

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