

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

American ambassador at Rome, J. G. A. Leishman, dated March 23:

Mgr. Kennedy, rector of the American Catholic College, in reply to an inquiry which I caused to be made, requests that the following communication be transmitted to you! "The Holy Father will be delighted to grant an audience to Mr. Roosevelt on April 5, and hopes that nothing will arise to prevent it, such as the much regretted incident which made the reception of Mr. Fairbanks impossible."

Replying to Mr. Leishman on March 25, Mr. Roosevelt said:

Please present the following to Mgr. Kennedy: "It would be a real pleasure to me to be presented to the Holy Father, for whom I entertain high respect, both personally and as the head of a great church. I fully recognize his entire right to receive or not receive whomsoever he chooses, for any reason that seems good to him, and if he does not receive me I shall not for a moment question the propriety of his action. On the other hand, I in turn must decline to make any stipulations or submit to any conditions which in any way would limit my freedom of conduct. I trust that on April 5 he will find it convenient to receive me."

On March 28 Mr. Roosevelt at Cairo received a cablegram from Mr. Leishman, giving a message from Mgr. Kennedy, which concluded by saying:

His Holiness would be much pleased to grant an audience to Mr. Roosevelt, for whom he entertains high esteem, both personally and as the former President of the United States. His Holiness recognizes Mr. Roosevelt's entire right to full freedom of conduct. On the other hand, in view of the circumstances for which neither His Holiness nor Mr. Roosevelt is responsible, an audience could not take place except on the understanding expressed in the former message.

The following day Mr. Roosevelt sent another message to the American ambassador, saying:

The proposed presentation is, of course, now impossible.

Through an editorial message to the Outlook from Rome on the 3d, Mr. Roosevelt issued an appeal on the subject to the American people in which he said:

I am sure that the great majority of my fellow citizens, Catholics quite as much as Protestants, will feel that I acted in the only way possible for an American to act, and because of this very fact I most earnestly hope that the incident will be treated in a matter of course way as merely personal, and, above all, as not warranting the slightest exhibition of rancor or bitterness. . . . Bitter comment and criticism, acrimonious attack and defense are not only profitless but harmful, and to seize upon such an incident as this as an occasion for controversy would be wholly indefensible and should be frowned upon by Catholics and Protestants alike and all good Americans.

† †

The British Parliament.

When Mr. Asquith moved on the 29th that the

House of Commons go into committee of the whole to consider the Ministerial resolutions abolishing the absolute veto of the House of Lords (p. 297), he traced the course of events culminating in the Lords' interference with the Budget of 1909, and declared that under the circumstances the general elections of last winter had given the House of Commons express authority to bring that state of things to an end. The King's veto, he said, was as dead as Queen Anne, and the absolute veto of the Lords must follow before the road is cleared for the advent of a full grown and unfettered democracy. Mr. Balfour, the Tory leader, characterized the resolutions as "the most absurd experiment in constitution making upon which any government ever embarked," and intimated that if they became a law, the Tories would promptly repeal it when they returned to power. Mr. Redmond, leader of the Irish progressives, congratulated Mr. Asquith upon the substance of his resolutions, and said they would be supported heartily by himself and his friends. Winston Churchill, now the Home Secretary, closed his speech on the Lords' veto on the floor of the Commons on the 31st in a manner which is regarded as highly significant, coming from a cabinet minister. He declared that when the veto resolutions were disposed of in the Commons, the Ministry would advance with the Budget, regardless of the consequences. Unless the House of Commons carried the Budget, it was idle, he said, to look to the King or to the country to carry the veto bill; but he predicted that at the proper time and under the proper circumstances the Ministry would succeed in carrying both the veto and the Budget to the steps of the throne. "The time for action," he concluded, "has arrived. Since the Lords have used their veto to affront the prerogative of the Crown, and have invaded the rights of the Commons, it has become necessary that the Crown and the Commons, acting together, should restore the balance of the Constitution and restrict forever the veto power of the House of Lords."

†

Meanwhile a Tory motion to amend the resolutions (offered by Sir Robert Finlay), was defeated on the 4th by 357 to 251—a majority of 106 in an attendance of 608 out of a total membership of 670. The Finlay amendment as reported by cable declared that "a strong and efficient second chamber is necessary and that the Commons are willing to consider proposals for the reform of the present second chamber, but decline to proceed with proposals that would destroy the usefulness of any second chamber and thus remove the only safeguard against any great changes being made by the Government of the day without the consent and against the wishes of a majority of the electors." After the Finlay amendment had been rejected by