While this progressive increase in the assessment of land values from two-thirds value, as now, to full value, as proposed, is under way, a like progressive decrease will be under way in respect of improvements, thus:

In the year 1912 the improvements on land shall be assessed nine-fifteenths of true value, and each year thereafter the assessment shall be decreased progressively, as follows: In the year 1914 the assessment shall be eight-fifteenths; in the year 1915, seven-fifteenths; in the year 1916, six-fifteenths; in the year 1917 and each year thereafter, improvements shall not be assessed.



This bill runs little or no risk of defeat except from indifference or misunderstanding on the part of members of Congress. That, and that alone, will afford land speculators an opportunity to fool Congress into letting them hold fast to their "graft." They can be deprived of this "graft," and the public service be improved morally and administratively, by getting Congressmen to see the importance of the George taxation bill. We suggest, therefore, that every Congressman be asked for a copy of this bill by his constituents, and that these constituents, if they favor the bill after examining it, thereupon canvass their Congressional districts as fully as they can, to the end that their respective Congressmen may be urgently advised from home of the merits of the bill and its importance.



Is This a Big Business Pull?

To the Esch bill for putting a prohibitive tax upon the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches,* queer things have happened. Every motive for obstructing the enactment of this necessary health law would appear to have been removed, but the law hangs fire. Foreign competition might have been urged, poor as that excuse would be, for ignoring the terrible "phossyjaw" disease which the handling of white phosphorus causes; but the United States is the only important country in the world which has not taken steps to protect its people in that regard. Another basis for opposition to the law at first was the fact that the best and cheapest of the harmless substitutes for phosphorus in match-making was monopolized by the match trust through its patent on "sesqui-sulphide"; but the match trust placed that patent in trust a year ago upon terms designed and with trustees disposed to make its general substitution for phosphorus commercially desirable, and a little later the patent was surrendered altogether. Yet the Esch bill hangs fire, phosphorus is still used in match manufacture, and the horrible "phossyjaw" disease continues to make victims of boys and girls and men and women—of living and breathing human creatures just like the wives and daughters and sons of members of Congress. Why? There seems now to be nothing political in a partisan sense about this secret pull. Last year it was a Republican Congress under the lead of Congressman Dalzell of Pittsburgh that stood for "phossyjaw"; this year the job has apparently been undertaken by a Democratic Congress. What is the meaning of it all? What interests are intervening? Where is the pull?



In Memory of "a Kindly Country Doctor."

In our news report of the opening of the Ohio Constitutional Convention* we quoted from the Cleveland Plain Dealer its account of a presentation of flowers to one of the delegates, Thomas Fitzsimons, by the Washington Reform Club of Cleveland, of which he was an original member. Cleveland progressives of nearly twenty years ago will recall the activities of that club with the keenest interest, and remember its founder with much the same affection and honor its surviving members have shown for Mr. Fitzsimons. Its founder died just at the time when Cleveland was passing out of its period of deadly inertia and indifference, which Tom L. Johnson regarded as a greater obstacle than opposition, to overcome in any fight in which fundamental moral issues are involved. Telling of this period Mayor Johnson says in "My Story"† that although the people of Cleveland "were quite contented to let a few agents of special privilege attend to the details of the city government," there were nevertheless "a few agitators who had raised the voice of protest upon occasion." He names Peter Witt, but "before Peter," he adds, was "Dr. Tuckerman, who was responsible for Peter;" and Dr. Tuckerman was the founder of that Washington Reform Club of twenty years ago whereof both Peter Witt, now city supervisor of the traction system, and Thomas Fitzsimons, now a delegate to the Constitutional convention of Ohio, were live-wire members. A splendid tribute to Dr. Tuckerman is this which Johnson pays to his memory in his own posthumous autobiography: "When Cleveland shall ultimately have become a free city, she will trace the beginnings of her struggle against Privilege back to the days when that

[†]B. W. Huebsch, publisher, 225 Fifth Ave., New York.



^{*}See vol. xiv, pages 83, 109, 207.

Public of January 19, page 58.

kindly country doctor began to wage war on the established order."

Father Burtsell.

With the death of Father Burtsell last Sunday there passed out of this world the last of the four Americans who figured most prominently in an ecclesiastical attempt a quarter of a century ago to rule New York politics from the Catholic cathedral. The political figure in the center of it all was Henry George, and the American priest of the Catholic Church whose support of George as the Labor candidate for Mayor of New York was treated as an ecclesiastical offense, was Father McGlynn. Archbishop Corrigan was the American priest of superior degree at the cathedral who drove McGlynn out of his parish and out of the priesthood. All these have long since gone. And now the last to go is Dr. Burtsell, who defended Dr. McGlynn and in consequence was by the same Archbishop transferred from his city parish to a strange parish in the country by way of punishment. Both McGlynn and Burtsell came to their own before they died. McGlynn was restored to his priesthood over the head of the Archbishop who had deposed him, and Burtsell was made a prelate of the Pope's household. These two names are linked affectionately together in the recollections of many Catholic workingmen of New York and of many who are not Catholics. Neither can be forgotten while a memory survives of Henry George, to whose teachings both were devoted.



Another Reason for the Recall for Judges.

Washington dispatches of last week indicate that the railroads are to get another Supreme Court judge at the hands of President Taft. The particular individual this time is Judge Hook, whose strong-arm judicial work for corporation interests in the lower courts naturally enough commends him to a corporation President for promotion. From different directions come testimonials to Judge Hook's fitness, from the corporation point of view. One of his exploits was in the Oklahoma railroad-rate case, in which as a Federal judge he granted an injunction against the State in behalf of railroads. In order to arrive at a conclusion as to the reasonableness of rates, he took the average assessed valuation per mile, and, without proof, added 25 per cent in order to show a capital value large enough to explain his injunction against the reduction of rates required by the State law. The value of one railroad which without proof he fixed at \$64,000 a mile, has since

been reported by the road itself to have cost only \$31,000. Other roads costing less than \$30,000 a mile, rolling stock included, were valued by Judge Hook at approximately \$50,000 a mile. Still another performance of this interesting Federal judge in the Oklahoma cases was the bundling together of the earnings of two roads, one of which was making between 3 and 4 per cent on his valuation, and the other between 7 and 8. As the owners of the less profitable road owned the corporation that owned the more profitable one, and as the aggregate net earnings of the two were less than 6 per cent under the rate law, Judge Hook granted an injunction against the enforcement of that law in respect of both roads; this notwithstanding that they were operated as well as owned by separate companies distinctly officered, and that each had brought its own suit for the injunction separately from the other. Isn't Judge Hook truly a dainty judicial dish for the railroads to hand up to President Taft?



"Tepid Teddy."

Dr. Blount, the woman suffragist of Illinois, who practices her profession in Chicago but is honorably famous throughout the State, might be suspected of never having heard of "Terrible Teddy." She criticizes him as "tepid." But when you come to think about it, perhaps she did not choose her adjective lightly. For "Terrible Teddy" is a bit like the cold mince-pie at the county fair, which the hawker sold for "hot," not because it was hot, for, of course, it wasn't, but because, as he explained to disappointed customers, "Hot" was the trade name of the goods. "Tepid" is truly a more faithful epithet for Theodore than "terrible." He did not terrorize the Wall-street gang who ran off with the Tennessee coal and iron plunder, even if he did make terrible faces at everybody who shouted at him to stop them. A little boy once went hunting with his father's shot When he came home to dinner he told his mother in great excitement how he had seen an awful animal sitting upon its haunches on a rock in the woods; how this animal had long teeth, a pointed nose, and great big staring eyes; how its ears stood up straight and stiff, and how big blackand-yellow stripes ran along its lithe body to a tail that "stood up immense"; and how it looked fiercely at him, the boy himself, as if getting ready for a terrible spring. But the boy wasn't scared. Not a bit. He raised his father's gun and blazed away at the awful animal, and he "fetched the beast, sure enough," and now its mangled body lay out on the stoop. The mother went to look at her