

the "trusts," and who, therefore, are in a conspiracy in restraint of trade, do not meet with a like experience. Although the law explicitly directs the forfeiture of their property when transported between the States, and the Attorney General has been given a special fund of \$500,000 to investigate and prosecute these combinations, they are accorded different treatment from that meted out to other violators of law. Is this because they are rich and powerful, or because they have made large contributions to campaign funds?

A bill to "Reform the Consular Service" has been introduced. Surely reformation is hardly needed when the present system results in the selection of men of such high intellectuality as our consul at Nottingham, England, who in a recent lengthy and discursive report on "hard times in England" sums the whole matter up thus:

"A close analysis of the latest returns to the Government Board of Trade seems to show that the general stagnation is due to dullness in the home trade, and apparently a revival therein would restore prosperity."

No matter has come before Congress during my term which so clearly shows the evil effects of failure to put single tax principles in operation decades ago, as did a proposition before the House on Friday last to grant jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to award "a fair and reasonable rent" for the use of an undivided one-sixth interest in a 20-foot building lot in San Francisco, taken over 50 years ago as part of a site for the mint there, and also a suitable indemnity for said property.

It appears that the United States government paid for this 20-foot strip at the time the other land was bought, but the widow (and now the descendants of the widow) of one of the joint owners claimed she did not release her interest in this particular strip. It was not contended that the claimants nor the widow in question had created the land value attaching to that strip at that time, nor that any labor products were taken by the Federal government. All the government took was the use of a strip of land in San Francisco, which had been made valuable by the presence of population. The effect of the passage of this bill would be that we should delve down into the pockets of the laborers of to-day, taking from them a part of their scanty earnings and turn it over to the descendants of a woman who had no moral title to the land value.

Not content with robbing present-day labor to the extent of the capitalized value of the ground rent of 50 years ago, we were asked to rob labor to an amount equal to the additional value which succeeding generations have given to that land; and then on top of all that, to still further rob labor so as to recompense those people for not having col-

lected ground rent for 50 years. I insisted on the floor that if the single tax were in operation the courts would be cleared of endless litigation of a similar character, while the brains and energies of thousands of lawyers who are now engaged in assisting the robbery of labor through the legalizing of such claims would be turned to useful vocations.

ROBERT BAKER.

AUSTRALIA.

Corowa, N. S. W., Nov. 19.—As predicted in my last letter (p. 503), the no-confidence motion against the Reid ministry in the Federal House was defeated by two votes. The voting was exactly the same as when the Watson ministry was defeated, every vote being recorded. Since then the House has been occupied with budget and defense matters.

The Senate has been discussing the arbitration bill, and has restored the worst features to it—preference to unionists, and inclusion of agricultural laborers and domestic servants. This will mean a disagreement with the House, and perhaps the loss of the bill.

ERNEST BRAY.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Dec. 22.

Thomas W. Lawson's "frenzied finance" exposures in *Everybody's Magazine* (p. 472) have reached the point originally promised by their author, of circumstantially revealing instances of enormous crime by distinguished persons. In several issues of the magazine he seemed to be making an atmosphere or setting for his revelations by sensationally describing financial conditions which to the sophisticated are familiar enough to be commonplace. But in the December issue he told with details of time, place, person and circumstance, of the bribing of a Massachusetts legislature by men high up in the financial world, and in the January issue he narrates with like particularity the buying off of a receiver ship under circumstances implying political and judicial corruption. The latter installment of his story surpasses all others in sensational effect.

It tells in detail of the corrupt settlement of a lawsuit, brought by one creditor in the interest of all the creditors of one of J. Edward Addicks's corporations, and for which a receiver had been ap-

pointed. Included in the alleged corruption was a receiver. The judge who had appointed him confirmed the settlement upon the mere application of the plaintiff's counsel and without reference to the rights of other creditors. For effecting this result the fund, some \$225,000, is declared to have been raised by H. H. Rogers of the Standard Oil trust, and to have been paid nominally by the Republican national committee of 1896 as a contribution to Addicks's campaign of that year in Delaware. The money is described as having been passed in dress suit cases in the court room upon the signing of the necessary papers by the judge, and by a representative of the prominent Wall street brokerage house of Moore and Schley.

Since the publication of this story, on the 20th, several important newspaper interviews regarding it have appeared. Among these is one from the accused receiver, Dwight Braman, who explains:

I was appointed receiver of the Bay State Gas company in 1895 at the request of attorneys representing William Buchanan, among whom was United States Senator Higgins, Roger Foster, and Frederic E. Snow of Boston. As a result of that receivership J. Edward Addicks was kept out of the United States Senate. It has kept him out ever since for the reason the receivership tied up the securities of the Bay State Gas company in such a way he could not use them to buy votes. Concerning my discharge as receiver, I would say that in the absence of any intervening petitioners, and owing to the fact that I was unable to get the visible assets, I agreed to the discharge, when Foster told me that he had an excellent opportunity to settle the case for his client. Lawson's statement not only affects my own standing but that of President McCauley of the Wilmington Savings bank, who was my co-receiver. Lawson's story as to how the money was paid over is amazing. I never saw, spoke to, or knew by sight H. H. Rogers until last summer. The money was paid to the attorneys for Buchanan in the law office of Judge Gray, then United States Senator from Delaware. The amount paid was over \$125,000, of which \$40,000 went to the attorneys and \$30,000 went to the receivers. The balance, \$55,000, went to Buchanan. In addition the firm of Lawson, Weidenfeld & Co. gave its note for \$50,000, which was later settled for \$25,000.

Roger Foster, counsel for the peti-