

expression of doubt as to your own capacity for self-government? It is the part of patriotism to trust your people and enter the sisterhood of states with a firm confidence in the ability of your people to protect their own rights, take care of their own interests and advance their own welfare through a government which puts the people themselves in absolute control of their own affairs.

THE RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

The Dallas (Texas) News thus commends the plan inaugurated by the Sage Foundation to relieve the victims of loan sharks:

"The Russell Sage Foundation estimates that the loan shark business of New York amounts to \$30,000,000 a year, and that the average rate of interest charged is 120 per cent per annum. It has set about the task of putting these loan sharks out of business. It is engaged in a good work. These loan sharks are social vampires who ought to be destroyed if there is any possible way to do it. They are occasionally a convenience to some, but for the good they may do, they do a thousand times more harm. They first pander to profligacy, and then visit a terrible retribution on those whom they seduce. Furthermore, they operate in self-confessed defiance of law, and for that reason the state ought to proceed against them with as little mercy as they show for those who get within their clutches. It is to be hoped that this subject will get some consideration from our own legislature during its current session. The loan shark business thrives in Texas, too. Its spoils are not so great as in New York, of course, but it is not inferior in capacity nor in the boldness with which it mocks the law."

Well said! The money left by Sage, and so wisely employed by his widow, could not be put to better use. "The destruction of the poor is their poverty," said the wise man, and it is still true. In all the states and in the cities more attention ought to be given to the prevention of the injustice done to the poor by the chattel loan agents.

SCHEDULE BY SCHEDULE

Of course the protectionist democrats oppose the schedule by schedule plan of tariff revision. They do not want tariff reduction and they know that they can prevent it at the next session if they can only commit the party to a general bill. They know that no bill satisfactory to the democrats can pass the senate and that the adoption of a general bill plan would continue the high tariff for at least two years more. It would also give the voters an excuse for turning the party down in 1912, because of its insincerity. Then, too, a general bill gives protection democrats a chance to join the republicans in taking care of the protected industries on individual items while calling loudly for a general reduction.

Champ Clark understands all this and, therefore, he is insisting on revising the tariff, one schedule at a time, as the party did in 1892. That means a possible reduction soon, and it also means that the protection democrats will have to do their fighting in the open. More strength to your arm, Champ.

DEMOCRATIC OPPORTUNITY

The democrats would win a nation's gratitude if they would take advantage of their congressional victory to submit an amendment to the constitution postponing inauguration day for a month and providing that congress shall convene immediately after inauguration and that the second session shall adjourn before the election. Such a change would have two advantages: First, it would convene congress more quickly after the election and thus secure a more immediate compliance with the popular will; Second, it would give the people a chance to review the entire record of congress and pass judgment upon it, whereas at present they have no chance to sit in judgment upon the action of congress during the closing session. Several attempts have been made to delay inauguration day but there is still more reason why the first session of congress should be held earlier than it is and the last session before the following election.

The American Homestead, a monthly farm journal of national scope, will be sent to all Commoner subscribers, without additional cost, who renew their subscriptions during the month of March when this notice is mentioned.

Democrats Pass Canadian Reciprocity Bill

The house of representatives passed the Canadian reciprocity agreement February 14, by a vote of 291 to 92. The vote was divided in this way:

Republicans for reciprocity	78
Republicans against	89
Democrats for	143
Democrats against	5

The debate was long and bitter, Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, leading the anti's, and Clark, of Missouri, leading the supporters.

How They Voted

The final vote by which the bill was passed, was:

For the bill—Republicans: Alexander, of New York, Anthony, Austin, Barchfeld, Barnard, Bartholdt, Bingham, Boutell, Burke, of Pennsylvania, Butler, Calder, Cary, Cassidy, Cocks, Cooper, of Pennsylvania; Cooper, of Wisconsin, Crumpacker, Denby, Douglas, Draper, Durey, Fish, Foss, Garner of Pennsylvania, Gillette, Graff, Greene, Griest, Heald, Henry, of Connecticut, Higgins, Hill, Hinshaw, Hollingsworth, Howland, Hubbard of Iowa, Kinkaid of Nebraska, Knowland, Kronmiller, Kusterman, Lafean, Law, Lawrence, Longworth, McCall, McCreary, McCredie, McKinlay of California, McKinley of Illinois, McKinney, Madden, Madison, Mann, Massey, Miller of Kansas, Miller of Minnesota, Moon of Pennsylvania, Morehead, Needham, Nye, Olmstead, Parker, Parsons, Poindexter, Roberts, Rodenberg, Stafford, Stemp, Stevens, Sulloway, Taylor of Ohio, Tilson, Vreeland, Weeks, Wiley, Wilson of Illinois, Young of Michigan and Young of New York. Total, 78.

Democrats—Adair, Adamson, Aiken, Alexander of Missouri, Anderson, Ansberry, Ashbrook, Barnhart, Bartlett of Georgia, Bartlett of Nevada, Beall of Texas, Bell of Georgia, Boehme, Booher, Borland, Bowers, Brantley, Burgess, Barnett, Byrd, Byrns, Candler, Cantrill, Carlin, Carter, Clark of Florida, Clark of Missouri, Clayton, Cline, Collier, Conry, Covington, Cox of Indiana, Cox of Ohio, Craig, Cravens, Cullop, Dent, Denver, Dickinson, Dickson, Dies, Dixon of Indiana, Daniel, Driscoll, Dupree, Edwards of Georgia, Ellerbe, Ferris, Finley, Fitzgerald, Flood, Floyd, Foster of Illinois, Gallagher, Garner of Texas, Garrett, Gillespie, Glass, Goodwin, Goldfogle, Gordon, Graham of Illinois, Gregg, Hammill, Hamlin, Hardwick, Hardy, Harrison, Havens, Hay, Helfin, Helm, Henry of Texas, Hitchcock, Hobson, Houston, Hughes of Georgia, Hughes of New Jersey, Hull of Tennessee, Humphreys of Mississippi, James, Jamison, Johnson of Kentucky, Johnson of South Carolina, Jones, Kelliher, Kinkead of New Jersey, Kitchin, Korbly, Lamb, Latta, Lee, Legare, Lever, Lively, Lloyd, McDermott, McHenry, Macon, Maguire, Martin of Colorado, Mays, Mitchell, Moon of Tennessee, Morrison, Moss, Nicholls, O'Connell, Oldfield, Padgett, Page, Peters, Pou, Rainey, Rauch, Reid, Robinson, Roddenberry, Rucker of Missouri, Saunders, Shackelford, Sharp, Sheppard, Sherley, Sherwood, Sims, Sisson, Stayden, Small, Smith of Texas, Sparkman, Stanley, Stevens, Taylor of Alabama, Taylor of Colorado, Thomas of Kentucky, Thomas of North Carolina, Touvelle, Turnbull, Underwood, Watkins, Weisse and Wickliffe. Total, 143. In all, 221.

Against the bill—Republicans: Bennett of New York, Bradley, Burke of South Dakota, Burley, Campbell, Chapman, Cole, Cowles, Creager, Currier, Dalzell, Davidson, Davis, Dawson, Dodds, Dwight, Ellis, Elvins, Englebright, Esch, Fairchild, Fassett, Focht, Fordney, Foster of Vermont, Fuller, Gaines, Gardner of Massachusetts, Gardner of New Jersey, Goebel, Good, Graham of Pennsylvania, Grant, Guernsey, Hamer, Hanna, Haughen, Hawley, Hayes, Hull of Iowa, Humphrey of Washington, Keifer, Kendall, Kennedy of Iowa, Kennedy of Ohio, Knapp, Kopp, Langham, Lenroot, Linberg, Loudenslager, Lowden, Lundin, McLachlin, McLaughlin, Maltby, Martin of South Dakota, Mondell, Moore of Pennsylvania, Morgan of Missouri, Morgan of Oklahoma, Morse, Moxley, Nelson, Morris, Olcott, Rickert, Plumley, Pratt, Pray, Prince, Reeder, Scott, Simmons, Smith of Iowa, Snapp, Southwick, Steenerson, Sterling, Swasey, Thistlewood, Thomas of Ohio, Volsted, Wanger, Washburn, Wheeler, Woods of Iowa. Total, 87.

Democrats—Broussard, Estopinal, Hammond, Pujó, Webb. Total, 5. In all, 92.

During the debate Champ Clark said he believed the American flag would one day float over the entire western hemisphere. This remark stirred up considerable criticism in England. The Associated Press says: "President Taft took occasion to write to Representative McCall, introducer of the reciprocity bill, disclaiming and deprecating the annexation talk, and to follow it up with personal remarks even more emphatic to his visitors. The news that Mr. Clark's allusions had created excitement in Canada and in England occasioned great surprise and considerable amusement at the capitol. The man most surprised of all was Mr. Clark himself.

"Mr. Clark's entire speech on reciprocity yesterday, was delivered in a half humorous, half taunting vein. The house was in a gale of laughter most of the time. In return for the laughs he was creating, at their expense, some of the republicans tried to turn tables on Mr. Clark by chiding him with the fact that he might have President Taft as an opponent for the democratic nomination.

"This humorous exchange reflected the spirit of the debate during the time Mr. Clark was on his feet, and no one gave serious consideration to his remarks regarding the possible annexation of Canada. They regarded his statements in the nature of a compliment to the Canadian people, in that he would be glad to see the friendship that exists at present, between the Canadians and the United States ripen in the future so that all some day, may be under one flag. There was a further touch of facetiousness to the debate when one of the republicans asked Mr. Clark if he would like to be the first president of the magnificent union he was creating, and he replied, amid a burst of laughter, that he certainly would.

"The excitement abroad was attributed to the capital today in part to the fact that several English and Canadian newspaper correspondents were in the press gallery following the debate, when Mr. Clark spoke. His remarks may have appealed to them as the most important feature of the story and may have been cabled accordingly. In 'skeletonizing' his remarks for cable purposes the semi-humorous character of the debate was entirely lost sight of."

An Associated Press dispatch, under date of February 16, says: "Democratic leaders, particularly, were pleased today over the passage of the McCall bill. Representative Underwood, of Alabama, Minority Leader Clark's chief lieutenant, and the chairman of the ways and means committee of the next congress, said that he regarded the action of the house as in every way helpful to the democrats; that it marked the beginning of the end of high protection, and foreshadowed a democratic victory in the national elections in 1912. Their vote showed that the republicans were as badly split up as the democrats were in the last session of congress, during the Cleveland administration.

"Speaker Cannon, Republican Whip Dwight, Chairman Dalzell, of the rules committee, and other leaders of the republican party in the house, were among those who stood out against the administration program and the democratic leaders figured that this split in the ranks augured well for democratic success."

PANAMA CANAL EXPOSITION

A few weeks ago The Commoner published the following editorial on the Panama canal exposition:

"The approaching completion of the Panama canal, like other coming events, casts its shadow before it. New Orleans and San Francisco are contesting for the honor of holding an exposition commemorating the great event, and both Louisiana and California have put their credit back of the respective cities. By why this rivalry? Why not have two expositions? This is a notable wedding—this union of the oceans. Let the marriage take place at Panama with appropriate ceremonies; then let there be a reception at the home of the bride's parents and another at the home of the parents of the groom. It is not necessary to decide which is man and which is wife—the Pacific may be regarded as the husband because larger or as wife because of its better disposition. New Orleans can very properly represent the next of kin of one and San Francisco the near relatives of the other. New Orleans is nearer to Panama and also much nearer to the center of population. Probably three times as many people would attend an