

## REPUBLICAN LEADERS—CHARLES DICK OF OHIO

By Senator Robert M. LaFollette of Wisconsin.

It was during the "morning hour" of a day in the early part of a session of congress. A few spectators were in the galleries of the senate—"seeing the menagerie," as Tillman says. In the ladies' gallery two women were talking in loud whispers.

"I wonder who that senator is," said the first.

"Which senator?" asked the second.

"That tall senator with the military 'strut' who has just walked down to that desk in the middle of the third row on the republican side; that one with the long hair," replied the first.

"Oh, that one," said the other, "I'm sure I don't know. He looks like the actor who played Hamlet in the show that came to Greenville last winter."

"Oh, look!" exclaimed the first, as the senator in the third row arose and beckoned for a page. He is going to make a speech!"

But he didn't. He handed a bundle of papers to the page, to take to the clerk's desk, said a few words that could not be heard in the gallery and sat down. Then the vice president announced in quick, stentorian voice, "The senator from Ohio introduces the following bills." Whereupon the reading clerk proceeded, even more rapidly and stentorously, to read the titles of the bills introduced by the senator from Ohio.

"A bill granting a pension to William White."

"A bill granting an increase of pension to John Jones."

"A bill for the relief of Henry Smith."

"A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles Clark."

"A bill to place Frank Brown on the retired list of the army."

"A bill to correct the military record of James Green."

"A bill for the relief of the heirs of John King."

"A bill to erect a public building at Squashville, Ohio."

"A bill to promote Robert Roe on the retired list of the army."

"A bill for the relief of the estate of David Doe."

"A bill to increase the pay of the army, navy, marine corps, and the revenue cutter service."

"A bill to provide campaign badges for service in certain campaigns in the Spanish war."

"A bill to extend the franking privilege to officers of the national guard."

"A bill to readjust the pay of civil war soldiers on a gold basis."

"A bill to erect a memorial structure at Fort Bunk, Ohio."

"A bill to erect a statue of Edwin M. Stanton."

"A bill to create a civil war officers' annuity honor roll."

Contemplate that list, gentle reader, and ponder well the constructive statesmanship of Senator Charles Dick of Akron, Ohio. The names, of course, are fictitious, but the list is none the less representative of that genius which combines more ways than were ever before discovered of asking for something from your Uncle Samuel for someone who did, does or may wear a uniform and who votes in Ohio. These bills are general, special, public and private. The general legislation proposed must be ahead of the times for it fails to impress the committees to which it is referred. Of course, the introduction of it serves to endear the senator from Ohio to the proposed beneficiaries and this is possibly one of the purposes of its introduction.

As for the private bills, the ingenuity of the senator from Ohio is exceeded only by his industry in this field of statesmanship. During the last congress he introduced about ninety private bills, mostly proposing benefits for ex-soldiers. Over half of them were private pension bills. Anyone who knows enough about senate business to discharge the duties of messenger to the senate committee on disposition of useless papers could have told the senator from Ohio that the committee on pensions could have told the senator from Ohio that the committee on pensions could not report half that number of bills for any senator. Presumably the senator from Ohio did not know there was a limit. Presumably he was not baiting anyone.

In the senate, Dick is not much of a warrior. He is one of the kind of senators Dolliver had in mind when he pleaded with his colleagues not to be a bunch of "intellectual come-ones."

Dick's part in the tariff legislation consisted mainly in "standing by the committee" and introducing a few amendments asking higher duties for some Ohio interests.

He voted 121 times on provisions of the tariff bill and all but four of his votes were with Aldrich. Only one of these four could give Aldrich any offense. He voted for a motion by a New England senator to refer the Philippine tariff amendment to the committee on Philippines, of which he was a member. The other three votes were for duties that Aldrich did not care about and Dick's voting for them was probably not regarded as a breach of discipline by the "boss." The first one was in favor of a democratic amendment to subject kip and calf skins, which were free, to the same duty as Aldrich proposed for heavy hides. The second was for a democratic amendment increasing the duty on pineapples and the third was in favor of Tillman's ten cent tax on tea. He voted always for Aldrich's motions to table amendments proposing reductions of duty. He voted for every outrage proposed by the finance committee, from "Dutch standard" to the cotton schedule increases, except twice when he missed voting at all. On several occasions he voted for higher duties than the finance committee would recommend, including the Penrose and Curtis amendments proposing duties on petroleum. On the eighty-two roll calls where the issue was drawn clearly between higher duties on one hand and lower duties on the other, he voted every time for the higher and against the lower duty.

He introduced amendments proposing to increase the duties recommended by the finance committee and thereby set the stage for the playing of that tragic farce of Aldrich objecting to a tariff increase. At such times Aldrich's treatment of Dick suggested how much better it is to "insurge" a bit, a la Elkins, if you are a "system" senator and want to be accorded a chance to make a play for a home interest not on the Aldrich program. When Dick wanted to propose the restoration of the house rate on gypsum rock, which the finance committee had reduced, Aldrich cut him off curtly, declaring "There has got to be an end of this business (he almost said nonsense) at some time." Dick started to protest, "But Mr. President—" when Aldrich broke in and called for the consideration of the next paragraph of the bill and the "steam-roller" proceeded, scarcely allowing the senator from Ohio time with scant dignity to take himself out of the road. The moral of which being that a "system" senator of the Dick calibre sits in the senate for the purpose of voting with Aldrich and should learn to accept the answer of the "big boss" and not try to do "stunts."

An example of Dick's alacrity in the service of Ohio trusts was his voluntary defense of the cash register monopoly. This monopoly, said Senator Beveridge, "has probably not been exceeded in the atrocity of its practices by perhaps any other similar concern in the country, unless it might be the Standard Oil company, even if the things that are alleged about that corporation are true." And he put into the Record a list of 170 cash register "firms which this concern has either forced to the wall or forced into its arms." The cash register trust sells cash registers all over the world and, because of a high tariff duty, has been able to charge the American purchaser about twice as much as it charges the foreigner for the same article. Beveridge proposed an amendment to reduce the duty to 15 per cent. Both Ohio senators voted against it and curiously enough it was defeated by just two votes.

In Ohio, as in other central and middle western states, public sentiment demanded of congress that the tariff be taken off lumber. The Ohio state legislature memorialized congress for free lumber. The republican state convention in Ohio last year declared for free lumber. Now, such demands might appeal to some statesmen in congress. They doubtless appealed to President Taft and helped form his determination to insist that the tariff conferees report for free lumber. But these demands of the people of Ohio, the recommendation of her state legislature or the declaration of the state republican convention could make no appeal to the "system's" senator from Ohio. He was senator from Ohio but not senator for Ohio. So he looked not to Ohio to determine his course in legislation. Aldrich was there in the senate to tell him what the "system" wanted him to do and he looked to Aldrich. The house had reduced the duty on lumber to \$1 per thousand feet. Aldrich brought in an amendment to put the duty back to \$1.50 a thousand and Dick

voted for the Aldrich amendment. Also he voted against every amendment offered (and some were offered by republican members of the finance committee) to reduce the Aldrich rates. It may be that the Ohio legislature when it comes to choose a senator at the end of Dick's term will decide to have a senator from Ohio and for Ohio.—From LaFollette's Magazine.

## A QUESTION FOR TODAY

Under the headline, "Keeping the Record Straight," a southern paper says:

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot is not willing that the one-time populist party shall have credit for the origination of the agitation for the election of president, vice president and senators by a direct vote of the people, and it recalls that Andrew Jackson, who was born in North Carolina, urged in his first message to congress that the president and vice president should be chosen by the people without the intervention of the electoral machinery. Sixteen years later, Andrew Johnson, then a member of the house, offered a joint resolution to amend the constitution so as to allow the people to vote directly in the selection of senators.

When Johnson was president, in 1868, he recommended to congress the following changes in the organic law:

1. For the election of president and vice president by a direct vote of the people, instead of through the agency of electors, and making them ineligible for re-election to a second term.

2. For the distinct designation of the person who shall discharge the duties of president in the event of a vacancy in that office by the death, resignation, or removal of both the president and the vice president.

3. For the election of senators of the United States directly by the people of the several states, instead of by the legislatures thereof.

4. For the limitation to a period of years of the terms of the federal judges.

Indiana, through the action of a democratic legislature, demanded the direct election of senators in 1890, before the populist party had gained any headway, and since that time the states have petitioned for direct election of senators as follows:

1. Arkansas, April 25, 1901.
2. California, approved, 1900.
3. Minnesota, February 9, 1901.
4. Utah, March 12, 1903.
5. Kansas, certified, 1908.
6. Texas, April 17, 1901.
7. Illinois, April 9, 1903.
8. Indiana, March 11, 1907.
9. South Dakota, February 2, 1907.
10. Idaho, February 27, 1901.
11. Washington, March 12, 1903.
12. North Carolina, March 11, 1907.
13. Tennessee, March 22, 1905.
14. Montana, February 21, 1907.
15. Wyoming, February 16, 1895.
16. Nevada (date not noted).
17. Michigan, session of 1901.
18. Wisconsin, certified March 11, 1908.
19. Missouri, March 6, 1907.
20. Iowa, March 12, 1907.
21. Oregon, March 10, 1903.
22. Louisiana, November 25, 1907.
23. Colorado, April 1, 1901.
24. Kentucky, February 10, 1902.
25. Pennsylvania, February 13, 1901.
26. Nebraska, March 25, 1903.
27. Oklahoma, January 9, 1908.

This effectually disposes of the claim of populism that it instituted the demands for the direct election of president, vice president and senators.—Houston (Texas) Post.

It is not so important as to what particular party is entitled to the credit for originating a particular reform, it is more important to know the parties that advocate the reforms today. It would seem that among a progressive people, a reform that has been agitated for seventy-five years should at this time be able to command the serious attention on the part of President Taft who, prior to the election, declared that he personally favored the plan.

## MY CREED

I would be true, for there are those who trust me;  
I would be pure, for there are those who care;  
I would be strong, for there is much to suffer;  
I would be brave, for there is much to dare;

I would be friend of all—the foe—the  
friendless;

I would be giving and forget the gift;  
I would be humble, for I know my weakness;  
I would look up—and laugh—and love and lift.  
—Howard Arnold Walter in American Boy.