

Clancy and His Kind

One of Chicago's police inspectors has been on trial for some time on a charge of accepting bribes from crooks, gamblers and others. Many good people believe he has been wrongly accused and that the charges were framed up by the criminal element which he has prosecuted too vigorously.

But the interesting feature of the trial is the sidelight it throws on the extent to which the saloonkeepers of Chicago escape punishment for the most brazen offenses.

One of the witnesses, Inspector Clancy, swore on his direct examination as follows:

Julius Frank met me in the corridor and he says, "Captain, I got a couple of hundred dollars here for you." I said: "What is a couple of hundred of dollars to you? Can't you do better than that?" "O, yes," says he, "make it \$300." "Can't you make it \$500?" says I. "I will see you in a few minutes," he says, and he came back and says, "I am satisfied."

"Now," says I, "only that I don't want to be mixed up with you I would turn you over to the state's attorney. Now, you dirty scoundrel, get out of here before I change my mind and turn you over to the state's attorney."

Extracts from the cross examination follow:

Q.—The grand jury was in session at the time of this conversation?
A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—At the time of the conversation how far were you from the grand jury room? A.—In the corridor outside. We had to be called in the Streeter case.

Q.—Of course you went right down and told the state's attorney of the crime that had been committed in your presence? A.—No, sir.

Q.—When you went back to the station you went back and ordered the captain to bring the Franks over there? A.—No, I did not.

Q.—You went back and swore out a warrant for them for this crime? A.—No.

Q.—Did you not understand that there had been a crime committed? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Had you never heard of the bribery statute? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—So you did not consider it a reflection upon your integrity, and standing, and honesty as a police officer, did you? A.—No, sir, I did not.

Q.—Why didn't you report the matter to Mr. Deneen, who was then state's attorney? A.—I did not think it was worth my while.

Q.—Did it occur to you at that time that a great crime had been perpetrated or was about to be perpetrated? A.—Yes.

Q.—What did you do in reference to it? A.—Did nothing.

The police inspectors of Chicago rank next to the chief of police in their official importance. It is an interesting subject of speculation as to how many more inspectors there are in the same boat with Clancy. A man occupying such a position and frankly testifying under oath that he had been offered a bribe of \$500 for violating the law, and that he neglected to report the attempted bribery to the State's Attorney or the grand jury or to anyone else in authority, is unfit to hold office of any rank, and there is no telling how many more of the same kind of men are filling public office in the city of Chicago today.

That is the condition of things in a city ruled by its saloons, and the city that is ruled by saloons in this case happens to be nearly large enough to rule the entire state; so the people of the sovereign state of Illinois have got to face the situation of paying taxes to support a commonwealth that is dangerously near complete domination by the liquor power.

Many good people doubt the wisdom of doing away with the license system in a city like Chicago, but in the light of Inspector Clancy's testimony, and in view of the possibility of official corruption which it suggests, does anyone seriously believe that conditions could possibly be worse if the saloon were placed on the list of outlaws, where it belongs, instead of being sanctioned by the community and allowed to pursue its lawless ways unmolested by pliant public officials.

Let those who have the good of the state at heart, and those who are proud of saying they are citizens of Illinois, again read over the testimony of Inspector Clancy.

The country is founded on manhood and womanhood. The saloon is built on the ruins of both.

Who Pays the Tax?

In the days of Dana, the famous editor of the New York Sun, when anything slipped into the Sun that was inconsistent with the policy of the paper and "Old Subscriber" sent in his kick, the editor would explain that the office cat was to blame for it.

It looks like the office cat had been getting in its work on the Champion of Fair Play (whisky paper) which reprints the following from the Detroit Journal. Note **who pays the tax** as explained in the latter part of this editorial:

"While a good deal of thought and discussion are being devoted to the state assessment contemplating that the railroad system of the state shall pay a gross amount of about \$3,000,000 in taxes, it is interesting to note that another industry, the business of dealing in intoxicating liquors, pays this year gross taxes to the amount of \$2,762,531.

"The modest, unobtrusive saloon, whose back door is as valuable an asset as its front door, pays in special taxes alone almost as much as the lordly railroads, without counting in the regular taxes paid on stock in trade, fixtures, buildings and real estate.

"No doubt if all the taxes paid by those engaged in the saloon business and on property directly utilized in the business were computed the total would be considerably greater than the amount the railroad companies pay.

"In the case of both railroads and saloons **it is the patron and consumer on whom the tax is really assessed**, and it is to be noted that it is for the most part the increased price of necessities which represents the patrons' portion of the railroad tax, whereas it is the price of a luxury that represents the consumers' payments in liquor tax.

"Economically the fact is significant and suggests reflections to others aside from the extreme advocates of teetotalism. The distribution of the liquor taxes is a point of some slight interest. We are shown that while Wayne County pays about one-fifth of the ordinary property tax of the state, it pays one-third of the liquor tax, confirming a view founded on observation that the use of intoxicants is much more prevalent here than in other portions of Michigan."

Pianos Succeed Booze

It is said that the wave of prohibition legislation that has swept over the South has had a stimulating effect on piano selling in some places, says Presto, a music publication of Chicago. In other words, the piano sales there have been improved or unaffected according to the tightness or looseness of the prohibitive lid. The effect of prohibition on piano selling is an interesting phenomenon that might be studied and written about by the thinkers of the trade.

The general industry and sobriety of the South naturally affects the piano dealer, and his sales are in proportion to the thrift of the population. The wave of prohibition in the South only showed that section's response to the economic stimulation that beats upon it from all the rest of the world. It has awakened to the fact that it must have a dependable industrial population.

In the economic stress, the indifferent and inefficient man, the village loafer who is seldom sober, has no place and his worthlessness has long been a serious burden for the southern communities to carry. He does not enter the scheme of piano things and if a tight lid can banish him the piano trade will be no loser.