

superior race is to be protected, let the protection be thorough. . . . There is growing indignation at the action of the Pullman Car Company in refusing seats and berths on their cars to colored people. We are informed that the withdrawal of accommodations, which originally began in Tennessee, is now spreading through the South, and that soon the only way in which a respectable colored man or woman can travel North will be by sitting up in a Jim Crow car, or by engaging an entire sleeper. The latter method was resorted to by Bishop Arnett and other colored dignitaries of the Methodist Church in going to the council of bishops held in Mobile. . . . Before long, the courts will be called upon to decide whether there is no legal remedy under the Interstate Commerce law for this outrage upon a race.

#### SUPREME COURT ANARCHISM.

New York Evening Post (Ind.), Mar. 1.—There must be something wrong with the Supreme Court of the United States. We had never suspected it of anarchistic leanings before, but here it has actually treated Turner, the English anarchist, as if he were a human being, instead of a social outcast to be handled like a dog. Secretary Cortelyou's agents, it will be remembered, seized Turner on the platform of the Lenox Lyceum when he was making an address on labor unions. They hustled him off to Ellis Island and locked him up. This was in true Russian style, for his offense was not what he was saying or had said in America, but what he was believed or thought or rumored to have said in England in the course of the last ten years. Some newspapers, like the carping Evening Post, and a few cranky citizens, saw in this a most scandalous interference with the right of free speech. But they were promptly characterized as lovers of anarchy, and accused of wanting to bring about the assassination of another President. This was in November last, and meanwhile Turner has been in close confinement. Now comes along our misguided Supreme Court to give comfort to assassins. It has released the offender on bail, and set his hearing for early in April. Meanwhile, he is to travel about, and is actually to be allowed to keep his lecture dates in monarchial Canada. It really looks as though the Supreme Court thought that such old-fangled questions as the freedom of opinion and of speech deserved the careful consideration they have always received at the hands of English tribunals.

#### IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 33 of that publication.

#### Senate.

Washington, Feb. 29-Mar. 5, 1904. No business of general interest was done on the 29th, but on the 1st the Senate bill to regulate shipping between the United States and the Philippines was taken up for consideration (p. 2728). This subject was continued on the 2d (p. 2733). The naval appropriation bill was under consideration on the 3d (p. 2864), the 4th (p. 2942), and the 5th (p. 2986).

#### House.

On the 29th the House began consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill (p. 2689), which it continued on the 1st (p. 2738), the 2d (p. 2824), and the 3d (p. 2873). On the latter day it was passed (p. 2882), and the Indian appropriation bill was taken up (p. 2893). Consideration of the Indian appropriation bill was resumed on the 4th (p. 2919) and continued on the 5th (p. 3001), when the bill was passed (p. 3019).

**Record Notes.**—Speech of Representative Foss on naval appropriation bill (p. 2846). Speech of Representative Baker on sale of Rosebud Reservation lands (p. 3009).

To admire pluck in a base cause is to hazard contamination.—Diary Consolidated Stock and Petroleum Exchange, of New York.

## MISCELLANY

### SILENCED. AN EPITAPH.

For The Public.

Death has been the punishment which the world, and those in authority, have awarded to persistent truth-speakers, in innumerable cases, in the history of mankind. Instances are so many and well known, that it is unnecessary to give any.

He would speak nothing but truth;  
And so we slew him;  
And, now he is silent,  
Rejoice therefore: he is dead.  
Spurn him!—Spit upon him!  
And he is silent.  
And he shall speak the truth  
No more.

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

### PENALIZING OPINION.

At this time, when John Turner is held for deportation because he "disbelieves in all organized government" under a law recently enacted by Congress, the following speech by Henry George, delivered in Cooper Union, New York, in 1894, is of peculiar interest. The report is from the New York World.

The final rally of the Democratic Party Reform Organization, which placed Everett P. Wheeler in nomination for the Governorship, was held in the large hall of the Cooper institute, and was so largely attended that at six o'clock standing room was at a premium. Considering that the big guns of the anti-Hill party were not advertised to speak, and that the gubernatorial race of Mr. Wheeler was, of course, known to be hopeless, the size of the audience was astonishing, and can only be explained on two grounds. First, that Henry George, who was announced to speak, has an enormous personal following, and, second, that Grover Cleveland's followers in this city are as full of enthusiasm and fight as ever. In fact, the subsequent action of the audience showed that it was about evenly divided between admirers of President Cleveland and of Henry George, for, although the President's name was cheered when it was first mentioned, Mr. George was quite as heartily cheered when he said he could not understand why Mr. Cleveland's name should awaken any applause.

Among those on the platform were Candidate Everett P. Wheeler, Robert Baker, Thomas G. Shearman, Otto Kemper, Joseph Larocque, Charles Frederick Adams, Benjamin F. Butler, Jr., John J. Hopper, Rev. Dr. Maynard, W. J. Gorsuch, J. L. Denison, W. J. Atkinson and R. R. Bowker.

Henry George spoke at length and with great vehemence. It was not until after he had spoken at least 3,000 words in ventilating his own personal and

somewhat peculiar views on the tax question that he got to the issue in which an anti-Hill audience might be supposed to be interested.

"David B. Hill," said he, "is now posing as a lover of labor; as a man who has the interests of labor at heart. What has he ever done for labor? Possibly some little things called for by organized labor, and he has appointed a lot of labor leaders to little positions, earning their support. Labor is the creator of all wealth; labor is the one thing that has no little favors to ask. It is monopoly that wants protection. But labor—labor wants only justice; labor wants only fair play. What we want for labor is not such miserable and shameful laws as those which meet men seeking our shores and turn them back again; men who come here to this country to work, as our fathers came. The great movement for labor is along the line of taxation.

"David B. Hill has persistently opposed every movement of that kind, and to-day, in his opposition to the income tax, he assures us that the national revenues should be raised by a tax on commodities of which this sugar tax that he helped to put in and prevented the repeal of, is an example—the tax that falls on the poor sewing girl as heavily almost as it falls on the wife of the richest hundred millionaire in the land.

"Mr. Hill is posing as a defender of liberty of religion and opinions. He has raised the cry against the A. P. A. I do not need to tell any one here that I do not belong to the A. P. A. I do not have to tell anyone here that I am not a bigot in religion. But seek where you please, there is one place where you will not find them, and that is in the ranks of the single tax men. As for this A. P. A., it is a sort of excuse for democracy. I have seen the thing where it began. I have heard the beat of the Irish drums—the Orange drums on the anniversary of the battle of the Boyne at Belfast, and a very funny thing it is. Wherever that has existed it is simply an importation from the other side of the water, something that grew up there. It was a device to split the Irish people. But it will die out here. It cannot live at this time and in this country. David B. Hill is posing as a defender of the right of belief and of opinion! He is a nice man to pose as a defender of that right.

"Here is something that there has been very little said about. I would like to occupy a little time in speaking about it. Here is a copy of a Senate

document — Senate Document No. 2314. Since the first Congress met, aye, since the first Colonial Legislature was formed, there never has been so wanton, so flagrant an attack upon the principles of liberty, of liberty of thought, as this bill, and David B. Hill is its author. This is the bill popularly known as the anti-anarchist bill, the bill introduced into the Senate of the United States in its last closing days by David B. Hill.

"I am not an anarchist; it is also needless for me to say that. But I am far from sharing in the opinion that an anarchist is merely a man who wants to use dynamite. The anarchists have not a monopoly of physical force. That has been used over and over again by trades unions, by American patriots, and by people of all kinds. Anarchy in its true meaning is a belief; it is a political philosophy. It is an extension to its limit of the old democratic belief that the best government is the government that governs least.

"The anarchists would abolish government. In that I think they are mistaken. I think they go too far on one side, just as the socialists go too far on the other side. But every anarchist has a right to his opinion. Now, what is this bill? A bill to provide for the exclusion and deportation of alien anarchists, which provides that no alien anarchist shall hereafter be permitted to land in any part of the United States; that a board of inquiry is to examine every person who is suspected of being an anarchist. This is David B. Hill! Every alien seeking admission into the United States is to be examined if he is suspected of being an anarchist. Examined as to what? As to whether he ever blew up a house, or killed an emperor, or murdered a brutal and oppressive governor, whom human laws could not reach? No, nothing of that kind. He is to be examined by pertinent questions as to his antecedents, and as to his opinions as to government!

"Is there any difference between examining a man as to his opinions as to government, and if you do not like him sending him back again, and asking his opinion as to God, and after that sending him back? He is to be examined as to whether he belongs to any society or association of known anarchistic tendencies, and this board may examine the person of such alien for marks indicative of such membership. What does that mean? To examine him from the crown of his head

to the soles of his feet for marks indicative of such tendency! What marks? Would a man looked for by all the police of the monarchies of Europe mark himself so that he could be known by them? No; but in some of those countries political prisoners are marked. This precious bill took that way of finding out whether any man coming to this country in search of liberty had been under the ban of the despotic police of Europe.

"And more. This board may accept evidence of an emigrant's common reputation as an anarchist, and the judgments of foreign courts and police investigations may be taken as prima facie evidence, which may be deemed sufficient, unless controverted.

"And this bill goes on to provide that, in case they think there is evidence of his holding such opinions, he is to be sent back from this country, and from there the bill goes on to appropriate \$60,000 of money wrung from labor by the most atrocious taxation. For what? To send agents who are virtually to be police spies to Europe; there to go into connection with the police of European countries, and to find out and report here whom they suspect to be anarchists.

"Why, under that bill such a man as Prince Krapotkine, a man who enjoys the hospitality of England to-day, a man who as an investigator has rendered the greatest service; such a man as Prof. Reclus, who enjoys the freedom of free Switzerland, a man who stands to-day as the most eminent of living geographers—under that bill if such men came to this country they could be taken up, examined as to their opinions of government and then sent back to Europe. The man who introduced that bill was David B. Hill. A man posing as a democrat; posing to-day as a friend of labor; posing to-day as a defender of free speech. There never was such an atrocious bill introduced into the Congress of the United States.

"And in that Senate which has become an American house of millionaires, that Senate which was only anxious to serve the sugar trust, for good and sufficient reasons; in that Senate this bill passed without opposition, and it might have been to-day the law of the land, just as the atrocious Russian treaty that binds us to send back political offenders to Russia is the law of the land. It might have been the law of the land, but, thank God, there was one real democrat, a single tax democrat—John DeWitt Warner—who

stood up and protested, and killed that bill there and then. No man who ever introduced such a bill as that into the Senate of the United States, whatever else he may have done; no man who ever fathered such a bill as that can have my vote any time or for anything. John DeWitt Warner, a man who stood up and did this, the man who has been true to all his pledges, has been turned down by Tammany. You cannot vote for him this year. Tammany and Hill! They are simply parts of the same thing. I shall vote against Tammany and I shall vote against Hill."

MR. GARRISON ON MR. HANNA.  
AN OPEN LETTER TO REV. EDWARD  
EVERETT HALE.

Published in the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of February 26.

Dear Sir: Your recent eulogy of Senator Hanna at the Washington funeral services, wherein you extolled him as "a whole-souled child of God who believed in success and who knew how to succeed by using the infinite powers," if a true estimate, compels one to readjust his ideas either of the Ohio politician or of religion.

On such occasions it is natural that expressions evoked by a keen sense of loss should lack the restraint and balance which marks later judgments of character and service. Grief is rarely joined to dispassionate speech. But you were not under the spell of close friendship. "I knew him very little," was your voluntary acknowledgment. Of him and his career, however, aside from his agreeable personality, you held a common and undisputed knowledge. That conceded, how is your picture of the deceased to be reconciled with the reality?

These ostentatious and exceptional honors were not rendered to the senator's memory because of individual probity, genial manners or family virtues. These traits are not in themselves reason for distinction. It is true that great stress is laid upon them in this instance, evidently to draw attention away from the indefensible acts of his political career,—the special acts, however, which this deliberate public display was calculated to condone. To this scheme your sincere friends have cause to regret that you lent your respected name and reputation.

Whatever Senator Hanna's personal merits or party value, it is undisputed that his political methods, now held up for admiration, would have been adjudged criminal had he applied them to private transactions. They are in-