator Raines had changed his mind about the bills since adjournment. Asked about Republican prospects in the Niagara-Orleans district, where a success in the fall would be a great help to the party, Mr. Woodruff said he expected to attend the conference and meet Representative Parsons was coming from Washington to attend it.

"It is an unusual thing for such a meeting to be held," said Mr. Woodruff. "It is the custom to wait till the delegates get to the national convention. Just what General Woodruff wants us to do I do not know. He has not consulted me about it. Some of the delegates told me that, if they attempt to make to elect a chairman of the delegation or to pass any binding rule of any sort, they will walk out. Three of the up-state districts have not elected their delegates, so that there is no chance that there will be a full attendance of the delegates."