

and exchange—that is all legitimate business is or can be,—and production on its present scale is impossible without trade.

Trade! the foundation of civilization! the beginning of all progress!

Make it universal by making it free, and the death knell of war will be sounded! Most of the quarrels of men and of nations are the result of misunderstandings and the lack of common interests. Trade will make interests universal, interwoven and inextricable.

War is impossible between our States today because of the vital mutual interests resultant from free trade. We simply cannot afford to fight, and our common interests destroy also such desire. Our several States stand today the highest example and most forceful demonstration of the power of trade to harmonize the tempers, interests and desires of men. Their free intercourse is the greatest experiment in free trade in the history of the world, and their practice proves the theory sound.

+

The so called higher wages of this country are due to the higher productiveness of labor and to labor unions; not to foolish, wasteful, and worse than useless tariffs.

To complete this circle of ever widening beneficence we need not only free trade, but free production. All products come from land, but so surely as land is monopolized and vast areas of it held out of use for speculation, just so long shall we be hampered as a nation, as an industrial quantity, and our progress will always be threatened by prospective commercial adversity.

One little clause in the same Constitution (a companion piece to the other) would solve the problem—a simple provision like the other. Let us add it: "There shall be no tariffs between the States of this Union; *neither shall taxes be levied upon any product of labor for any purpose.*" Just thirteen words. But if they were embodied in that instrument, they would work a revolution—social, economic, political and moral.

+

To the statement, "I do not see it," as a response to the above assertion, let us say that you cannot see anything unless you look at it. This is true of a great waterfall, a great picture, a great building, a great man, and—a great idea.

Stop taxing industry for the support of government. Tax monopoly only; it is the child of government. Why should not the child do something for the parent when it is old enough—and

monopoly is very old and very strong. Government supports monopoly; labor supports itself. Just leave labor alone. Stop taxing it; that's all, and that's enough.

HENRY H. HARDINGE.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE SECOND ELECTION UNDER THE DES MOINES PLAN.

Des Moines, Ia., Apr. 4.

The second municipal election in Des Moines under the new "Plan" occurred March 28th.

At the primaries there had been only 24 candidates, against 40 at last election. Three out of the four old commissioners were re-elected, throwing out John L. Hamery, commissioner of public safety, who had won the enmity of the city traction company during a former administration by his detecting them in giving a bribe, and the hatred of the vice trusts during his recent term, by his vigorous prosecution and abolition of the red light district.

The new Mayor, Prof. James R. Hanna, a municipal ownership man, won out by a narrow margin of sixteen votes over Mayor Mathis.

John MacVicar, a former municipal ownership mayor, of whom much was expected two years ago (but who completely reversed himself after he was elected commissioner), with Schramm, his coadjutor or "me too," was re-elected by a large majority.

The other two men, Ash and Roe, were also believed to be corporation candidates. They had no platform but that political platitude "a square deal for every man"; however, they are young enough to respond to better influences, and Mayor Hanna may contrive a majority to obstruct some bad legislation.

+

In the recent campaign every trivial question was paraded, while the real one pertaining to the street car franchise, was dodged by all but the three municipal ownership men, two of whom did not sift through the primaries.

One of these, L. J. Kasson, is a single taxer. The other, A. D. Pugh, a socialist, and an astute lawyer, had, months ago, drawn up an ordinance which, among other things, provided that "no franchise or right for the use of the streets, alleys and public places of said city for street railway purposes shall be granted, renewed or extended by said city," and that the rights, if any, claimed by the street car company should be speedily and finally determined; it further arranged details for the assumption and maintenance by the city of the street car business. A petition of 2,100 names was secured to have this ordinance put to vote under the referendum feature of the Des Moines Plan, which was upheld by Judge Howe and the Supreme Court of Iowa as a proper delegation of legislative authority to the people of the city. Mr. Pugh took care in drawing up the instrument that "every step in the proceedings was legislative and beyond the power of the judiciary to supervise and superintend. That if the ordinance was beyond the power of the city it would be void

if passed and the judicial power could then be invoked."

Well, the Traction Company brought suit. Then Judge Howe claimed that the city had no power to pass such an ordinance, because the city had no express statutory authority for acquiring and operating street railways. That the duties of the city clerk in verifying the signatures to the petition were judicial, and the action of the council in submitting it to vote was also judicial and could be reviewed by the courts. The court held the whole legislative proceedings and enjoined the Clerk and Council from proceeding further with the ordinance. Mr. Pugh cites three important cases where this judicial enjoining of city councils was decided illegal by Supreme Courts. *Des Moines Gas Company vs. Des Moines* (44 Iowa, 505), *Albright vs. Fisher* (164 Missouri, 56; 64 S. W., 106), and *State ex rel. Rose vs. Superior Court* (105 Wis., 651; 81 N. W., 1046). But, strange to say, in these cases, the power enjoined was corporation power, while the parties trying to enjoin were only the people through their elected officials. It makes a difference on whose foot the shoe is. The amusing part of the judicial contention is that while it takes express statutory authority to permit a city to resume the ownership of its own streets and operate the street car business, it needs no express statutory authority whatever to compel it to go on granting continuous franchises to street car corporations forever!

An interesting feature of this judicial opinion by Judge Howe is that his judicial opinion (1,023 lines) was printed in all the four newspapers of Des Moines as advertising matter at 25 cents a line, with 17 lines devoted to ridicule of supposed socialist views and a plain insinuation that such an ordinance "would work great injury to plaintiff, and nothing short of the charity of the law can prevent one from believing that it was so intended."

Today, the street car company has gone back to straight five-cent fares after years of 6 for 25 cts!

LONA INGHAM ROBINSON.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before, continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, April 5, 1910.

Egyptian Nationalists Protest Against Mr. Roosevelt's Support of the English Protectorate.

Resentment against Mr. Roosevelt's assertions that Egypt was not ready for self-government, in his speech before the University of Cairo on the 28th (p. 297), was not only indicated by a written protest sent to Mr. Roosevelt by the Nationalist leaders, but also found popular expression on the

day following Mr. Roosevelt's University speech, in the marching of a mob of Nationalists to Mr. Roosevelt's hotel. Mr. Roosevelt did not happen to be within, but the mob was unaware of the fact, and for half an hour crowded the streets, crying: "Bas Roosevelt!" "Vive Egypt!" "Down with liars!" "Long live liberty! We demand a constitution! Long live independence!" The leaders would first shout a phrase like the cheer of leaders at an American football game; then the mob would repeat the cry passionately. The mob finally marched down the street, wheeled and returned to repeat the demonstration, with its ranks augmented by Cairo ragamuffins; then departed to disperse. At an evening meeting of protest, Ali Kamel, brother of the founder of the Egyptian Nationalist party, said:

It is surprising that Roosevelt opposes the grant of a constitution for Egypt, because he comes from a free country. The secret must lie in the fact that he is of Dutch descent, as the Dutch are well known as oppressors of their colonies.

The Cairo organ of the Nationalists, the *Alshaab*, has suggested that flatterers and English paid agents supplied Mr. Roosevelt with his information, and adds:

We expected Col. Roosevelt to give us a lesson in liberty, his country having suffered tyranny from England similar to that wherefrom we are suffering. But he declined to be anything but an advocate of British occupation.

In England the Radical papers of the 30th criticized Mr. Roosevelt's speech severely, but the Tory papers applauded it. One of the latter, the *Times*, through its Cairo correspondent, said that although it is not likely Col. Roosevelt's address will have much effect in Egypt, it was heartily welcomed there by the British and French and all those natives who have large interests which would be affected by a change in the system of government. "It is hoped," added the correspondent, "that it may help to convince the United States and the continent that British occupation is the only guarantee of order and financial stability."

† †

Roosevelt in Rome.

Soon after arriving in Rome, Mr. Roosevelt himself publicly announced the breaking off of diplomatic overtures for an audience with the Pope. He inferred from the correspondence that the Papal authorities conditioned the audience upon his refraining from addressing the Methodist mission at Rome. Former Vice-President Fairbanks had offended in this way and was consequently denied an audience. We give the correspondence with reference to Mr. Roosevelt, as Mr. Roosevelt has given it to the newspapers, and verbatim as they reported it. While at Cairo Mr. Roosevelt received the following message from the