

Washington, May 29, 1912.

Hon. Harry D. Calhoun,
Barnwell, S. C.

Dear Sir:

Since dictating a hasty reply to your letter of the 25th inst. enquiring about a certain vote of Mr. Byrnes of your District it has come to my knowledge that I was not the only recipient of such a letter, which led me to conclude that you must feel some peculiar interest in Mr. Byrnes and that perhaps for that reason your letter deserved a more careful and extended answer. So I have taken occasion to verify the impression I had entertained of Mr. Byrnes' course in Congress and my opinion is confirmed that his record has been a most excellent one, and he has displayed marked ability on many occasions, and he is a faithful, able and upright representative; that the vote you complain of is the only one of importance on which I have differed with him, and that in that he had the company of nearly all the Democrats in the House, including most all of the leaders. I could not get my consent to fall out with him or discredit him for that vote. Under the circumstances he may be right. While I am fully satisfied with the rectitude of my course, I admit that it is possible for him to feel the same way about his course. He certainly has the advantage of me in having two-thirds of the Democrats of the House with him besides many of the leading Democrats of the country out of the House. I SHOULD REGARD IT VERY FOOLISH POLICY TO DEFEAT HIM BECAUSE YOU DIFFER WITH HIM ON THAT VOTE. IF YOU DO, YOU WILL TURN OUT TWO-THIRDS OF THE DEMOCRATS IN THE PRESENT HOUSE AND RETIRE FROM BUSINESS EVERY ONE OF THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT INCLUDING BRYAN.

Yours truly,

Signed: W. C. ADAMSON.

Washington, June 11th, 1912.

Hon. Harry D. Calhoun,
Barnwell, S. C.

Dear Sir:

I have your rather peculiar inquiry of the 10th inst., and hasten to advise you that I was not solicited by Mr. Byrnes to write you the letter of the 29th instant, or any other date, nor did he suggest that I write that letter or any other letter for his satisfaction or any other purpose. After writing you on the 27th, I learned that you had written similar letters to mine, to other members of the House, among them one of my colleagues from Georgia. Then it occurred to me perhaps in writing you hurriedly I had not expressed myself as fully as I should, and I thought it right to send you a supplemental letter.

Since learning that you are a candidate against Mr. Byrnes, I have deemed it only fair to him to furnish him copies of the two letters which I wrote you.

I have no interest in your fight at all and would take no more pleasure in furnishing information affecting you than affecting Mr. Byrnes. It was something unusual to receive a letter like yours asking me to pass upon the conduct of one of my colleagues, and I confess that I answered it rather hastily. I should have either weighed the matter more fully before answering you and written you more in detail, or should have declined to discuss it at all.

Yours very truly,

Signed: W. C. ADAMSON.

Did he receive any other letters from members who voted as he says he would have voted? Yes; and I'll take another one of his own witnesses, Mr. Stephens of Mississippi. Why didn't he publish it?

Washington, 5-27-12.

Mr. Harry D. Calhoun,
Barnwell, S. C.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of the 24th inst. received. I appreciate very much your complimentary reference to my remarks on the Bristow Amendment. You say "I notice that Mr. Byrnes of our District voted for the final adoption of the Bill. How do you reconcile his vote with others in this matter?"

The arguments advanced by those favoring the Bill were that it was extremely unlikely that the power given by the Amendment would ever be exercised, that the danger if any was very remote; and that, unless this amendment was adopted, no resolution could pass providing for the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people.

The demand for this reform has become so great that many good men thought it best to vote for the resolution as amended rather than have it fail altogether. A majority of the Congressmen from the South took this position. My feelings and judgment caused me to vote the other way; but I feel sure that these gentlemen were as honest and sincere in their conduct as I was.

With reference to Mr. Byrnes, I will say that I am serving on a committee with him and have had a good opportunity to study and to know him. I regard him as a splendid young man, honest, conscientious and intelligent. He is active and energetic. He devotes himself untiringly to his work. From what I know of him, I say unhesitatingly that no constituency has a representative who is more anxious to be of service to his constituents, or one who is more unremitting in his efforts than has the one represented by Mr. Byrnes.

(Signed) HUBERT D. STEPHENS,
Member of Congress.

And then Senator Tillman: Mr. Tillman has furnished me copies of his correspondence. Mr. Calhoun did not ask him what he thought about my vote? He asked what he thought of the action of the Democratic House? Mr. Tillman has furnished me the entire correspondence so that because Mr. Calhoun showed part, I could show

all and he would not be done an injustice by him. I shall give it all to you.

Washington, D. C., June 3rd, 1912.

Mr. Harry Calhoun,
Barnwell, S. C.

Dear Mr. Calhoun:

Since writing you on June 1st, I have thought more about the proposed constitutional amendment, and I feel it is due you that I should say this: When the House of Representatives accepted that amendment with the proposed Bristow amendment on it for which all our South Carolina members then present, voted, THEY COULD HAVE HARDLY DONE OTHERWISE UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES. They had done everything they possibly could to remove the obnoxious provision, had voted for the Bartlett amendment and in every way endeavored to secure an amendment acceptable to our people. The leading Democrats of the House voted for it, and they did this because of the urgent appeals of William Jennings Bryan and other leaders of the party. They also were largely controlled by the concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly itself of January 24th, 1911, a copy of which I send you.

THIS CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AMOUNTS TO INSTRUCTIONS TO THE SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE STATE. Indeed it is a part of the Democratic platform passed at Denver, and while it is true that the Bristow amendment was not a part of the original program, in their anxiety to get the constitution amended so as to provide for the direct vote, they felt that we in the South could take the risk because, from their knowledge of conditions and temper of the people, they felt as I do, that the probability of ever having to resort to extreme measures, was very remote, if not impossible. The Yankees are convinced of one thing, I believe, and that is that the white men in the South will not be governed by the negroes under any circumstances.

THIS AMENDMENT IN NO WAY INCREASED THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO CONTROL ELECTIONS. They can pass the Force Bill now if they had the votes, and from my observation, and I have traveled extensively and lectured on this subject all over the country, I have found the Yankees very little inclined to meddle with the South's way of managing the Race Problem.

ALL THINGS CONSIDERED, I FAIL TO SEE HOW ANY RIGHT THINKING AND WELL MEANING MAN CAN CRITICISE THE DEMOCRATS WHO VOTED FOR THIS MEASURE. I therefore, would not have you consider me as doing so in any sense of the word. It is merely a difference of opinion and I know the South Carolina members of the lower house are as good democrats as I am, and just as anxious to maintain white supremacy.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) B. R. TILLMAN.

Washington, June 11, 1912.

Mr. H. D. Calhoun,
Barnwell, S. C.

My dear Mr. Calhoun:

Yours of June 5th to hand, and I note what you say about the votes of our Democratic brethren in the House of Representatives. I have never said that our men voted "right." I distinctly said that I thought they made a mistake. I do not now say that it was a "good thing," for I am as much opposed to it now as I ever was, but having done all I could to prevent the Bristow amendment from being tacked on, and THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE HAVING DONE ALL THEY COULD, I DO NOT FEEL THAT THEY ARE JUSTLY TO BE CENSURED and that was all I intended to convey to you by my second letter. The people of South Carolina, if they are opposed to this constitutional amendment can instruct their Legislature to vote it down. I do not feel that there is as much danger as you seem to anticipate should the amendment be ratified. I think perhaps the amendment will fail to get the necessary three-fourth vote. If I were a member of the Legislature, I would vote against it still as I have done in the Senate. None of us know now what the future may have in store for us, but all true South Carolinians know that under this amendment, if it should be ratified, we will maintain white supremacy in South Carolina, just as we have maintained it in spite of the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments, AND I DO NOT THINK YOU OUGHT TO BE UNHAPPY ABOUT IT.

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) B. R. TILLMAN.

Washington, June 12, 1912.

Mr. H. D. Calhoun,
Barnwell, S. C.

My dear Sir:

Replying to yours of June 10th, Mr. Byrnes did not solicit or suggest that I write you again in reference to what I had written.

Yours very respectfully,

(Signed) B. R. TILLMAN.

Don't you think that in fairness to Senator Tillman he should have printed all of his letters and not misled the people?

As to Senator Bacon, I care nothing for what he thinks about it. Having voted against the overwhelming majority of Democrats he is trying to explain the best he can. He may say he voted against this measure, because he believed it detracted from the power of the States; but few people in Washington believe he favors the election of Senators by the people at all. Senator Johnston, of Alabama, says the Southern representatives voted against this measure because they were younger than he is. Some of the Southern representatives, many of them who stuck to their party, are as old as he is and have as good memories, not to speak of common sense. He may criticize the Southern representatives,

but I am glad that I voted with a majority of them against him. He voted for Lorimer and now has opposed to him Capt. Richmond P. Hobson, who will most likely defeat him. Certainly, one of the other Senators who voted against this measure, has already been defeated, Foster, of Louisiana.

When Mr. Calhoun says or intimates that he fears negro domination again in South Carolina, he does not mean it. He does it for votes. When in '76, with half the manhood of the State left lying on the fields of Virginia, those who remained, poverty stricken though they were, and surrounded by Yankee soldiers, overthrew negro rule and established white supremacy, they established it forever; and today no man with red blood in his veins will admit the possibility of his being ruled by an inferior race of negroes. If I feared it I would not admit it, and the mere statement is an insult to the white people of the South, and unworthy of a man who boasts of the glorious name of Calhoun and the military name of Colonel.

Oscar Underwood Tells Why He Fought For Amendment.

May 21st, 1912.

Mr. Morrison H. Caldwell,
Concord, North Carolina.

My dear Caldwell:

Yours of the 19th inst. reached me this morning, in reference to the Bristow amendment. Of course, as you understand, the Bristow amendment is merely in line with amendments to the Constitution that have repeatedly passed the House of Representatives since the Civil war, and received the votes of the Democrats in Congress. It places the United States Senators on exactly the same status as the members of Congress. It does not in any way change the qualifications of voters and I do not think there would have been any real question raised about the matter if it had not been for the fact that I was a candidate for the Presidential nomination and the Wilson men in the House tried to use my vote to affect the result of the election in North Carolina. In this day and time there is no possibility of a Force bill being enacted. I really believe it is an injury to our people in the South for some of our Statesmen to continue to talk about it. If the Bartlett proposition had been agreed to in the House, the Senate undoubtedly would not have concurred and it would have resulted in the defeat of the resolution to elect United States Senators by the people. As I have always been heartily in accord with the main purpose of the resolution, I could not vote for a proposition that I felt was intended to defeat it.

Of course, the real vote was on the adoption of the Bristow amendment itself. Two hundred and thirty-seven voted in favor of it and thirty-nine against it. All the Democrats from New Jersey, Mr. Wilson's state, voted with me against the Bartlett amendment, as did Mr. Henry, of Texas, and Mr. Burleson, of Texas, who were recently in North Carolina, making speeches for Governor Wilson. On the passage of the Bristow amendment, Burleson and Henry both voted for it, as did Messrs. Kitchen, Page, Pou, Small and Stedman of your State and most of the Democratic members from the South. When the final vote was taken in the Senate on the Bristow amendment, Senator Simmons of your State voted for it and Senator Overman, who gave out the interview against me stated in the Senate, when his name was called, "On the final passage of the joint resolution as amended (which was the Bristow amendment) I am paired with the Senior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Tillman). If he were presented he would vote "nay" and I should vote "yea." I send you record of June 12, 1912, with corner of page turned, giving the vote of the Senate, and also the Record of May 13th, giving my speech on the vote in the House. I think after an examination of these records you will see that the charges made against my vote were purely for political reasons to effect the present campaign, and that the position I took was really sustained by the Senators and members of Congress from North Carolina, because if they really thought there was danger in the Bristow amendment, they would not have voted for it. Of course, it goes without saying that I am not in favor of a Force Bill, or having Federal troops at the polls, but I was in favor of electing United States Senators by the people, and cast my vote to accomplish the result.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) O. W. UNDERWOOD.

Senator Tillman Says This Amounted to Instruction to Vote as Byrnes Did.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF SOUTH CAROLINA IN 1911 IN REGARD TO THE ELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATORS BY A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE.

Sec. 1. That it is the sense of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina that the Constitution of the United States relative to the election of United States Senators be so amended as to provide for their election by a direct vote of the people of each State.

Sec. 2. That a copy of this resolution be furnished each member of Congress from South Carolina.

In the House,

Columbia, S. C., January 24th, 1911.

Comments of the Press on Mr. Byrnes' Good Work.

BYRNES FORGING TO THE FRONT.

The Washington correspondence of the News and Courier contained the following:

None of the first-term members of Congress from the South, and very few of such members from any part of the country, can be justly said to have acquired more influence in the deliberations of the 62nd session than Mr. James F. Byrnes, of the Second South Carolina district.

This fact is the more remarkable in connection with the circumstances that Mr. Byrnes is one of the youngest Congressmen on the whole list. He has shown a great deal of practical ability in shaping matters for presentation on the floor, and likewise in advancing them in debate after they have come up for consideration by the House. His success as an organizer has begun to attract much attention from his colleagues. One of the chief elements in the success is that he does not seem to care overmuch who gets the credit, individually, for promoting legislation in which he is interested, provided only that the legislation is promoted.

The great influence of Mr. Byrnes in advancing the movement for Federal aid for good roads in the various States by organizing the advocates of this policy in a compact phalanx behind a joint bill, offered as a rider to the postoffice appropriation bill, has been mentioned in this correspondence.

Mr. Byrnes has also been extremely active as a member of the war claims committee in pushing the effort to secure definite information from the Government as to the ownership of property captured and sold by the Federal authorities during the civil war, and his bill on this subject, favorably recommended by the war claims committee, has been made the subject of a long communication from the Secretary of War to the Speaker of the House.

Another committee on which the young South Carolinian has been prominent is the committee on banking and currency, which made him a member of its sub-committee to handle the Money Trust investigation. While at first in favor of the action of the House Democratic caucus, which assigned various phases of this inquiry to other committees, Mr. Byrnes became convinced from subsequent experience as a member of the sub-committee that if a genuine investigation was to be made, it would have to be concentrated in one committee with ample powers, and in supporting the request of his sub-committee for such authority in the debate of Thursday, which resulted in overwhelming accession to the sub-committee's views, Mr. Byrnes drew great applause by declaring, in colloquy with Representative Tribble, of Georgia:

"For my part, as a member of this sub-committee, I do not want to be connected with an investigation the result of which we know now would be a farce, because we would be stopped at every step, and if we are to be hedged in, if we are to be restricted in our power, I can say to the House that I intend to ask the chairman to be relieved from duty upon this committee, because I do not desire to be one of a committee starting out to investigate a Money Trust, by direction of this House, and knowing from the very commencement of the investigation that we can absolutely make of it nothing but a farce."

WHERE THERE'S NO DANGER.

The people of South Carolina are not likely to take seriously an outcry against South Carolina members of Congress because they voted for the amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote. The adoption of the amendment in the form in which it finally passed Congress, to be submitted to the States for ratification, gives to the Federal government no more power to interfere with senatorial elections than the government already has in respect to the election of members of the Lower House.

The last 36 years have proved conclusively that there is no danger of negro domination in the South, and if the danger of a "force bill" could be escaped a quarter of a century ago, when both Houses of Congress were still full of Northerners of the generation that had participated in the War Between the Sections, it is ridiculous to talk about the existence of such a danger now.

The people of South Carolina are suffering from the oppression that the election of Senators by machine-controlled legislatures in many States causes. What is desirable now is that the Senate shall be restored to the people. The people of the South can be depended upon to keep it out of the hands of the negroes.—Editorial appearing in Columbia State June 26, 1912.

BYRNES COMMENDED.

We have received and read with interest a copy of the speech made in the House on April 22nd by Hon. James F. Byrnes of this Congressional District in favor of a bill providing for the payment out of the public funds of compensation for the use of the highways over which the rural mails are carried. Though interrupted and questioned by several city Congressmen Mr. Byrnes sustained himself excellently in running debate and made an argument that showed his accurate and entire acquaintance with the benefits that would come to the farming interests of the country. And what helps the farmers helps everybody.—The Barnwell People.