INITIATIVE, REFERENDUM AND RECALL NO FIELD IN NATIONAL POLITICS

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT, AS CONCEIVED BY FRAMERS OF CONSTITUTION, ONLY SAFE BULWARK OF CIVIL LIBERTY

Danger of Departing from Path Established by the Fathers

SPEECH DELIVERED BY MR. UNDERWOOD BEFORE CATHOLIC CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY DECEMBER 19, 1911.

The main purpose of government is the protection of life, liberty and property. The safe-guarding of property rights is essential to the advancement of our civilization.

Men do not always awake to the realization that the just enforcement of the law is more essential to good government than the enactment of new statutes.

Less than a century and a half ago the Federal Constitution was written; it become the pattern in its fundamental features for our State Constitutions. The world had experimented with almost every conceivable method of government for thousands of years before the birth of our republic. The statesmen who created the form of the new government were essentially students of the theories of government and lovers of the liberties of the people. Most of them had offered their lives and their fortunes in the struggle for their country's independence. No man can justly charge them with either lack of information regarding the essential principles of government, or want of honesty of purpose to create a government that would secure to themselves and their children "a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to themselves and their Posterity."

World's First Written Constitution.

They proclaimed to the world its first written Constitution, created a government of law in absolute contradistinction to a government of men. The framers of the Federal Constitution were familiar with the repeated failures of governments based on the principle of a direct democracy, where the people were the direct law-making power and in some instances the ultimate judicial power of the country.

Dangers of a Direct Democracy.

They knew from the history of the past that those governments had failed in their purpose; that the liberties of the people had been destroyed by the extremes and excesses which marked the administration of a government where the laws were made in the forum by the assembled multitude, and were not the mature product of selected men especially trained for the work in hand.

They knew that the failure of every direct Democracy was due not to the lack of honesty or purpose on the part of the aggregate citizenship assembled in the forum, but to the fact that they were often swayed by their desires, passions, and prejudices, and lacked intimate knowledge of the resultant effect of their actions.

No honest man in his individual entity will controvert the Golden Rule that all men should do unto others as they would be done by, but it is rarely the case that the assembled populace can divorce itself from its selfish desires and deal out abstract justice to those who may be temporarily in the minority.

Realizing the danger and excesses of a direct Democracy, the framers of our Constitution endeavored to establish a government that would protect the rights and liberties of the individual and at the same time reflect ultimately the will of the majority in the enactment of the law of the land.

Ours a Representative Form of Government.

To accomplish this end, they established a representative form of government designed to create a law-making power responsive to the will of the people, and at the same time they wrote in the Constitution certain checks and balances intended to prevent the more brutal force of a majority from destroying the liberty and property rights of the individual.

It must always be borne in mind that the framers of our Constitution were not attempting to establish freedom of Government, for they created a Government with only certain delegated powers expressly given to the Nation by the States, reserving to the States the right to make most of the laws that affected the liberties of the citizen. The underlying principle of the Constitution was to guarantee the liberty of the citizen and the protection of his property rights against the power of the Government itself.

Independent Judiciary Established.

To guard and protect these rights, an independent judiciary was established to see that neither the Executive nor the Legislative branches of the Government encroached upon the guaranteed rights of the individual.

It is evident that the framers of the Constitution were unwilling to trust a selected legislative body, held in check by the veto power of the Executive; fearing even then an unbridled abuse of the power, they established Constitutional guarantees of liberty that a majority of the people could not trample upon or the Government itself destroy.

Some may say that a majority of the people will not endanger the liberties and rights of the individual. I wish that this were true, but the history of every government has shown that at times the people, when unchecked by constitutional guarantees, have destroyed individual rights and individual liberty.

Unwise Changes Now Proposed.

It is now proposed by some that we shall in part abandon the representative government enacted by our Revolutionary fathers, and adopt a system that in the end would establish a direct democracy when the ultimate power to make laws would be placed directly in the hands of all the people, and the independent judiciary intended to protect the Constitutional guarantees of individual liberty would become subservient to the will of the majority through political compulsion.

We may forget that Madison and Hamilton, soldiers in the war for American Independence, brought their great minds and mature judgments to the framing of the Constitution of the United States, but there is one whose sincere judgment will not be doubted as to the value of a representative government as compared with a direct one, even by those who doubt the sincerity of purpose and the honesty of opinion of other men.

Jefferson's Wise Views.

In speaking of "the equal rights of man," Thomas Jefferson declared:

> "Modern times have the signal advantage, too, of having discovered the only device by which these rights can be secured, to wit: Government by the people, acting not in person, but by representatives chosen by themselves."

The author of the Declaration of Independence, knowing that all popular government before his time, resting on the direct decisions of the people, had failed and ultimately had reverted into uncontrolled despotism, rejoiced that the hour had come when a representative government could express the will of a free people. It is now proposed to abandon the representative principle of government established by our fathers and revert to the direct action of the people, to the principle of an Athenian democracy adapted to modern conditions.

Representative Government Only Check on Excesses and Passion.

Our representative government was established to guard against the excesses which had brought the ancient direct popular government to destruction, and because our government does not at all times immediately respond to public sentiment, there are some who insist that the principle of government is at fault and must be changed. They do not reflect that at times they may misjudge real public sentiment, that at other times the instrument of the government (the representative whom the people can change at recurring periods) is at fault and not the basic principle of the government itself.

My experience as a legislator leads me to believe that the Congress of the United States will always ultimately respond to the enlightened and matured sentiment of the people.

With the changing tides of public sentiment we have repeatedly experienced changes in the exercise of the taxing powers.

We have seen the legislative branch of the government in direct response [illegible] in recent years enact [illegible] legislation, pure food [illegible] of consumers' funds, national quarantine, irrigate [illegible] the Isthmian Canal. Can it be truthfully said that [illegible] ultimately to place on the statute books the laws that [illegible] American people were in favor of as a result of their permanent [illegible]?

(Continued on Next Column.)

TIME TO ABANDON UNWORTHY SECTIONAL ABASEMENT

The most humiliating paradox in American politics to-day is the shrinking attitude of some of our own people toward the presidential possibilities of Southern men.

The civil war, the memories of which furnished the nursery for this indefensible sectional abasement, is 50 years at our back. Ninety per cent of the American voters who elect a president remember this war and its dividing rancor only as history. With outstretched hands, having given every proof of viewing Mason and Dixon's line as no more a political barrier than the Mississippi or the Rockies, the dominant generation at the North invites the South, its public men, by right of citizenship and by right of demonstrated ability, into full fellowship in the nation's counsels.

South Wanting in Boldness

What has been the answer of the South—at least, the answer that may be interpreted by the silence or the diffidence of hundreds of thousands of representative Southerners?

Obsessed by the ghosts of half a century ago, guilty of an embarrassment and a self-consciousness that is nothing short of arrant sectional cowardice, there is a feeling among many Southerners that the wraiths of the sixties still stand between the South and the White House—the South and that participation in the nation's voice, the nation's destiny, to which the nation is eager to admit us.

The consequences of this abnegation of common manhood could not be more forcefully portrayed than in the words of the *Constitution's* Washington correspondent, in a dispatch discussing the presidential status resulting from the Harvey-Wilson-Watterson episode. "If he," writes our correspondent, canvassing the possibilities of Oscar Underwood, the brilliant Alabamian, along with other Southerners, "pays the penalty of being a Southern man, it will be the South and not the North to exact it."

South's Political Stage Fright

That is also an accurate delineation of the manner in which the North views the situation. We use Underwood only as an illustration, though his magnificent record as House leader during the special session would, as our correspondent declares, have assured his nomination "with a sweep"—had he lived at the North! To the North, it makes no difference where Underwood, or any other one of the galaxy being discussed, was born. The representative Northerner does not bridle at mention of Bull Run or Gettysburg. It remains for the South to develop political stage fright over these diminishing chapters in our history. The last smouldering embers of sectional acrimony were stamped out by the Spanish-American war. The last barriers between North and South were crumbled before the achievements of Joe Wheeler, of Fitzhugh Lee, and of many of the younger generation on both sides.

The most convincing evidence of this fact is the manner in which the nation received the announcement of the broad and patriotic action of President Taft in elevating Justice White, a Confederate veteran, to the Chief Justiceship of the United States Supreme Court. A protesting snarl rose here and there from the irreconcilables. And the voices most bitter in denunciation of that jaundice came from—the Northern press! It is only essential for the occasional freak firebrand to rise and attempt to wave the "bloody shirt," to be buried with ridicule, not only by his confrères, but as well by the newspapers of all sections of our common country.

Not a Question of Expediency or Discretion

In the face of these cumulative facts, there are some in the South who still question if, "on account of past offenses," it is "discreet" or "expedient" for a Southern man to offer himself for presidential honors! We insult ourselves, we debase our manhood, we surrender the rights the North is so willing to concede us, when we permit our course, as a people, to be so interpreted. It is not in human nature to accord respect, where self-respect is absent. How, then, can we expect the remainder of the nation to continue to respect us, when we grovel in the dust of a bygone era, and let go by default the rights inherent in American manhood?

For virtually half a century the South has furnished the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Democratic party. It has, faithfully with each recurrent four years, furnished the Democracy's army and its line officers—cheerfully yielding command to other sections. With a smile, it has steadily forsworn the political loaves and fishes, content, for the sake of the party, that they go to doubtful States—time and again to States most of us knew at the time were steel-riveted Republican.

Let Us Claim Our Birthright

For 50 years we have eaten in the political kitchen. Consistently, we have waxed cheerful when denied even the dubious privilege of the second table. And to-day, when the clock of destiny strikes, when the door of opportunity is wide ajar, when the North actually lives up to that prophetic utterance in the Senate of Ben Hill, "We are back in the house of our fathers, and we are here to stay, thank God!"—a few of us are still blushing and stammering, still wearing political sackcloth and ashes, still up to the old "easy mark" game of doing all the drudgery, with none of the cakes and ale! Let's end this disgraceful farce! We furnish, have long furnished, the electoral votes, the powder and shot, the munitions, of the Democratic party. Let's assert those equal rights and privileges as American citizens, as the remainder of the nation fraternally bids us to do. Let's cease the stultification of informing the nation, by our actions, that we cannot bring forth a man capable for the presidency. For the sectional cowardice, here and there manifested, is equivalent to that shameful and ungrounded admission.—*The Constitution*, Atlanta, Ga., January 21, 1912.

A New Leader From the South

"The President's veto, of course, destroyed the Free List Bill, as well as all the other features of the Democratic platform. The special session, however, was not without far-reaching results. Its chief accomplishments were a reorganized Congress and a resurrected Democratic majority under a new leadership. It also emphasized the new part which the Southern States are now playing in national affairs. With a Southerner as Chief Justice, a Southerner as majority leader in Congress, and Southerners as prominent candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination—Clark, Underwood and Wilson—the nation is certainly more united than at any time since the Civil War. No man rejoices more over this changed situation than Underwood. He is even more interested in the solidarity of the forty-eight States than in the union of the Democratic party."—Burton J. Hendrick in *McClure's Magazine*, February, 1912.

Alabama's Candidate

Mr. Underwood's service to the country during nine terms in the National House of Representatives has been most distinguished, and has made his name a household word in the homes of the people. For more than 20 years he has been in the very front of his party's battle line, a leader from his youth, and ever faithful to his party's principles and candidates. No Democrat can find a flaw in his political record; no charge of desertion in any campaign; no accusation of serving special interests can lie against him.

His congressional colleagues respect him for his sincerity, his high sense of honor, his sagacity and his acknowledged ability, and this in itself is an infallible proof of his merit, for none know so well the capabilities of a statesman as those who have served many years with him and noted his conduct in days of peace and those of political storm.—*Cincinnati Enquirer*, October 23, 1911.

Underwood for President

The argument that he lives too far South to be available is without weight. The country has reached that state of union—has been so closely drawn together by railroad and telegraph—that Alabama is brought to the door of New York. Massachusetts and Texas are near neighbors and even the two Portlands, of Maine and Oregon, stand within easy hailing distance of each other. So far as any feeling of sectionalism is concerned, or any prejudice against the selection of a Southern man for the presidency, Underwood is, like Lincoln, a native of Kentucky, and therefore as much Northern as Southern, was born during the Civil War, and grew to manhood after the old bitterness between North and South had died out. He is a big, brainy, courageous man.—*Baltimore Sun*, July 26, 1911.

Underwood Presidential Timber

Mr. Underwood would make an ideal President. He is a broad-gauged, level-headed citizen; he doesn't slip his cerebral cogs and go off at a tangent as a rabid exponent of revolutionary dogmas in an effort to popularize himself; he is uniformly courteous to all men; he believes in reducing the high cost of living in this country, not talking about it; he does not believe in destroying the industries of the United States while at the same time he is a thorough believer in the principles of tariff for revenue only.

* * * * * * * *

There is no flub-dub about Mr. Underwood. He doesn't believe in shams. He is a big, brawny, brainy statesman, without his lightning rod out to attract the Democratic nomination for the presidency, and largely on that very account he is liable to be the very man that will get in the way of the bolt that may elevate him to the White House.—J. W. Flenner, in the *Times-Democrat*, Muskegee, Okla., October 28, 1911.

Southern Leaders

"Naturally the men who have led the Democrats in the House of Representatives so successfully under trying conditions are freely mentioned at the present time as possible candidates for the presidential nomination by the Democratic Convention. These leaders are Champ Clark, Speaker of the House, and Oscar W. Underwood, a new and coming man.

"Both are Southerners, by the way, but in my mind there is no reason in these days of broadening views and lessening prejudices why a Southerner should not be nominated and elected to the presidential chair of the United States. In fact, there are many reasons why it should be so."—London cable of William Randolph Hearst in the *New York American*, Monday, September 25, 1911.

Takes Up Underwood

The years since the Civil War have rolled too fast and far to permit it to be conceivable any longer that the circumstances of Southern birth should constitute in Northern judgment a disqualification in any degree whatever. Both as to nomination and as to election the Southerner will be rated in 1912 on his individual merits. As far as this particular Southerner, Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, is concerned, it is agreeable to note the absence of geography in the regard in which he is held in all parts of the Union.—*New York Sun*, 1911.

A FALSE POSITION

Rumors generally believed to have emanated from the camps of men who either are or have been considered as Democratic presidential possibilities, that Mr. Underwood, of Alabama, could not command the support of the North because of the fact that he is a Southerner, are not only poppycock, pure and simple, but they place the men of the North in a false position in the eyes of the people of the South and tend to revive sectional feeling which has been buried for many years. The effects of such rumors are nil in the North because the people of the North know they have not one iota of truth, but people in the South are apt to take them more seriously, and there is where they may prove harmful, not only because of their tendency to cause dissatisfaction on the part of Southern Democrats, but because of the effect they may have in giving rise to sectional prejudice through false representations of conditions which do not exist. No Northerner would hesitate to support Mr. Underwood because he comes from the South.—*The Argus*, Albany, New York, November 23, 1911.

UNDERWOOD THE MAN

We have been humbugged and scared off long enough by the bogy of Northern prejudice against a Southern candidate. Underwood stands for just those things which recent Northern majorities have declared they want—a revision of the tariff downward and the destruction of special privilege. His qualities of leadership have been tested and approved. In his personality he is solid, clean and sane, with the courage of a fighter and the clairvoyance of a true reformer, and if the South presents him as her candidate and the party ratifies her choice this fine, strong character of a new day in our annals will catch both the sentiment and the sober judgment of the North, sweep away the last remaining debris of the dead old war and its dead issues and carry enough States in that section to give us the Presidency.—Live Oak, Fla., *Democrat*, reprinted in the *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 17, 1912.

(Continued from First Column.)

The response may not be as rapid, but it is probably more permanent and there is certainly not as much danger of enacting hasty, ill-considered or bad legislation.

Cannot a committee of the Congress, composed of representative men, initiate legislation, within the limitations of the Constitution, guard against excesses and abuses, protect the rights of the minority, voice the wishes of the majority, as well or better than the partisan friends of a measure who, in order that they may accomplish one result, are tempted to reach so far that they leave a wake of destruction as to collateral matters the measure touches?

Untrustworthiness of Petitions.

It is true that under the system proposed, a petition by a percentage of voters would first have to be obtained. But let every man ask himself how often he has signed petitions to please or get rid of the person who presented the paper, to determine what thought and deliberation will be exercised by the average man who signs a petition.

People Suffer More From Failure of Law Enforcement Than From Lack of Proper Legislation.

Should I stop to criticise our government, I would say that the people suffer far more from the failure to enforce the laws on the statute books than they do from the lack of proper legislation. How many remedial laws are to be found on the statute books, that if fairly enforced would remedy the evils we complain against; but it is so much easier to cry out for new legislation than to insist that our neighbor shall go to jail for violating the law we already have.

If there are evils in our government as it exists today, it is not in its organic form. It is due to the failure of those in office to honestly, fairly and justly perform the duties imposed upon them. The remedy is plain and the way is clear. The people should drive from the places of power and responsibility the unfaithful servant and elect those who will be faithful and true to the trust imposed upon them.

The People and the Representatives.

You tell me the people cannot elect honest and faithful servants. I tell you that the masses of the people are far better judges of men than they are of measures, and are far more likely to select an honest man than an honest measure.

When you say that the voter cannot select a public official who will reflect the will of the people in his office, and be faithful to the Constitution of his country, I say you reflect on the very first principle of free government and misjudge the honesty and the intelligence of the American people.

Our Constitution was born in the hour when the love of liberty and freedom was ripe in the hearts of men. For a century it has withstood the storms of war, greed, and intolerance; through the tempests of discontent, danger and disaster, it has protected the lives, liberty and property of our people.

Let us elect honest men to public office, men who have the courage to stand for the true interest of the Constitution they represent regardless of what effect it may have on their personal fortunes. There then will be no demand for a change of the fundamental principles of our government.

FREE LIST BILL VETOED BY PRESIDENT TAFT

DRAWN BY CHAIRMAN UNDERWOOD OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

A Bill of Direct Benefit to the Farmer, Whose Hopes Were Dissipated by a Republican President

MR. UNDERWOOD THE FRIEND OF ALL CLASSES

MR. UNDERWOOD, FROM THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, SUBMITTED THE FOLLOWING REPORT (EXTRACTS).

[To accompany H. R. 4413.]

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, saddlery and harness, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, having had same under consideration report it back to the House without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

It was expressly stated in the Democratic platform of 1908 that the belated promises of tariff reform made at that time by the Republican Party were a tardy recognition of the righteousness of the Democratic position on this question, but that the people could not safely intrust the execution of this important work to a party which is so deeply obligated to the highly protected interests as is the Republican Party

* * * * * * * * * * * *

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

By this measure agricultural tools and implements of every kind are placed on the free list, in order to remove or to prevent any possible discrimination against our farmers in the prices of these necessary articles, and to place them on an equal footing with their competitors elsewhere in the world Our domestic manufacturers of agricultural tools, implements, vehicles, and machinery have grown to great proportions and are largely organized into great trusts and combinations. These organizations are selling their products all over the world, meeting and overcoming all competition. They need no protection, and, as a rule, ask for none. For a number of years they sold many of their products in foreign countries at lower prices than at home, and so recently as 1907 agricultural associations in public resolutions protested against this practice. The imports of these agricultural implements are insignificant; the value of all such imports, free and dutiable, in 1910, amounted to $122,302. The exports of these implements have become a matter of more importance than the domestic trade, the figures indicating an increase from $3,859,184 in 1890 to $28,124,033 in 1910. This foreign business will be greatly aided by the removal of duties from lumber, as provided for in this bill.

BAGGING AND BALING MATERIALS.

It is of the greatest importance to our producers of cotton and other agricultural commodities that the materials necessary for bagging, sacking, baling, or otherwise packing these commodities be made free from duty, so that they may be available to the producers at the most favorable prices possible, without shelter for the exaction of unreasonable prices by trusts and combinations of manufacturing interests. The bill, therefore, places all such materials and articles on the free list, including cotton bagging and cotton ties, jute and jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, tow, burlaps, and other materials or fibers suitable for coverings, and bags or sacks made therefrom, together with all hoop or band iron or hoop or band steel for baling any commodity and wire for baling agricultural products. All these coverings and materials for making coverings are essentials in the transportation of agricultural products to their markets. The products can not receive the benefit of any protection in these markets, and for this and other reasons it is unfair and unjust to continue duties on coverings for agricultural produce. These duties have annoyed and burdened farmers and have served principally to increase the profits of exacting trusts and combinations.

62d Congress, 1st Session. H. R. 4413. An Act to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on and after the day following the passage of this Act the following articles shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wide strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitae, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages.

Passed the House of Representatives May 8, 1911.

Attest:

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk.

UNDERWOOD A UNIFYING FORCE

The Republicans cannot agree with his tariff views; the country, we are sure, will never put him into the presidency, but assuredly he must be conceded to be the ablest, the strongest, the most influential Democrat in Congress to-day, and he has shown a marvelous capacity for leadership. His party associates stand solidly behind him, and that could not have been said of any other man in recent years who led the Democrats in the House of Representatives.

* * * * * * *

The shrewd Republican politicians who predicted that the Democrats in the House would be split into a dozen bitterly fighting factions in less than a month, are now amazed at Underwood's success as a harmonizer and a unifying force. He has succeeded where everybody else failed; it seems likely that with the prestige of success he will grow larger and more powerful as time passes. We detest his political principles, but it would be folly to deny his strength and capacity.—*The Post Herald*, Rochester, N. Y., June 21, 1911.

FORAKER ON UNDERWOOD

Mr. John Temple Graves will be in town soon to make us a speech. He was in Birmingham the other night and *The Age-Herald* printed an interview with the former Georgian, in which that gentleman discussed Mr. Underwood as a presidential candidate. Mr. Graves said: "Mr. Foraker used to be very bitterly opposed to the South, but softened a great deal after his elevation to the Senate. I asked Mr. Foraker if in case Mr. Underwood is nominated for President, will it make any difference to you that he is a Southern man?"

"'Absolutely none,' said Mr. Foraker. 'Of course, I cannot vote for him, as I am a Republican, but if any Republican should get up and denounce him because he is from the South, I would stump in Underwood's defense.'"

That reads well, coming as it does from a man whose antagonistic attitude towards the South in other days gave him the appellation of "Fire Alarm Foraker."—*Montgomery* (Alabama) *Advertiser*, reprinted in the Birmingham, Ala., *Age-Herald*, January, 1912.