



"INDEPENDENT IN ALL THINGS NEUTRAL IN NONE"

VOLUME XVI.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 17, 1897—TWELVE PAGES.

NUMBER 393.

DOWN WITH THE BAD JUDGES!

There Are Some Men on the Bench Who Must Step Down and Out.

The People, Without Regard to Age, Sex or Condition, Demand Their Official Heads.

But the Crooked Men, to Save Themselves, Are Talking for a Non-Partisan Ticket,

Believing that in This Way They Can Scorn the Effect of Freemen's Ballots.

The rotten judges are getting uneasy. All of the crooked men on the bench are moving heaven and earth to have a "non-partisan ticket" endorsed by press, public and politicians.

A "non-partisan" ticket means the renomination of all the good, bad and indifferent judges now on the bench.

It means that no new blood is to be infused into the present lazy and, in some instances, outrageously incompetent bench of Cook County.

This is a fine move—for bad men. But the people will have none of it.

The people know who the good judges are, and they also know who the bad judges are.

And they want to exercise their sovereign prerogative at the ballot box in rewarding the good and in punishing the bad judges.

A non-partisan ticket in Cook County this summer, composed only of the old judges, means general dissatisfaction among the voters.

It means the confirmation of a widespread and growing belief that the ballot is powerless as a redress for grievances.

The perpetuation of some crooked men now on the bench will go as far as anything else towards fanning that revolutionary spark which is now smoldering in this, as well as in other, communities.

Down with corruption on the bench! And down with any man or set of men who try to interfere with the people's rights to choose their own judges.

The terms of all the members of the Circuit bench expire in June. Judge Brentano's term does not expire until fall, but a law has been passed by the Legislature providing for the election of his successor at the June election. The object of this is to save the expense of holding a county election in November simply to elect one judge. Judge Magruder represents this Supreme Court district on the Supreme bench. He is a Republican, as is Judge Brentano.

Following are the Republican and Democratic Circuit Judges of this county:

Republicans—Oliver H. Horton, Richard S. Tuttle, A. N. Waterman, Eldridge Haney, John Gibbons, Abner Smith, Edmund W. Burke, Charles G. Neely. Democrats—Murray F. Tuley, Richard W. Clifford, Frank Baker, Francis Adams, Thomas G. Windes, Edward F. Dunne.

The resolution endorsing the present judges, which was adopted by the Republican Executive Committee, was evidently inspired by the friends of the present judges, based on the idea that the present judges are better fitted for the services they perform by reason of their experience than a new set of men would be. The judges say they are now educated, and it would not be wise to select new men, because they would have to be educated at the expense of the public, like they have been, and now that you have competent men on the bench keep them there. This is a non-partisan judiciary argument, and is only concurred in by men who are drawing the judges' salary and their salaries. The Bar Committee, self-appointed and self-constituted, appeared before the Republican Executive Committee, and persuaded that committee to renominate for re-election all the present judges, because they are well qualified. It is well for us to inquire into the situation of these present judges, when they and their friends insist that they are the proper persons to dispense justice and equity in Cook County, and raise the question

as to whether at the coming judicial election other men in the legal profession of 7,000 lawyers in Cook County, competent men, could not be found, and that the different political parties are not competent to select them. We do not desire to raise any question of qualification. For the sake of the argument we will admit that all the men on the bench are qualified to perform their duties, but that will not prevent us from reviewing the present condition of things. We have sixteen Republican judges in Circuit and Superior Courts of Cook County; we find twelve Democratic judges. Three Republican judges in the Third Ward, and one Democratic judge in that ward; three Democratic judges in the Fourth Ward, and one Republican judge in that ward. We find three judges in the Eleventh Ward—two Democrats and one Republican—and Judge Kohlsaat, of the Probate Court, also resides in that ward. In the Twelfth Ward, two Republicans; in the Thirtieth Ward, two Democrats; in the Thirty-fourth Ward, one Republican; in the Second Ward, one Democrat; in the Twenty-fifth Ward, a Republican; and Judge Carter, a Republican, in the Twelfth Ward. Thirteen of these judges are on the South Side, six on the West Side, and five on the North Side and four in the county. Nealey at Evanston, Dunn in River Forest, Windes in Winnetka, and Ball in Oak Park. Eight of these judges on the South Side are in the Third and Fourth Wards, living on less than a mile square. Six of these judges are residing on the West Side, living on less than two miles square. To say that these wards are the only wards in which there is suitable timber, and that they are the only men in these wards that are suitable to occupy the bench, is an insult to every Democratic and Republican lawyer in Cook County. To say that only ten wards of the city of Chicago shall be represented on the bench, without a contest at a primary election, is a violation of the sacred rights of every voter, Democrat or Republican, in Chicago; and without any disrespect to the men who have endeavored the non-partisan judiciary of Cook County we think it no more than fair that judges of the Circuit and District Courts should take their chances before the people at primaries equally according to law. To pursue that course would command the respect and confidence of voters, and could not be trifled with.

But now in view of the fact that the Republican party of Cook County is in bad repute at Washington, and under a cloud at Springfield, it would be well enough for the Republican managers to submit all political questions to the voters of their party, and have a fresh expression at the ballot-boxes of the desires and intentions of a majority of the voters of the Republican party; and in view of the fact that the Republican party has been retired from power, and a majority of the voters have voted for a man whom they denominated as a boater, and in view of the fact that the present Democratic powers are bolters from the regular Democratic organization, it would be well enough to refer all political questions to the primaries.

One of the reasons why the Democratic leaders do not join in the cheap non-partisan cry is that they want to get rid of some of the Democratic judges and want to take care of several men who have judicial aspirations. One of these is Charles S. Thornton, who was the Chairman of Mr. Harrison's campaign committee. It is claimed



MR. JAMES J. CASEY,

The Well Known Furniture Merchant and Public Spirited Citizen.

that the only Democrats who will be renominated are Tuley, Adams and Dunne.

Another question that is being considered is the reorganization of the county committee. It is regarded as desirable to have a committee that is in hearty accord with the Harrison administration. If the committee gets together and concurs in the resolution adopted by the Republican committee it will not be necessary to hold a convention, and if a convention is not held the personnel of the committee will not change, and consequently an opportunity will not be presented for a reorganization. Just how much there is to this desire to reorganize the committee is not known, but there has been some quiet talk on the subject. There are several members of the Harrison people who wish to legislate off the committee.

Those who want to get on the board are especially anxious to have the non-partisan agreement kicked over, as they believe this is a Democratic year, and they feel that the Democrats can elect a full ticket. There are three men in the organization who are especially anxious to take care of, as their services in party matters are appreciated. One is Granville W. Browning, who is slated for Corporation Counsel under Mayor-elect Harrison. Mr. Browning, it is said, greatly prefers a place on the bench to the position of Corporation Counsel, and if an agreement can be fixed up by which he is reasonably sure of being nominated he will decline Mr. Harrison's offer, if it should be made. This would work satisfactorily, as Judge Payne, of the Superior Court, is anxious to retire from the bench. His name is also being considered by Mr. Harrison in connection with the position of Corporation Counsel, and should the place be accepted by the judge his place on the bench could be filled at the June election.

William Prentiss of Evanston is another man whose party services have been appreciated. He is also regarded as a good lawyer and, it is said, would make an excellent judge. He has been the candidate for Congress twice in a hopelessly Republican district, and has been prominent in local and State conventions.

The other man is Charles S. Thornton. He is ambitious to get on the bench and his party associates are anxious that he shall have this ambition gratified. There is no doubt but he could have a place in Mr. Harrison's cabinet if he desired it, but he announced some time ago that he did not want a place in the city hall and his friends

soon caused it to be known he expected a judicial nomination this spring.

It will then be seen that there are many reasons why the Democrats will refuse to concur in the action of the Republicans, and it will not be a surprise if both parties nominate full tickets.

Among some of the other Democratic attorneys who are looking for a judicial nomination are these: R. M. Wieg, Lawrence P. Boyle, Austin Sexton, Lawrence E. Eunis, M. P. Brady, Colonel Francis T. Colby and J. A. Daulton. There is some talk of nominating General J. C. Black, the United States District Attorney. The fact that General Black refused to be the candidate of the Gold Democrats for Governor last fall is appreciated by the Democratic organization. He is regarded as an excellent man for a place on the bench.

Lawyers all over the city are laughing over the candidacy of "Shadow" Atwood, of Lake View, for Judge. Whenever a judicial vacancy occurs, the "Shadow" bids up. He has bid up again, but then he will bob down again.

One of the brightest young business men in Chicago is Mr. James J. Casey, president of P. Casey's Sons' great furniture and carpet establishment, 41 to 47 5th avenue. Mr. Casey is a typical Chicagoan, having been born on the West Side twenty-nine years ago. For many years he held a responsible position with Robert Law, the veteran coal dealer, until the death of his father, when he took entire charge of the great establishment of which he is now the head. The firm of P. Casey's Sons does a business second to none in the city of Chicago in the line of saloon, store and office fixtures, ice boxes, mirrors, tables, chairs, etc. A few years ago Mr. Casey married Miss Maudie Clifford, the charming daughter of Mr. John Clifford, secretary of the L. Wolff Manufacturing Company, and they have since resided in their lovely home at 529 Cleveland avenue.

Thomas J. Dawson, chairman of the Democratic Campaign Committee of the Twenty-sixth Ward, is prominent as a candidate for chief assistant prosecuting attorney under the new administration. Mr. Dawson is one of the best known young lawyers in the city and has been actively identified with politics in Ravenswood for several years past. His candidacy for assist-

ant prosecuting attorney is backed by A. W. Maltby, Alderman from the Twenty-second Ward; T. J. O'Malley, Alderman from the Twenty-third Ward; Ald.-elect Mangler, of the Twenty-first Ward; William Schlake, Alderman from the Twenty-sixth Ward; John J. Philbin Jr., one of the largest property owners on the North Side, and a number of other Democratic voters in that section of the city.

John R. Bensley and Lloyd J. Smith are now members of the Board of Education, the Council having confirmed the appointments Monday night. Mr. Bensley was formerly president of Hyde Park for two terms before the town was annexed to the city. He is president of the Hyde Park Electric Light and Power Company and is an ex-president of the Board of Trade, of which he is still a member. He came to Chicago in 1833 from Springfield, Erie County, N. Y. Mr. Bensley is married and has a son, John R. Bensley Jr., in Cornell, and a daughter, Marie S. Bensley, who is an artist. His home is at Ellis and Oakwood avenues. For several weeks he has been confined to the house by an attack of grip, but is better now.

The appointment was made at the suggestion of Ald. Mayor and the term will expire June 30 next.

Lloyd J. Smith comes very near being a typical Chicago man. In force of character, energy and effectiveness, in the care for a good name and the regard for an obligation, he is representative of the town with which his fortunes are united. He is a native of Indiana, having been born in Porter County Sept. 10, 1863. The public school at Wheeler, a village, provided the beginning of his education. He studied later at the normal school in Valparaiso, and then came to Chicago. His equipment was a perfect dynamo of energy and an unflinching faith that the future would pay him what he earned. He worked in a humble capacity for three years at the Northwestern National Bank, and then took a flyer in the further West just by way of experience. Returning in less than a year, he found employment with the Central Elevator Company. In 1888 he went with the Santa Fe Elevator and Dock Company, and in 1890 became secretary and treasurer of that concern and manager of the business. He is a stalwart Republican, a clubman and the possessor of a fine home at 103 Evanston avenue. His wife was Miss Sadie B. Hall, whose father was a pioneer in Chicago.

FOR COMMON JUSTICE SAKE!

The Legislature Should and Will Pass the Bills Introduced by Senator Humphrey.

They Merely Aim to Protect the Vested Property Rights of Great Business Interests,

And to Prevent Sandbaggers from Ruining Enterprises Which Employ Thirty Thousand Men.

Dignified and Manly Statement of Mr. Chas. T. Yerkes on Wednesday Last.

Springfield, Ill., April 14, 1897.—The Humphrey bills will probably pass the Senate to-morrow. Charles T. Yerkes, who has done more for Chicago than any other living man, was here to-day and made the following manly and straightforward statement regarding the measure:

"I have been studying these bills for some time, and it may be that I am all wrong—it may be that I am living in a dream—but it appears to me that the bills protect the citizens of Chicago.

"It is stated that the establishment of a commission which shall take charge of certain matters takes the powers away from the City Council, which is the representative branch of our government in the large cities. It does nothing of the kind. What it does is this: It establishes certain rules under which the street railways are to be operated. Some of these rules I do not like. For instance, it says how much headway we shall give to our cars, and that means the kind of cars we are to use. It prescribes the time in which we are to run them. Whether that might be profitable or unprofitable, we are bound to abide by the decision of that commission. They say the City Council can do that. That is very true. The City Council could do it every week, and the probability is that would be about the condition of affairs if you gave that power to a City Council. But the main point in the powers of the commission is that the bill regulates the manner in which ordinances are to be passed by the City Council. Practically it does not take from the Council anything. It merely says that the City Council shall do this business in a proper manner. The bill provides first that when an ordinance is presented it shall be accompanied by certain signatures. That is the law at the present time and it is not proposed to change that law.

"Now, what this bill proposes is this: When it is contemplated having a street railroad in any particular street the signatures of the property-owners are obtained, and it is necessary that a majority in frontage of the property-owners shall sign that petition. That petition then is handed over to the commissioners. The commissioners examine that petition—examine the route over which the line is laid—and they decide, first, is it necessary to have a street railway in that street. There are very many times when streets are laid out for a proposed railroad where there is no necessity for it whatever. There is no doubt of that, and every one living in Chicago must be aware of the fact. This committee decides whether there is really a necessity for a street railroad in that street. Now, that is not anything new. It is done in New York always. There is a commission there that has charge of just that kind of business. Now, after they have concluded that that street is a proper one to place a street railroad in, they examine these petitions; they go over them and determine whether the signatures are genuine and valid or not. When they have concluded that the petition is valid—and the petition is the foundation on which the ordinances must rest—they send it to the City Council.

"The City Council would then frame the ordinance, and they would pass just such an ordinance as they choose. They could put all the restrictions in to it which they might think necessary. This bill even provides that whatever restrictions are placed in an ordinance by the City Council shall be a contract, and the parties taking that ordinance must comply with the terms of the

contract. It is not for the commissioners to determine what the city shall do. The City Council passes the ordinance, we will assume. They pass it in the name of the three commissioners. The commissioners put that ordinance up at public auction for sale to the highest bidder. Now, I mention that to contradict the assertion that this bill takes the power away from the City Council. All the power that is taken away is that the City Council may or may not verify these petitions.

"In regard to the manner of treating our men, it is hardly necessary to revert to that subject, but such strong assertions have been made here that I think it is proper that I should reply to them. The gentleman who made those assertions said that our corporations were very hard on the workmen—that we did everything we could to oppress our employes. At the same time he told you that we paid more wages to our employes than any other community in these United States, and that means that anywhere else in the world.

"Now, I admit one thing, and that is that at the time we had the big strike I opposed the labor union, and in that way I suppose made myself very unpopular with that class of people. I did it because I thought it was best for me to run our railroads rather than the committee of gentlemen who walked around to our car barns and attempted to do it for us.

"Now, in regard to what we do for our men, and what these same labor unions don't, I will state what we do. We have at the North Chicago Railroad Company's office what we call a gratuity fund. We there have what we call our own benevolent association. When a man comes into our employ the rule of that benevolent association provides that when he has been three months he shall then partake of its benefits. The benefits are these:

"If a man is taken sick we have our doctors; and they are good ones—they are chosen from the best men in that North Side—Dr. Truman Miller is at the head of the staff. Our doctors look after the welfare of that man. They take as good care as can be taken of him. Our rule provides that that shall last three months, but there has never been a case where we stopped taking care of an invalid at the end of three months. In fact, we have men on our rolls who have been invalids for four years, and we expect them to be there as long as they live. Another provision is that during the sickness of a man we pay him one-third of his wages, and we guarantee that that shall amount to, at least, one-third of \$15. Another provision is that if a man dies a wife the \$400 goes to her. If he has a wife, but has children, the treasurer takes care of the \$400 and spends it for the benefit of the children. If he has neither wife nor children, it then goes to his parents. If he has no wife, children or parents, it then goes to whomsoever he chooses to will it; and if he wills it to no one the company keeps it. Now that is the bad way in which we treat our employes, and that is all done without any subscription whatever from the employes.

"It is said that the people should be considered in this matter. I do not know that there is anything in these bills that does not consider the people. It is all well enough to talk about the people this and the people that—it is very popular—and we have often taken notice that when a speaker is a little away from the subject and has not got his points right at hand he will then begin to talk about the rights of the people. I contend that these bills are for