

His campaign was carried on largely by means of newspaper advertising. In this way he told the people of Houston just why he had become a candidate and what he intended to do if elected. When accused of being "a crank and a Single Taxer," he used some of his advertising space to explain:

Now, a crank is a man who has advanced ideas, not yet understood by all. Yes, I am a Single Taxer, and I will not lose any sleep over the votes that I don't get on that account. Mayor H. B. Rice [re-elected] has told me more than once that he thought the single tax was all right. J. Z. Gaston [Mr. Pastoriza's predecessor whom he defeated at the primaries] had told me the same thing. Both of these gentlemen have told me that they were adopting the principles of the single tax as near as they legally could in that it was the policy of the city of Houston, under their management, not to tax buildings at anything near their value, and to almost totally exempt personal property from taxation. Now, all that the Single Tax means is to exempt entirely from taxation improvements upon land and personal property—so you see I am not such a vicious crank after all. The Constitution of Texas will not allow the adoption of the Single Tax, so don't worry. I can do nothing to give the people the benefits which would flow from its adoption no matter how much I might desire it.

In the primary campaign Mr. Pastoriza arranged for a public meeting to which he invited all the candidates for Commissioner besides himself, to take part, reserving for himself fifteen minutes at the opening and the same length of time at the close. No one accepted the invitation, but he held his meeting, with a large attendance, and it was one of the influences that elected him.

He was born in 1857, came to Houston in 1858, lost both parents by yellow fever in 1859, became an iron moulder's apprentice in 1874, business manager of the only daily paper in Houston in 1878, proprietor of a Houston job printing establishment in 1879, allied himself with the George movement in 1897, retired from business with a moderate competency in 1906, and has traveled extensively since then in Europe as a student of municipal government. He has the unlimited confidence of the people of Houston for ability and integrity, and the respect of all but grafters and land speculators. They know he cannot be bought off nor be used as a catspaw.

Being a fundamental democrat—a Single Tax man for that reason—Mr. Pastoriza is quite naturally an advocate of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. Since his election, replying to the objection of a Texas politician that it is not democratic, he wrote as follows to the Houston Post:

I advocate it because I think it pure democracy. Now, who is correct? The aforesaid politician fails to define his democracy. If he did—why, he might be right from his point of view. I will define my brand of democracy, and leave it to my readers to decide whether or not I am right in advocating the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, because I believe it

democratic and because I believe that we have arrived at a point in our political existence when we need more democracy than we have had in the past, and that this reform will give it to us. I believe that when that great democrat said democracy was a government of, for and by the people he really meant what he said. For the benefit of the layman who scribbles for the press without studying his question I say that I think this definition of democracy means that, while the people are willing to elect representatives with power to enact laws, they reserve to themselves the power to regulate their representatives' actions by forcing the enactment of such laws as they want, if their representatives refuse to enact them. This act is called the Initiative. That looks democratic, don't it? It's the people ruling themselves. Second, the people want to reserve the right to veto any bill or law which they consider vicious, that has already been passed by their representatives. This is called the Referendum. The people give our Governor the power to veto a law. Now, if the people have the right to confer this great power on our Governor, by what democratic reasoning can you deny the people the right to exercise this same power themselves? Who will advocate that a free people shall tie their hands and again be bondsmen by giving to their rulers all their powers of self-government without retaining the whip handle. Third, the people want to reserve the right, which all employers of men possess, to discharge at any time any one of their representatives (employees) when he fails to do his duty, as the people, their employers, see it and not as he sees it himself. I can not but believe that the man who objects to this kind of democratic government is a man who prefers a monarchy to a democracy; particularly if he can be the monarch.

+ + +

HENRY GEORGE, JR.'S, MAIDEN SPEECH IN CONGRESS.

In Committee of the Whole on the Canadian Reciprocity Bill, as Reported in the Congressional Record of April 18, 1911, at Page 331.

Mr. Underwood. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. George].

Mr. George. Mr. Chairman, mindful of the custom of this House to regard a new Member as a political accident, I rise with humility to address myself to the question of Canadian reciprocity.

In coming here, I came with a mandate of a great constituency to help reduce the high cost of living, and I regard this bill as the first step in that direction. I came here, Mr. Chairman, from a district normally Republican. I came here as a Democrat, but elected, or helped in the election, by, I compute, 10,000 Republican votes, so that I may be regarded as a kind of eclectic in politics.

The question is, What has the tariff to do with the high cost of living? Out of the mouths of the fathers of Republicanism I think we can answer, for, if I remember correctly, Mr. Blaine, Mr.

Sherman, and Mr. Garfield proclaimed themselves protectionists, but protectionists who believed in a protection that should lead to free trade. Their argument was simple. They asked for a tariff against things from without in order to induce production within. They argued that cutting off competition from without would enable home producers to charge more within; that these increased prices would induce competition among producers within this country; that this competition among domestic producers would reduce domestic prices; and that ultimately these domestic prices would fall so far that they would be no higher than foreign prices, and that then this country could throw down the tariff wall and proclaim free trade with all the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what has been the course of things? It has been just this, that we have piled up a tariff which has increased prices in the United States. Concurrently with that has come the formation of combinations within our country for controlling production here and keeping prices up, and even driving them higher. So that, instead of leading to reduced prices and free trade, the tariff policy has been accompanied by trust and other monopoly combinations and to higher prices.

Therefore, carrying the mandate of my constituency, I rise here to support this Canadian reciprocity bill with a view of breaking down some of these combinations and reducing prices by letting in competition from outside.

I have been in Canada quite recently. How are these Canadian people different from us? I should say that there is little or no difference. I found that on getting close to the Canadian line Canadian money mingled with our own currency. I found after I got over the line that our currency mingled with the Canadian currency; that Canadian and United States money freely passed and without distinction among Americans and Canadians. I found that I could go into a Canadian post office and with United States money buy Canadian stamps. I found that the people on both sides of the line interchange newspapers, and that the whole current of life is concurrent; that the people north of us were practically of us; that the one thing that separates us is the humbug tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We need no protection of forts or arms on either side of the line. We need nothing to make us one people save the opportunity to exchange freely—that same relation that exists between State and State. Therefore I have great joy in supporting this reciprocity bill.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I myself stand upon this side of the House of Representatives in what is perhaps a peculiar relation. I look not only for the time, and I hope it may come speedily, when there shall be no tariff whatsoever north of us, but I look to see no tariff south of us, no tariff east of

us, no tariff west of us, but perfect freedom of trade with all the world. [Applause.]

I am the type of American that is not afraid to say he is an absolute free trader. I was so elected, and so long as I live I shall proclaim that truth as I see it. I stand with the Democratic Party now, not because I believe that the Democratic Party believes as I do, or, at least, declares as I do, but because it is, at least, moving in that direction. I am glad to be of the party that has its face toward the light.

I heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Fordney] talk yesterday on this floor about cotton. He talked of the pathetic condition to which American labor would be reduced from any breaking down of the tariff walls with a people east of us or west of us. He talked about Japanese labor and Japanese cotton mills. Let me tell you that I have been in these Japanese cotton mills; that I visited the cotton mills of Osaka; that I have seen American machinery in their mills, and German machinery, and English machinery, and Japanese machinery; that I have seen the operatives working at these machines. I have verified the fact that American laborers in similar occupations are paid very much higher wages than the Japanese laborers. That would seem to be as far as we need go. It is as far as we are carried, at least, by the gentleman on the other side of the Chamber. But let me explain this, Mr. Chairman: Gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber who produce these facts fail to produce another most important fact that should accompany them, namely, the fact that relates to the productive power of the respective laborers in the two countries. I found on my visit to the Osaka mills that while precisely the same machinery is used in both countries—the same machinery in Osaka as that used in the Carolina mills, for instance—and that while wages in the Japanese mills were one-fourth the rate of those paid in the Carolina mills, the productive capacity of labor in Japan was but one-fourth of that in the Carolinas.

From this fact and facts like it I base the declaration that, while we pay higher wages in this country, we are preeminently the machine-making and machine-using people of the world. Because of this our laborer produces, dollar for dollar, more than the laborer anywhere else in the world. I assert, and I am ready to prove, that our people, because of their high wages, are not at a disadvantage in production. They are, on the contrary, at a distinct advantage. Because we have higher wages in this country we have the most productive labor in the world. We produce more machines, we get more from them, because we use intelligence with our labor, because we mix brain power with manual power. We have the greatest natural resources in the world and the labor that produces cheapest; and hence we can, if we have absolute freedom of exchange, become the greatest producer in the world.

My colleagues here on this Democratic side, be not afraid. Courage is what our people want now. They will vote for men, they will support parties that have courage. It is what we most need in this time of our history.

For the high cost of living is the greatest of all questions just now. I come from the part of the country that most needs a reduction in the cost of living. New York City is the greatest, the richest, the grandest of all our cities, and yet side by side with these riches is revealed the gauntest poverty. One of the gentlemen on the other side just a few minutes ago spoke of this. He referred to our towering buildings. We are about to put up a 50-story building. But we have buildings with several subcellars. Yet we have conditions there that, alas, beat the world for degradation of mankind. Nowhere is population so congested. We have village populations in square blocks. We have in two contiguous square blocks enough children to fill a whole public school, and that school is made to accommodate 2,500 children. We bury 10 per cent of our people in potter's field at public expense. We have conditions that were never seen in any civilization of the world. God knows that this question of the cost of living is the direst one that can come before a large part of our people. Then, what shall we do about this tariff? I am here to work for a reduction of it. Let it be ever so little as a start, I will work for that. I will patiently serve for that.

But I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this is but the beginning. My hope is and my feeling is that it is but the beginning. My hope for years has been that once we would raise the tariff issue the whole sham and swindle of it would come tumbling down.

We have the greatest natural resources in the world. We have the most wonderful and potent mingling of bloods. We have the largest homogeneous population. We have the greatest possibilities in production.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I take great pleasure in supporting this bill. Though I be the only man in this House to stand as a free trader, I do so here, because I believe that before a great while the predominant political issue in this country is going to be the straight-out issue, not of percentages, not as to a little tariff reduction here and a little tariff increasing there, but as between the principle of protection on the one hand and of free trade on the other. I long to see that kind of freedom of commerce that will knit together the nations of the earth; that will lead us to perceive the folly of great war navies and the wisdom rather of sinking such navies in the bottom of the sea, and of binding ourselves to the other bodies of mankind by bonds of trade. A free commerce will bind us closer than all the treaties in this world. Then will not rise a question of what the Japanese are going to do to us or what the Germans are going to

do to us, of what the English are going to do to us. It will be a question of better, larger, wider production and exchange. It will build up our factories as nothing else will build them. It will make real progress in the conditions of labor, as against warfare and increasing hardships under the false system of protection. It will mean a prosperity that this country has never before seen. It will mean freedom, the heritage of our Nation, and it will lead to another great step forward in the great cause of progress. Mr. Chairman, I yield back any time I have not used. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

BOOKS

AVERY'S PEOPLE'S HISTORY.

A History of the United States and Its People. From Their Earliest Records to the Present Time. By Elroy McKendree Avery. In sixteen volumes. Vol. VI. Published by The Burrows Brothers Company, Cleveland.

The comprehensiveness of this popular history of the United States (vol. xiii, pp. 20, 974) may be inferred from a comparison of the scope of the volume before us with those preceding it. Although there are to be sixteen and five have gone before, the present volume tells the whole story of the Revolutionary War from the defeat on Long Island to the final victory at Yorktown. And not only that, but it includes also the circumstances following the war which led on to the submission of the Constitution of 1789. Yet this extraordinary condensation is by no means at the expense of human interest in the narrative.

Washington's historic retreat across the East River and Manhattan Island, and then across the Hudson and New Jersey, is described with a sweep of narration that makes the movement picturesque, and with enough of detail of the right kind to make it definite as an elementary study and to give it life as a story of the time and place. This is true also of the important battles, North and South, and of the political and the diplomatic episodes which were as much a part of the war as the marching and the fighting.

Personal touches as to historic individuals in camp and congress add greatly to the life-quality of Mr. Avery's performance; and nowhere do these appear to better advantage than in connection with the treachery of Arnold and the capture of Andre. Toward both men the author prefers fairness to perfunctory patriotism. Likewise with the Tories—"united Empire loyalists" as they are remembered in Canada where their descendants now form a peculiar aristocracy—to whom the volume gives a considerate chapter. It is interesting to note,