

# What the Insurgents Are Doing

## WHERE SENATOR CUMMINS' STANDS

Special dispatch to the New York Tribune: Des Moines, Ia., Sept. 5.—Senator Albert B. Cummins in a signed statement today states in a "bill of particulars" the reasons why he thinks President Taft should not be re-elected. He says that on all vital questions the allies and supporters of Mr. Taft have been the reactionaries and "stand-patters" in the senate and house, and that if the republican party believes in perpetuating this leadership it can not do better than renominate Mr. Taft. Mr. Cummins says he does not believe in this, and therefore hopes for the nomination of a progressive republican. The statement follows:

It is to be understood that my opposition to the renomination of Taft is based solely upon his attitude toward public questions, and my conviction that the convention ought to nominate a candidate for president who will be strongest in the election.

I have no other than the most friendly feeling for the president. With the preliminary and explanatory suggestions I present my bill of particulars.

It will be conceded, I suppose, that President Taft's alignment must be defined chiefly:

1. By his position upon the Payne-Aldrich tariff law.

2. By his position upon the bill for the further regulation of interstate common carriers, brought forward about the first of the year 1910.

3. By his position upon the change made in the postal savings law, just as it was being passed in the senate.

4. By his position upon the proposed income tax law, which was sought to be incorporated into the Payne-Aldrich tariff act.

5. By his attitude toward the control and disposition of our public domain.

6. By his position on the Canadian tariff bill passed at the extra session just closed.

7. By his work for the peace treaties.

8. By his vetoes of the woolen schedule, the free list and the resolution admitting New Mexico and Arizona as states.

It is manifest that space to analyze each of these measures and argue at length their merits or demerits is not available. I shall content myself in the main, therefore, with merely recalling to the minds of the people the line-up on each of them.

1. The Payne-Aldrich tariff law. Mr. Taft's associates in the making of this law, which he declared to be the best ever passed upon the subject, were Mr. Aldrich and his followers in the senate; Mr. Payne, Mr. Dalzell, Mr. Cannon and their followers in the house. It seems to me I am justified in the conclusion that he did not take "the progressive view" with respect to this measure.

2. One of the notable laws passed during the present administration is the act amending and enlarging what is commonly known as the interstate commerce law. President Taft made legislation upon the subject the prominent feature of the first regular session after he was inaugurated. Through his attorney general he presented to congress a bill which was introduced in the senate, referred to the committee on interstate commerce and reported back to the senate precisely as the attorney general wrote it, and as President Taft apparently believed it ought to be enacted.

If this bill had passed as insisted upon by the president, the work of nearly a quarter of a century would have been swept away and we would have taken a long step backward in the regulation of our railways.

The committee bill was put through the committee under the coercion of Mr. Aldrich and with his declaration that not a letter or line should be changed in it. It came to the senate and was opened up for discussion. Many parts of it were so bad that they found no defenders, and such effort as was made to defend the administration bill was led by Mr. Aldrich and Mr. Elkins.

It was reconstructed upon the floor of the senate by the progressives against the violent opposition of the reactionaries who were acting for the president. I believe that people generally will agree with me that with respect to this measure Mr. Taft did not take "the progressive view" of the subject.

3. Before the present administration came in a postal savings bill had been practically agreed upon in the senate, and the fight which

the progressives had made was to insure the deposit of the money put into the postoffices in the banks of the local communities. We had won out, but just as we were on the point of passing the bill, President Taft had sufficient influence to rewrite that part of the bill, and everybody recognizes that the law as it was finally adopted, in that respect, was a victory for the great city banks and a defeat for the small country banks. Again the president was found in the company of the reactionaries and not with the progressives.

4. The progressives were exceedingly anxious to attach an income tax law to the Payne-Aldrich tariff act. We had good reasons to believe that the president was with us in this effort, but at the moment when it seemed likely to succeed, the president, under the leadership of Mr. Aldrich and his close associates, brought forward the so-called corporation tax law and defeated the proposal to levy a tax upon the great incomes of the country. He did this through the instrumentality of the most pronounced reactionaries of congress. I think it must be conceded that whatever else may be said of his action, he did not take "the progressive view."

We were encouraged by the suggestion that we would be able to obtain an amendment to the constitution and we could then have an income tax law of unquestioned validity, but the constitution has not yet been amended to remove the doubt, and it is exceedingly doubtful if it ever will be.

5. All that I care to say is that he seems to be out of harmony with those who were recognized before his advent into office as the best exponents of the conservation policy, and so far as I know his appointment of Mr. Fisher as secretary of the interior was about the first act of his administration which commanded the approval of the progressives throughout the country.

6. With respect to the Canadian tariff bill, there is, of course, the widest difference of opinion. It is a false pretense from beginning to end. It gives free pulp and free paper to publishers using print paper and it gives free farm products, but it will not reduce the cost of living, and it will not, in my judgment, widen or enlarge our markets for manufactures in Canada. Its evil effects have been greatly exaggerated, and its beneficial effects are almost wholly imaginary.

The newspapers have their free pulp and free paper and I can easily understand why the measure appears to them as progressive legislation, but to those of us who have been laboring for a systematic and comprehensive reduction of duties, so that they will, in all the schedules, represent the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, the Canadian bill is the most unfortunate act of legislation passed within the period of the present administration, for it has destroyed the chance of a fair revision of the tariff along republican lines for years to come.

It is perfectly apparent that we must now either suffer the injustice of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law indefinitely or the perils of a democratic bill for revenue only. It's hard for me to think of the Canadian bill as progressive, believing as I do that its passage was the result of an understanding between the president and those eminent reactionaries, Penrose, of Pennsylvania, and Lodge, of Massachusetts, that they would see it through the senate if all other tariff bills reducing duties should be vetoed.

7. With regard to peace treaties, I am in hearty sympathy with the president in the endeavor to broaden the field of arbitration, but they can hardly be instanced as a great advance in the move for peace when they are construed as the president himself construes them in his public speeches, and as they must necessarily be construed if the senate amends them as is proposed, for they are practically the same as the peace treaty we already have with Great Britain.

8. With regard to the woolen bill and the free list bill, I have only to say that I haven't heard of any progressive rejoicing over the vetoes which killed them. They were both prepared with the greatest care and in the full light of abundant information, and both amply justified by the standard of protection. I predict that these bills gave the president the only chance he will ever have to sign acts of congress reducing the iniquitous duties of the Payne-Aldrich law, but preserving the system of pro-

tection. In waiting for his tariff report he lost an opportunity which democrats will not give him again.

With respect to the veto of the resolution admitting New Mexico and Arizona as states, I have this to say: Some of the progressives were opposed to provisions in both constitutions. They were not all in favor of the form of initiative, referendum and recall found in the Arizona constitution. I do not approve the recall of judges. All these things became immaterial in the presence of one progressive proposition, viz., that congress had no right to prescribe constitutions for these incoming states.

## CLAPP DENOUNCES TAFT VETO

Special dispatch to New York Tribune: San Francisco, Sept. 5.—The action of President Taft on the Arizona statehood bill, eliminating the recall of the judiciary, was denounced by Senator Clapp, of Minnesota, at a dinner, given last night by the direct legislation league, as an attempt at the bribery of the people. He said:

"What shall we say of a policy to force an electorate to forswear its convictions as the price of admission to the union? It savors of the dark ages. It is an attempt at the bribery of a people. There are two cases of bribery now being investigated by the senate, yet, in the face of that, here is an attempt to bribe a whole people. The insult to the people of Arizona will react on the opponents of the recall finally, and will do much to further the recall of the judiciary throughout the United States. The fight against the recall of the judiciary is the last stand of the special interests."

## CRAWFORD FOR LA FOLLETTE

Special dispatch to New York Tribune: Sioux Falls, S. D., Sept. 5.—In a statement to the Sioux Falls Press Senator C. I. Crawford, of South Dakota, says: "I am for La Follette for president. La Follette represents the principles and convictions of our people, and for that reason, and because in general I agree with him and admire his superb courage and commanding ability, I shall support his candidacy for the republican nomination for president."

## DAN V. STEPHENS

Nebraska City (Neb.) News: The democrats of the Third congressional district did well when they nominated Dan V. Stephens to succeed Mr. Latta as their congressman. Mr. Stephens is a man of more than state reputation. By his efforts in behalf of democracy he has become known all over the country. He is not a democrat simply because that is the name of the party, but he believes in the principles the party stands for. Every democrat and progressive republican in the Third district should use their influence for Mr. Stephens.

Tecumseh (Neb.) Journal-Tribune: Those who know Dan Stephens will have no fear as to his position on all public questions, as he has been a loyal party worker for many years. In fact it was Stephens who managed both the successful Latta campaigns, and that he will be elected is a foregone conclusion. While Mr. Stephens does not pose as an orator he is endowed with an abundance of sound horse sense, and we predict a brilliant record for the young man.

Lyons (Neb.) Mirror: We feel like throwing up our hat and hollering, because Stephens is a noble man of energy and courage—just such a man as the people need to lead them in the great struggle for the betterment of mankind.

Scribner (Neb.) News: When it comes to vote-getting Mr. Stephens' prowess over many a campaigner was demonstrated in the remarkable victories and gains he made against great odds in the number of campaigns he personally conducted for other men of his party faith. The News is more than pleased with the selection and firmly believes that the nominee will make a triumphant march to the goal of his ambition.

Oakland (Neb.) Independent (rep.): As was expected, Dan V. Stephens was nominated for congressman of this, the Third district, at the democratic convention in Norfolk, Tuesday. We remember when Stephens first entered politics as a candidate for county superintendent in Dodge county against the republican incumbent, Mr. Clarendon. Stephens was an obscure country school teacher, was not much in favor with the school teachers for the office he was seeking, but he conducted a most strenuous campaign and when the votes were counted it developed that he had had the support of the mass of farmers who do the voting and he was elected, and re-elected to the office. If campaign work will win, then Stephens is there with the goods.