

decent among fair-minded men. But President Roosevelt takes advantage of his high position to gain the ear of every possible juror with an assertion of his belief in Tyner's guilt. To this unwarranted mode of influencing juries in criminal cases, Mr. Tyner very properly responds with a searching question. "Has it occurred to you," he asks the President, "that pending the trial of the three indictments against me, based on the allegations of the report, and without having heard one word from me in my defense, your premature and unwarranted announcement of my assumed guilt and your call to the court and jury to indorse the same, is, to say the least, extraordinary and dangerous?"

Every man accused of crime is entitled to certain rights. Not to condone his crime if he is guilty, but to shield him from injustice if he is innocent or excusable. One of those rights is that the jury must regard him as innocent until his guilt is affirmatively proved beyond reasonable doubt. Of this right, President Roosevelt has done much to deprive Mr. Tyner. With the President's denunciation in mind, many a juror would go into the box convinced of the defendant's guilt. So Mr. Tyner would have to prove his innocence instead of challenging the prosecution to prove him guilty. Courts sometimes punish newspapers for doing what President Roosevelt has done in this case.

"We are suspicious of these traction companies," said Margaret Haley in her argument before the traction committee of the Chicago city council; "and we insist that there be no further negotiations with them until after the Mueller law is voted on by the people." Those words define the present traction issue in Chicago. A volume could express them no better. There has been much reason to be suspicious of the traction companies. There has been some for suspecting the city council and the council committee. There

will be ample reason for suspicion of anybody concerned in the matter, if any traction franchise is granted before the people vote next April on the Mueller law—on the question of municipal ownership. An intimation and justification of this suspicion was pointedly but considerately and respectfully made by John Z. White in his argument before the council committee, when he said:

Suppose you were personally seized of these municipal rights, and, like the people of Chicago, were obliged to act through agents; and suppose your agents should make terms with a third party, immensely favorable to him, but not favorable to you, wouldn't you look upon your agent with suspicion?

An immense and impressive meeting was held at Cooper Union, New York, on the 4th, to protest against the arbitrary proceedings against John Turner (p. 514), the English labor organizer, who is now under Federal arrest in close custody, awaiting deportation by authority of the "anarchist" act because he disbelieves in organized government. John S. Crosby presided, and Ernest Crosby and ex-Congressman John DeWitt Warner were the principal speakers. The comprehensive wickedness of the law was indicated by Mr. Warner, who, after quoting one of its sections, said:

In other words, thousands upon thousands of voters in western States, thousands of peaceable citizens, married here, acquiring homes and building up the country, are at the mercy of reptile informers, inspired by official zeal, paid by personal enemies, or subsidized by foreign governments to counteract the immigration of their citizens, and they may at any time be taken from their work, their friends, and their families, and, if condemned in secret trial, deported thousands of miles to the country they left.

Among those who contributed to the success of the Turner meeting was Edward M. Shepard, whose admirable letter we give in another column. The list of the vice presidents, men who defy the malice of designing frauds and respectable fools by consenting to the use of their names, is very encouraging. We find in the list

such names as Felix Adler, William H. Baldwin, Jr., Horace E. Deming, Franklin H. Giddings, Rev. Thomas C. Hall, William Jay Schiefflin, Carl Schurz, Charles Sprague Smith, Oswald G. Villard, George F. Seward and Horace White. The resolutions are excellent for their outspoken democracy and conservative tone. They are as follows:

Whereas history shows that whatever evils accompany freedom of speech and of opinion, permanence of popular government can only be maintained by their exercise, and that no error need be feared where truth is free to combat it; and whereas, our constitutions secure freedom of thought and speech to us and their spirit should assure the same rights to aliens; and whereas, Russia, which excludes political opponents and represses free thought and free speech at home, has suffered more than any other Christian nation from violence and assassination, while England, which for 60 years has received and protected all kinds of political exiles, repealing or permitting to grow obsolete her own repressive laws, has alone maintained complete internal peace (except in the case of Ireland, where repression was used), and has been free from revolutionary agitation; and whereas, these examples demonstrate that repression tends to encourage and freedom prevents bloodshed and violence, therefore, resolved, that we, citizens of New York, protest against so much of the immigration law as authorizes the exclusion and deportation of an alien solely because of his opinions, believing that this provision of law is illiberal, unjust and contrary to the spirit of the constitution, and that it tends to the creation and encouragement of the evils it is intended to prevent; resolved, that we recommend that petitions be addressed to Congress asking that the portions of the law against which we protest be repealed.

And whereas, John Turner, a citizen of England, is imprisoned under this act solely for his opinions, and is denied the right of private consultation with counsel, and permission to see friends, and is guarded and confined as though convicted of a crime, although he is staying voluntarily in order to test the law; resolved, that we protest against such treatment and against the "administrative process" by which Turner was arrested and is detained; resolved, that we believe such arbitrary imprisonments to be against the will of our people, and that in the end the United States will not yield to England in the jealousy with which she guards freedom of thought and speech.

The Republican favorites for