with the fact that the governor and attorney general of Illinois are now in Washington in obedience to some sort of call from the president. Governor Deneen, before he left Springfield, stated that he positively did not know why he was summoned to Washington, and the belief at the state capital is that he is to be required to obstruct and defeat several bills now pending in the legislature which are thought to be contributing to the Wall street panic. This new usage of summoning city and state officials to Washington to square themselves with the government is deeply interesting. The question is what this practice will grow into. The government has almost unlimited patronage at its disposal, and it becomes an interesting speculation whether these visits of mayors and governors will after a while combine legal conferences with political jobs. The further question is suggested whether bare authority will after a while be substituted for patronage. Secretary Root's 'feeler' in New York in regard to centralization resulted in an outburst of indignation all over the country, and yet there seems to be a growing inclination in Washington to co-ordinate federal and state action, and eventually to substitute one for the other."

THE Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, says: "Two prominent Tennessee lawyers, one of whom has been a personal friend of President Roosevelt for some years, were at the White House this afternoon, and, in the friendly conversation, they inquired of the president who he thought would be a good candidate for the presidency. The president replied: 'Well, you know I cannot be placed in the attitude of dictating who my successor shall be, but I want to say to you that there is not a better man in the country than Mr. Taft, my secretary of war.' Half an hour after they left the White House the story was being passed along as indicating the aggressive part which is being taken in things political by President Roosevelt. John Wesley Gaines of Tennessee said the story should not be taken seriously. He said that while the language quoted was substantially correct, he knew the president was speaking partly in jest, and without intention of conveying a 'tip' to his callers. Of far more significance was the action of the president tonight in announcing a decision to appoint John E. Sater of Columbia, Ohio, as judge of the new southern district of Ohio. The nomination will be fought strenuously by Senator Foraker, who also took occasion tonight to deny the statement in the Washington dispatches of the New York Sun yesterday that Mr. Taft will probably have the Ohio delegation in the next republican national convention, and that a decision in that connection will shortly be announced. The senator permitted himself to be quoted to the extent of saying: 'I have never said any such thing, nor have I authorized any one to say it for me.' The senator indicates that he will make a fight for the control of the state delegation."

THE SIGNIFICANCE of the appointment of the Ohio judge lies, according to the Globe-Democrat's correspondent, in the fact that it is a direct rebuff for Senator Foraker and a plum for Representative Burton of Ohio, Mr. Taft's political manager in the state. This correspondent says: "The bill creating the judicial place was passed by Senator Foraker's aid as a member of the judiciary committee of the senate, and claimed to have the promise of President Roosevelt that his man for the place, John J. Adams, would be appointed. But, after the bill was passed, Mr. Burton went to the White House and told the president that the appointment of Adams would be the carrying out of a political 'deal' made by Foraker and Dick. He explained that at the Dayton state republican convention there was a fight made by Senators Dick and Foraker for as strong an indorsement of their senatorial careers as there was embodied in the resolutions for the national administration. Some fine and bitter politics was played. Representative Burton and friends of Mr. Taft opposed the senators in their wish. Finally the Fifteenth congressional district gave its strength to the Foraker-Dick combination, and the senators won. Mr. Burton told the president that this delegation was delivered by two relatives of Mr. Adams named Black, who did so with the understanding that Adams would get the federal judgeship when created. The president, it is said by the Foraker people, sought an excuse for turning their man down. Foraker wrote a letter to the president in which he said that the Burton story had come to his attention. He denied that there was the least foundation for it. He said he had not talked with Adams for ten years about politics; drew attention to his standing and character and invited an impartial inquiry into the character and qualifications of Adams. The answer is the announcement tonight that Burton's man, Sater, gets the place. Senator Foraker will fight the confirmation of Sater's nomination to a finish when it is sent to the senate. A prominent man who has been visiting Washington for a few days called at the White house tonight to talk presidential politics. By way of getting a line on what President Roosevelt wanted done he asked: 'Mr. President, what kind of a delegation do you want Kansas to send to the republican national convention?' The president promptly said: 'Good men, who stand neither for Harrimanism nor LaFolletteism.'"

A LITTLE ROCK, Ark., dispatch to the St. Louis Globe-Democrat says: "The senate today, by the decisive vote of 19 to 6, passed the Amis bill requiring all insurance companies doing business in Arkansas to invest 75 per cent of their local reserve in the state. It is generally conceded that the measure will pass the house by a unanimous vote. Representatives of the large New York life insurance companies say the operation of the law will drive from the state all of the large life insurance companies."

THE NEW YORK PRESS, a republican paper, has its own ideas on the 1908 presidential question, and in making them public makes a very interesting showing. The Press says that one of the lists of possibilities for the republican nomination for president next year going the rounds of the newspapers is:

Theodore Roosevelt of New York.
Charles E. Hughes of New York.
Elihu Root of New York.
George B. Cortelyou of New York.
William H. Taft of Ohio.
Joseph B. Foraker of Ohio.
Leslie M. Shaw of Iowa.
Joseph G. Cannon of Illinois.
Charles W. Fairbanks of Indiana.
Albert B. Cummins of Iowa.
Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin.
W. M. Crane of Massachusetts.
Philander C. Knox of Pennsylvania.

BUT IN THE OPINION of the Press "a little blue penciling for obvious reasons shows how excessively the list has been padded." The Press adds: "These are to be stricken out for reasons that are self-evident:

Roosevelt—Because he will not touch it.

Root—Because he could not carry New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, nor a single state, with the possible exception of Iowa, west of the Mississippi river.

Cortelyou—Same reason.

Knox—Same reason.

Taft—Can't get the delegates of his own state, nor of any worth mentioning; might have a few federal officials from territories.

Foraker—President Roosevelt's battle ax will knock him in the head.

Cannon—Can carry the Standard Oil Trust, the Steel Trust, the Lumber Trust, the Sugar Trust, the Ship Subsidy grafters; nothing else.

Fairbanks—Frozen stiff.

Cummins—Hasn't any principles except 'push myself along.'

Crane—Never been introduced to the public."

THEN this republican paper concludes: "So the host dwindles to:

Hughes.
La Follette.
Shaw.

Shaw is a good man, but the public regards him as too conservative. It will not vote for a man who is less radical than Roosevelt. This leaves:

HUGHES.
LA FOLLETTE.
Plenty and to spare!"

UNDER date of Washington, March 19, the Scripps-McRae Press association carried a remarkable dispatch. The Commoner takes this dispatch from the Lincoln Daily News: "One of the most radical and far-reaching movements in American politics has been opened up in Roosevelt's latest addition to his railroad policy. State governments, so far as the railroads are concerned, are to be wiped out. State courts and legislatures, it is claimed by the administration, have no jurisdiction to regulate railroads. That means that every act by every state legislature, passed or being passed this winter or since June, is unconstitutional and void. It means that the two-cent fare laws, demurrage laws, safety coupler laws and other similar acts passed by state legislatures are worth no more than the paper on which they are written. These matters all will be hurried to the supreme court before Christmas. It is expected that control by the states over the roads will be a thing of the past, and this refers to within the state as well as between state carriers. The passage of the rate bill has done more than anybody suspected. It has wiped out state control over common carriers. The constitution gives to congress power over interstate commerce. Up to the passage of the rate bill, the federal government had not assumed full power over commerce between the states. In the passage of that act the federal government took full authority over the railroads. Nothing remains for the states. The president, in his opinion that the states have no control, even over within state roads, is backed up by an opinion by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of Ogden vs. Gibbons, in which that jurist said steamships plying between New York and Albany were engaged in interstate commerce. It is expected that the state rights senators will raise a big howl over this view of the rate bill."

THE public utilities bill pending in the New York legislature and endorsed by Governor Hughes promises, according to the New York World, to benefit and protect:

First—Every man, woman and child who rides in the surface, elevated or subway cars in the city.

Second—Every person who rides on steam railroads in the state.

Third—Every person who uses gas in the city and state.

Fourth—Every person who uses electricity for lighting or power in the city or state.

Fifth—Every shipper of freight in the state.

Sixth—Every minority investor in the stocks and bonds of street railway corporations.

If the public utilities bill becomes a law, it will compel:

First—A decent and adequate service on the lines of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit system.

Second—A decent and adequate service on the lines of the Metropolitan Street Railway company; the Manhattan Elevated Railway company and in the subways of the Interborough company.

Third—The steam railroads of the state to give their commuters an adequate and decent service.

Fourth—The gas companies to obey the law as to price and quality of their product.

Fifth—The electric light and power companies to make a fair and honest charge to their patrons.

Sixth—The railroads to treat all shippers of freight alike, with no preferences as to cars or rates to favored firms or corporations.

Seventh—A stoppage in high finance juggling of the securities of street railway companies, similar to the huge over-capitalization and stock-watering processes employed in the formation of the Interborough-Metropolitan company.

Eighth—Future mergers of street railways to be made on honest terms both for the public and the minority holders of securities in the merged companies.

Ninth—A cessation of speculating in franchises of street railway companies and issuing large blocks of stocks and bonds against them.

REFERRING to animals tried for crime, Countess Martinengo-Cesaresco, writing in the Contemporary Review, says: "The earliest allusions to such trials belong to the ninth century. One trial took place in 824 A. D. The Council of Worms decided in 868 that if a man has been killed by bees they ought to suffer death, 'but,' added the judgment, 'it will be permissible to eat their honey.' A relic of the same order of ideas lingers in the habit some people have of shooting a horse which has caused a fatal accident. A good, characteristic instance began on September 5, 1370. The young son of a Burgundian swineherd had been killed by three sows. All members of the herd were arrested as accomplices, which was a serious matter to their owners, the inmates of a neighboring convent, as the animals, if convicted, would be burnt and their ashes buried. Justice did not move quickly in those times; it was on September 12, 1379, that the Duke of Burgundy delivered judgment; only the three guilty sows and one young pig (what had it done?) were to be executed: the others were set at liberty, 'notwithstanding that they had seen the death of the boy without defending him.' Were they all alive after nine years? An important trial took place in Savoy in the year 1587. The accused was a certain fly. Two suitable advocates were assigned to the insects, who argued that these creatures had been blessed by God who gave them the right to feed on grass, and were in their right when they occupied the vineyards of the Commune; they availed themselves of a legitimate privilege conformable to divine and natural law. The mayor of St. Julien hastened to propose a compromise; he offered a piece of land where the flies might find a safe retreat and live out their days in peace and plenty. The offer was accepted. Records of 144 such trials have come to light."