

SENATE REPORT

ON THE

Chicago Police System

AS MADE BY THE

Committee of Investigation Appointed by the 40th General
Assembly, Special Session 1897-98

Adopted by the Senate February 17, 1898.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.:
PHILLIPS BROS., STATE PRINTERS.
1898.

SENATE REPORT.

In issuing his proclamation convening the 40th General Assembly in Extraordinary Session December 7, 1897, the Governor included, among other subjects urgently demanding immediate legislation, "An act to establish police boards providing for non-partisan police in all cities of the State containing over 100,000 inhabitants;" and in his message to the Legislature assembled in pursuance of his call he referred to the subject in the following terms:

EXTRACT FROM THE GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.

I desire to call your attention to the necessity of an act to establish a non-partisan police force in cities of this State which contain over one hundred thousand inhabitants.

In including this subject in the call, at the earnest request of hundreds of our best citizens of all parties, I am influenced by a desire to secure for our great metropolis a police system second to none in the world. Every interest of the people who pay the taxes to support it demands that the vast machinery of the police system shall be used only for the prevention and punishment of crime and the vigilant protection of life and property. Experience proves that these results can be secured only by divorcing it entirely from politics. The experience of the cities of Boston, New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Nashville, Denver, Detroit, Kansas City, San Francisco, Cleveland, and, in fact, all the principal cities of the United States, proves that they succeeded in obtaining an efficient police service only after they had secured the government of their police force by metropolitan boards of either bi-partisan or mixed politics.

Chicago presents the only instance of a police force used as an instrument for the sole benefit of the political party which happens to be in power after each election. Both parties have been to blame in this respect; but the time has now come when all good citizens should make an effort to correct this great evil. The efforts of the Civil Service Commission are and will be of no effect until they are supplemented by a board of control, which, composed of the best citizens of all parties, shall enforce an honest and practical civil service, assuring to every member of the force, who is competent and faithful, permanence in his position, and putting it beyond the power of politicians to control him by making his tenure of office depend upon his political complexion.

The opportunity offered by a special session to consider and mature such a measure, without political prejudice, I feel fully warrants me in asking for it your earnest attention at this time.

On December 15th Senator Lundin, by unanimous consent, offered the following resolution which, under the rules, was ordered to lie upon the table for one day:

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 9.

WHEREAS, His Excellency, Governor John R. Tanner, has included in his call the enactment of a law providing for an act to establish police boards, providing for non-partisan police in all cities of 100,000 inhabitants; and

WHEREAS, A bill has been introduced in the Senate—Senate Bill No. 9—providing for the enactment of such a law; and

WHEREAS, Numerous charges and various scandals have heretofore arisen in regard to the management of the police in the city of Chicago; and

WHEREAS, The morals, safety and security of the people of the city of Chicago demand a complete protection; and

WHEREAS, It has been charged that the enactment of such a law is a mere subterfuge designed to abolish civil service, overwhelmingly adopted by our citizens, irrespective of party; therefore, be it

Resolved, That a committee of seven be appointed by the President of the Senate; and further, be it

Resolved, That said committee be clothed with full power to act, to send for books and papers, to summon and subpoena witnesses, to administer oaths, and to thoroughly and fully investigate the subject, and to report their conclusions and findings as early as possible to the Senate of this Special Session.

The foregoing Senate Resolution No. 9, on being taken up by the Senate for consideration, January 6, 1898, Senator Lundin moved to amend by increasing the number of the committee from five to seven. The amendment was agreed to and the resolution as amended was adopted without division; and the President of the Senate announced the following named Senators as members of the committee provided for in the foregoing resolution:

COMMITTEE APPOINTED UNDER RESOLUTION No. 9.

Berry, Orville F., Republican.
Aspinwall, Homer F., Republican.
Baxter, Delos W., Republican.
Lundin, Frederick, Republican.
Bollinger, Albert C., Republican.
Mahoney, Joseph P., Democrat.
Dresser, Nathaniel, People's Party.

February 10, 1898, the Investigating Committee, through its chairman, Senator Berry, made its report to the Senate, which report was ordered printed and its consideration made a special order for Tuesday, February 15, 1898.

The full text of this report is reproduced, without alteration or emendation, on page 6 of this pamphlet.

The consideration of the committee's report having been postponed from February 15, it was taken up February 17, 1898, and, after debate, was adopted by the following vote—33 Republicans and one Democrat voting for the adoption of the report, and 8 Democrats voting against adoption:

VOTE IN THE SENATE ON THE ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE POLICE
INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

The following voted yes:

Anthony.....	Republican	Humphrey.....	Republican
Aspinwall.....	"	Hunt.....	"
Baxter.....	"	Little.....	"
Berry.....	"	Lundin.....	"
Bogardus.....	"	Mahoney.....	Democrat
Bollinger.....	"	Morrison.....	Republican
Campbell.....	"	Munroe.....	"
Case.....	"	Netterstrom.....	"
Crawford.....	"	Putnam.....	"
Danlop.....	"	Sawyer.....	"
Dwyer.....	"	Sparks.....	"
Eraus.....	"	Stubblefield.....	"
Fisher.....	"	Sullivan.....	"
Fitzpatrick.....	"	Templeton.....	"
Fort.....	"	Warder.....	"
Granger.....	"	Willoughby.....	"
Hamilton.....	"		
Harding.....	"	Yess.....	34

The following voted no:

Curley.....	Democrat	Mounts.....	Democrat
Landrigan.....	"	O'Brien.....	"
McAdams.....	"	Payne.....	"
McCounell.....	"	Nays.....	8
McKinlay.....	"		

On February 24, the last day of the Special Session, no legislation having been effected concerning Police Boards. Senator Hamilton offered in the Senate the following resolution providing for the continuance of the Investigating Committee, which resolution, by unanimous consent, was taken up for consideration and adopted:

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 15.

WHEREAS, The Senate Committee appointed to investigate the police force of Chicago has, in the limited time at its disposal, unearthed a most deplorable state of affairs in the management and control of said police force; and

WHEREAS, Said committee's investigations have established that the most flagrant violations of the civil service law have been brazenly practiced by those in authority in control of the said police force, and

WHEREAS, It is undoubtedly in the interest of good government in the city of Chicago, and for the protection and preservation of the property and lives of the citizens of Chicago that the unlawful practices in said police force should be further investigated and made known to the general public, in order that the existing evils may be properly remedied; therefore be it, and it is hereby

Resolved, That said Investigating Committee be authorized to continue its investigation and report the result thereof to the next regular session of this Senate; *Provided*, That said committee shall only receive as pay per diem for the days actually employed in such investigation, and that such per diem and the necessary expenses of said investigation be paid only upon the certificate of an itemized account by said committee, which shall be approved by the Governor.

Resolved further, That said committee be and it is hereby authorized to send for all persons, books and papers which it desires in said investigation.

The report of the Police Investigating Committee, adopted by the Senate February 17, 1898, by a vote of 35 yeas to 8 nays, reads as follows:

REPORT OF POLICE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

To the President and Members of the Senate:

Your committee, appointed under Resolution No. 9, for the purpose of investigating the management of the police of the city of Chicago, and other matters appertaining to the proper administration of police affairs of said city, having performed that duty, beg leave to report as follows:

Your committee, at its first meeting, in order to properly investigate and come to an intelligent conclusion on the subject matter contained in said resolution, and to procure and furnish this body with as much information as possible, determined to proceed to investigate along the following lines, and procure evidence and information that in their judgment would be of value to this body, as well as to the citizens of the State of Illinois. They therefore proceeded in their examination to take up the following topics for investigation:

1. The Civil Service Law.
2. The manner of its enforcement.
3. Its success or failure.
4. The police pension law; its success or failure.
5. The actual workings of the police department.
6. The condition of the city as to the enforcement of the law and protection to life and property by the police.
7. The management, control and direction given the department by the chief of police.
8. The workings of the police justices' courts.

I.

THE CIVIL SERVICE LAW.

The Thirty-ninth General Assembly passed an act entitled "An act to regulate the civil service of cities," which was approved March 20, 1895. This act provides for the appointment by the mayor of three commissioners, no more than two from one political party. It further provides that such commissioners shall hold no other lucrative office or employment under the United States nor the State of Illinois, or any municipal corporation, or political division thereof. Said commissioners shall hold their office for three years, or until their successors are appointed and qualified. It further provides that the mayor may, in his discretion, remove any commissioner for incompetency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office, but not otherwise. It further provides that said commissioners shall classify the offices and places of employment of said city with reference to the examinations therein provided, and that the offices and places so classified by the commission shall constitute the classified civil service list of said city, and that no appointments to any such offices or places shall be made except under and according to the rules of said act.

This act, with some exceptions and some delays before it went fully into effect, was adopted by the city of Chicago by a large majority, it thereby becoming a part of the organic law of the city of Chicago, and so long as it was in force all the officers of said city, including the executive head, were bound to enforce it as much as any other law of the State or ordinance of the city.

The lapse of time before this act took full effect made it impossible to tell just how it would have been enforced by the first administration of the city of Chicago when the same took effect. It is only necessary to say that that administration took the advantage given it by the law itself and adjusted the offices of the city of Chicago for that administration, practically without any reference to the civil service act as it had a legal right to do.

The first Board of Commissioners appointed by Hon. George B. Swift, Mayor of the city of Chicago, was Hon. John M. Clark and Christopher Holtz, Republicans, and Robert A. Waller, Democrat. This Commission was in office upon the election of the present mayor of the city of Chicago. The term of John M. Clark, by virtue of the law, expired July 1, 1898; Robert A. Waller, July 1, 1897, and Christopher Holtz, July 1, 1899. This Commission seems to have had the confidence of the people of the city of Chicago. Immediately upon Mayor Harrison's election, he appointed Robert A. Waller, the Democratic member of the Commission, city comptroller, thereby removing him from the Commission; and while the law provides that the commissioners can not be removed except for cause, or malfeasance in office, without any such charge the other two members of said Commission were immediately removed, and the mayor appointed the present Commission, who immediately organized and proceeded with the business of said Commission.

Your committee were favored the first two days of their investigation with the presence of the present Civil Service Commissioners, and such of their records as the committee desired to use, but after that the Commission, for reasons best known to themselves, withdrew entirely from the committee, and declined to be present or to allow any of their records to be examined or brought before your committee, but fortunately for the committee, and we think very unfortunately for the Commission, we had procured a sufficient amount of evidence, with what we were able to ascertain in other directions, to fully satisfy the committee of the management and workings of the Civil Service Commission, and your committee did not deem it necessary to undertake to enforce the presence of either the Commissioners or any of their records. The Secretary of the Commission, the committee desires to say, was present whenever requested, and furnished the committee all the evidence that was in his power as such secretary to furnish, and was of great assistance to your committee.

II.

THE MANNER OF ITS ENFORCEMENT.

The evidence before your committee fully justifies the committee in saying that the Civil Service Law, under the present administration of the city of Chicago, has not been enforced, neither in letter nor in spirit, and in the judgment of your committee it has not been allowed to prevent the appointment of any man that the administration desired appointed, whether he complied with the Civil Service law or not. Even heads of departments in the city have seen proper to openly and defiantly refuse to comply with the requests of the Commission and to appoint men who have qualified under the law.

We quote one instance: An examination had taken place for a certain office. Only three men passed the examination. There was a vacancy in that office. The man who stood highest was certified by the Commission to the foreman of that department. He presented his certificate, which entitled him to the office, to the foreman. He hesitated a moment, but at once arose to the occasion, and informed that Civil Service man that he had that morning abolished that particular office, and therefore he could not be appointed, and he was not; while this same foreman placed a man in that position, but under another name, who at the time your committee was in session was doing the work and drawing the salary which, under the law, the other man was entitled to. The difference seemed to be, one was qualified and had complied with the law, but did not have any particular pull, while the other man had neither passed the examination nor was qualified according to law; yet the mayor and his appointees wanted him, and that was sufficient to procure his appointment.

One other instance of the working of this law by the Commission: W. D. Darst, a professional cook, at the House of Correction: the evidence showed he had been there for a number of years. His recommendations were of the highest character; he had taken the Civil Service examination and had passed satisfactorily. In July, 1897, a new superintendent, A. Sturn, was appointed. Shortly after his appointment, Louis Kadlitz, an ex-convict, whom Superintendent Crawford had discharged from the same position for drunkenness

and inattention to duty, was making a vigorous campaign, backed by a prominent politician of the Tenth ward. On October 27th, when Darst went to get his pay, he was told that he was discharged and Kadlitz was to take his place. Darst immediately asked the superintendent what were the charges against him, and he replied there were no charges, "You are simply given a good old-fashion political boost for the good of the service." Darst said to him, "But how does your administration get over the Civil Service?" The superintendent replied, "I don't know. You are out, and the other fellow is in. See?" But Darst, knowing the law, insisted that he could not be discharged without a trial, and went to the Commission and stated his case. They said they would look it up. They said there were no charges filed against him, and he kept insisting until finally he went there and was told that the following were the charges, and the following paper, which we quote exactly, was read to him:

House of Correction,
Adolph Sturn,
Superintendent.

"CITY OF CHICAGO,
California Ave. and 23th Street,
Chicago, Ill., Nov. 9. 1897.

"J. M. GLENN, Esq.,

Secretary Civil Service Commission:

"DEAR SIR:—I have been asked by your honorable body to describe in detail the meaning of 'for the good of the service.' Every day I find on the 'mittimus of persons sent to the House of Correction by justices of the peace: 'Cause: A tendency leading to breach of the peace,' and this covers 'a multitude of sins. So does the remark, 'for the good of the service' embrace a large number of meanings, foremost of all is the sense of preventing 'the detrimental effect it would have if no change was made.

Very respectfully,

A. STURN."

These were the charges upon which Darst was tried. Darst insisted to the Commission that they were not charges at all. But the trial proceeded, and it is unnecessary to say that a Commission that would recognize such a paper as the above for any purpose of a trial, would readily find the man guilty, and his removal was sustained and the other fellow is still holding the job.

Numerous instances of this kind in other departments of the Civil Service of Chicago and like action by the Commission might be mentioned. But it is enough to say that the evidence justifies us in finding that in every instance where it was the desire of the mayor or his political backers to have a man removed and some person put in his place, that the Civil Service law never stepped in the way; and with all of the evidence before the Committee they are unable to find where it ever prevented the removal of a single man or enabled one to get a position unless his appointment was satisfactory to the present administration of the city of Chicago.

We now turn our attention particularly to the law as applied to the policemen, the appointment of which is of a much more serious character even than in any of the other departments of the service, as the life, liberty and property of the citizens of the city of Chicago depend in a very large degree upon the honesty, faithfulness and ability of the policemen of the city.

Under a former administration a large number of policemen had been relieved from office and friends of the administration, we take it, had been appointed, but at that time the Civil Service Law was not in force. As soon as the administration changed and Mayor Harrison became mayor, a demand was made by many of these policemen and their friends, that they should be reinstated on the force. Under the law, as it then stood, there was no way for policemen to be appointed except by taking the Civil Service examination, and this examination, under the law, must be open to every person who can fulfill its requirements, and in order to meet the demands of the mayor and to avoid the law, the Commission called for an examination for expert policemen. No such a thing is known to the law. When that was done the Commission requested the chief of police to furnish the Commission with the past records of all men who in their application stated they had once been police-

men. This information was furnished to the Commission by the police department, showing when every man had originally been appointed, how many times he had been discharged, and for what cause. These records were taken by the Commission and examined by them, and out of some 500 or 600 names, the records of which were furnished the Commission, the records of about 100 of them were so bad that the Commission marked them "rejected" and would not, in their view of the law and discharge of their duty to the people of the city of Chicago, permit them to take an examination or to certify them for appointment. Many of these men, whose records they had before them, had been discharged from the service, many of them two and three times, some as high as six and seven times, and they were discharged for such offenses as intoxication; being found drunk while on duty; found intoxicated in saloons; off duty without permission; firing pistols in the street while on duty and under the influence of liquor; willful maltreatment of prisoners; willful maltreatment and assaults upon citizens; immoral conduct and conduct unbecoming a police officer.

As we have already stated, the Commission refused a large number of these men examination; but the records show that when this fact was ascertained, requests would come from the mayor to know why such and such a man was not examined or certified to. A member, or members of the Commission would then send for the rejected paper and after a consultation with the aldermen or whoever came, the paper first marked "rejected" would come back to the secretary marked "approved" and this man would be certified and placed upon the police force. This continued from day to day and week after week until practically all of the men who were originally rejected by this Commission were certified for appointment on the police force.

The first afternoon of your Committee's investigation of this branch of work they found sixty-nine (69) men with records that in the judgment of your Committee were such as to unfit them for service on the police force of any city, and with a large number of records yet to investigate, which records were in the hands of the Commission. They were taken from the Commission and the original memoranda, as furnished the Commission prior to their appointment, was refused your Committee, and the box in which they were kept, as shown by the evidence, was placed in the vault, and locked, and the secretary, taking the key with him, left the office; that during the night the Commission in session sent for the box, took it out of the vault and broke it open, for what purpose your Committee can only surmise. It is sufficient to say that they, from that date, refused to allow your Committee to further investigate the contents of that box or to see the memoranda furnished in reference to the qualification and character of the men certified by them for policemen thereafter. At the time this box was broken open and these memoranda further examined, the evidence shows that there was a consultation of the different heads of departments of the city with the Commission. Why it was that they came to the conclusion that their records should not be open to the public, and that the Commission should not have the benefit of them, your Committee are unable to say, unless it be that a further examination would disclose even greater errors and more serious violations than had already been discovered.

Your Committee does not believe that it is in the best interests of good government and the protection of life and property that when a man is once appointed to the important position of policeman of the city of Chicago, or any great city, and has been discharged for willful violation of law, such as the evidence shows these men were, should ever again be placed in a position of power or responsibility. Almost the first act of Mayor Harrison was to remove the Civil Service Commission that was in office when he was elected, which was done in open violation of both the spirit and letter of the law, and could only have been done for the purpose of furthering his own interests and appointing to positions men that he could better control than the men already in.

The Civil Service Commissioners appointed by Mayor Harrison, it is true, were well known and highly respected citizens, and we are satisfied that the Commission in the first instance were inclined to obey the law, and that much could be said in mitigation of the violations of the law by the Commission.

But the fact remains that they were appointed by the Mayor and in a large degree, if he insists upon it, they are governed by his wishes (and in this case the records show he insisted upon it). The Commissioners are also dependent upon the city council for the means with which to conduct their office and transact the business of the Commission, and this again makes them more or less subject to the demands of the members of that body. The evidence shows that the members of the city council came, one at a time, and in pairs to the Commission, demanding that their friends should be placed in office, and that the Commission should pay no attention whatever to the law. And the records also show that in almost, if not every, instance where these men with such records as we have herein described, were appointed, it was done upon the demand of some alderman or some person having a pull with the administration; because the record abundantly shows the fact to be that the present mayor of Chicago has used the all-powerful influence of his position to defeat and prevent the proper enforcement of the Civil Service Law, and thus embarrass the Civil Service Commission. From the beginning of the present administration there has been a determined and combined effort upon the part of the mayor and the several heads of departments to evade the Civil Service Law. The Law Department, acting under the direction and with the advice and consent of the mayor, has continuously annoyed and harassed the Commission. Many opinions have been rendered holding the entire Civil Service Act unconstitutional, thus encouraging the heads of departments to disobey the law and also disregard the rules of the Commission. This materially prevented the enforcement of the law. The different departments seek to evade the law, and being encouraged therein, claim the privilege of using sixty-day men instead of choosing employees from the classified list; and the Commissioners were forced, in the judgment of your Committee, by the mayor, to yield to this violation. This was done by the mayor and the different heads of departments for the purpose of enabling them to put upon the pay-roll their political cohorts and ward-heelers without any reference to the good of the service. The different departments demand the right to appoint men to office without regard to the Civil Service Law.

The city council of Chicago, acting under the advice, consent and approval of the mayor, passed an ordinance in July creating what the council designated to be heads of departments, sub-heads, etc. This was done to remove the positions which were clearly within the classified service, from the control of the Commissioners, and enable the mayor to appoint whomsoever he pleased to office. This resulted in getting the entire Civil Service Law before the Supreme Court, and that body has recently handed down an opinion which shows that every action of the present city administration of the city of Chicago has been an open and palpable violation of the Civil Service Law. But the influence of the mayor, aldermen and the several heads of departments, were not the only influences which the Commission had to contend with. The ward heelers, keepers of gambling houses, low dives, and places of disrepute all joined in a clamorous demand for the appointment of their cohorts to office, and in this demand the mayor of Chicago lent the powerful influence of his office.

It is apparent from the execution of the law and the difficulties which the Commission labored under that the administration now in force in Chicago is unalterably opposed to the merit system and has done everything in its power to destroy the law and nullify its provisions and has made it a mockery, a by-word and a sham. The sole purpose of the administration being to remove from office competent and capable men without any cause, in order to appoint their own friends to office, and in this way we can readily account for the fact that there have been appointed to office many men of unsavory reputation and mental and physical unfitness, these men being endorsed by the heads of departments and appointed by the mayor. It is an old saying that "When a great man dies the nation mourns." This is equally true when a dishonest or incompetent man or one who inherits a name without inheriting the qualities possessed by the one who made the name great has been elevated to a great office, and this now seems to be the true condition in the city of Chicago.

We recognize the fact that to great centers of population the criminal and vicious drift, and it is also true that they exercise to a greater or less extent political influence because of their vast numbers and methods; and the purpose

of every good citizen should be to lend his influence to the end that only good men should be placed in office and that municipal government should be administered for the greatest good to the greatest number, and for the best preservation of life and property.

The evidence before your committee shows that the present mayor is in favor of a "wide open," or, in the words of Chief Kipley, "a liberal government." Just what a liberal government meant, as used by the mayor and Chief Kipley, we are unable to tell, but its results have been detrimental in a large degree to the welfare and fair name of the great city of Chicago.

Your committee believes that the Civil Service Commissioners originally would have been glad to enforce the Civil Service law, but such powerful, potent and dangerous influences surrounded the Commission in the discharge of their duties and sought by every means possible to prevent and destroy the enforcement of the law, that they were unable to resist. All these things are worthy to be taken into consideration, and should be considered in passing judgment upon the commission and their efforts to enforce the law, for your committee believe that while they have not discharged their duty under the law, yet your committee fully believe that the responsibility properly rests upon the present city administration of the city of Chicago, and that the failure of the law to be enforced should be charged to the undue and improper influence used by Mayor Harrison and his supporters, who have in every instance, as the evidence shows, opposed the enforcement of the law and invented every possible means to defeat its operation.

III.

THE POLICE PENSION ROLL.

A number of years ago the Legislature passed an act authorizing the organization of a police pension board among the policemen of the city of Chicago. It was the thought of the Legislature at the time to provide a means by which disabled policemen, after having served on the force for a number of years, and having paid into this fund, when they became disabled from service, might be retired and provided a means of support in their old age, and also to provide for the care of the widows and orphans of deceased policemen coming within the requirements of the act. The examination into the working of this law by your committee developed a state of facts that is really alarming. The evidence before your committee shows that a large number of men who were in many instances the very best men on the force, captains, sergeants, lieutenants, with many years of experience and records of which any man might be proud, were removed and placed upon the pension roll, solely for the purpose of giving places to some other men who could not be promoted otherwise, and these men testified, many of them, before your committee, that they were physically able to discharge the duties they were called upon to do when retired, and could fill the office of captain, desk sergeant, or almost any office in the department unless it be patrolmen, as well as they ever could in their lives, and many of them testified, and your committee believe it to be true, that their experience on the force made them much more valuable to the citizens than any new man could possibly be without any experience; yet they were retired, as we have stated, and were drawing from \$40 to \$180 per month out of the pension fund, which in the judgment of your committee should be sacredly preserved for disabled policemen, their widows and orphans,

The result of this investigation evidently threw a new light upon this law, and the citizens of Chicago and many policemen themselves say that the abuses must be remedied. Some of the men, in fact, testified before your committee that they were willing to remain on the police force in the positions that they occupied when they were retired and placed upon the pension roll, and would prefer doing so to retirement and receiving a pension.

Your committee believes that it is a great detriment to the police service of the city of Chicago to have such men removed from office, and a great hardship and wrong upon the police pension fund to have men retired who are ready and willing and able to work, drawing pensions from the fund that should be preserved for persons in real need.

Your committee believes that the investigation of this department of the police will result in great good to deserving police officers, as well as to the police department generally. The police pension fund act, as passed by the General Assembly, if properly managed, will be of great benefit to disabled policemen, their widows and orphans; but so sacred a fund ought not to be used for the purpose of maintaining in enforced idleness men who are able and willing to do police duty who are forced on the pension roll for the purpose of making room for some one else. With these facts before the policemen of the city, we do not believe that they will permit any further abuse of this law, but will look well to it that the fund is preserved, as the law originally intended it should be, for the benefit of those who, by long service, have become disabled and unable longer to work, and to the widows and orphans of deceased policemen.

V.

THE ACTUAL WORKINGS OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

The police department of the city of Chicago is composed in round numbers of 3,000 men in its various departments; that a large majority of those men are faithful servants of the people and discharge their duty conscientiously in the enforcement of the law and in the protection of life and property, your committee have no doubt, but in view of the fact that the entire police department, notwithstanding the civil service law, is in the hands of the political party in power, and now in the hands of the mayor of the city, who is a partisan, and in the very nature of the case must be, it is a fact well established by the evidence before your committee that it is not used to enforce the law, nor for the protection of life and property, but, upon the other hand, that it is even used, and is now being used, for the protection of all kinds of vice and for the furtherance of the political desires and ambitions of the present mayor.

The evidence before your committee conclusively shows that the assignment of policemen to different parts of the city materially affects the condition of morals in that particular locality. In other words, if there are portions of the city where there are a large number of gambling houses, pool rooms, houses of prostitution and opium dens, policemen can be assigned to those respective localities who either do not see what is going on or will openly enter into agreement with them to protect them in their nefarious operations; and the evidence before your committee shows that it was not an unfrequent thing for a policeman when assigned to duty in a certain place if he saw too much he was immediately removed to some other part of the city and a man took his place whose sight was not nearly so good.

Your committee find from the evidence, and believe it to be true, that the police department of any city is largely what the executive head of that city may make it. If the mayor of a city desires the enforcement of the law, desires life and property protected above everything else, he will appoint a chief of police whose aim and object will be to carry out his own views and to enforce the law; and your committee believe that with such a mayor and such a chief of police, the law could be enforced much better than it is, and life and property much better protected, but if the mayor does not desire the law enforced and prefers a "wide open" or "liberal" government, he will appoint a chief of police who is in favor of a "wide open" or "liberal" government, who will not himself see or know of any violations of law, and who can very readily communicate his own sight and his own want of knowledge to all the men under him. That such is the actual workings of the police department at present in the city of Chicago can not be successfully denied. That there are policemen now on the force in the city of Chicago who are not fit men to hold such places, the evidence justifies us in saying; that there are men on the police force recommended by the mayor and Civil Service Commission and appointed by the chief that no business man in the city of Chicago would employ to protect his life and property for an instant. The evidence shows that there are a great many men on the police force in the city of Chicago at the present time who either can not, or will not, see violations of law, the evidence justifies us in saying; that the actual working of the present police force in the city of Chicago is not in the interest of

good government, is not conducted for the sole purpose of protecting life and property, but, upon the other hand, is used in such a manner as not to molest many forms of crime and vice that are open and notorious, and that in many instances, as shown by the evidence, the department has been receiving contributions for protection to crime. This naturally grows out of, and is the result of the orders and management of the head of the department, Chief Kipley, who testified before your committee that he was carrying out the directions and instructions of the mayor.

VI.

THE CONDITION OF THE CITY AS TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW AND PROTECTION OF LIFE AND PROPERTY BY THE POLICE.

The evidence before your committee conclusively shows that gambling in almost every form for months prior to the meeting of your committee was running in the city of Chicago wide open. The evidence shows a public gambling house at No. 6 Plymouth Place, where they were playing various kinds of games for money; that there was in said place daily 100 to 150 people; that the doors were open so that the people could go in and out at their leisure; that policemen were up and down the street in front of said premises and that the establishment was not molested; that there was another gambling place at No. 17 Plymouth Place, which is a public street in the city of Chicago, the doors were wide open, a large number of people in there playing for money daily, and they were not molested by the police. This establishment, the evidence shows, ran day and night. Another place, at No. 311 Clark street, is on the first floor, saloon in front and gambling in the rear. There were from 100 to 150 people in this place daily, and that the doors were open and any one could go in and out at their leisure, and it ran day and night. The evidence showed it was not molested by the police. Also at 430 State street, which is one of the most public streets in the city of Chicago. In this place there were from 100 to 200 people daily and nightly playing all kinds of games, money in sight on the table and chips representing money, as any person could see that went in. There appeared to be no privacy about it, as shown by the evidence, yet they were not molested by the police. At 311 Clark street, another public place in the city of Chicago. This is the house at the same number as the one given before. One of the gambling houses is downstairs and the other one upstairs. About 150 people were constantly in this place, playing craps, poker and other games, money in sight, and anybody could see that wanted to; doors were wide open, and anybody went in that wanted to. There seemed to be no privacy exercised by the proprietors, and they were not molested by the police.

We deem it unnecessary to mention any others by number. It is sufficient to say that the evidence shows a large number of places in all parts of the city in the most public places, where the police, if they had been seeking to find them, could not have helped to do so.

Your committee further finds by the evidence that the proprietors of these several gambling places were indicted by the Grand Jury of Cook county, after the police department had failed or neglected to do their duty, and that most of them either plead guilty or were fined for violating the law, or were tried and convicted; and the evidence further shows that immediately after the indictments of these men by the Grand Jury of Cook county, the chief of police, in his enthusiasm to enforce the law, issued an order that gambling houses should be closed, after they had already been closed by the sheriff.

The evidence further shows that pool rooms were running wide open, or at least "liberally." That at 236 Clark street, in a large room, in a public place, as many as 500 people were receiving telegrams of races all over the United States; that they were betting their money, receiving their checks, and after the races were publicly announced, were going to the cashier and receiving their pay. This was done in the presence of oftentimes 500 people in the room, with the doors wide open, yet they were not disturbed by the police. Also at 269 Clark street and 255 Clark street; these are both large rooms; from 250 to 600 people congregated in broad day light; doors wide open; were conducting gambling in an open manner, as we have above described. They were not molested by the police. At 14 Custom House place, at 12 Ply-

mouth Place, also at 17 Plymouth Place, 26 Jackson street, 21 Plymouth Place, and a large number of other places your committee might name, but this is sufficient to show that the evidence before your committee was conclusive that gambling and pool selling was running wide open in the city of Chicago for months prior to the assembling of your committee.

The evidence before this committee further shows that these pool rooms were closed by the sheriff of Cook county and many of the men indicted and fined for gambling.

The evidence before your committee further shows that this gambling and pool selling is a very profitable business for the parties running it; and not only gambling houses and pool rooms were running wide open, but slot machines, for gambling purposes, were placed in public all over the city, and so far as the police were concerned, were allowed to run.

The evidence further shows that at these several places where pool selling was going on policemen were in there, and, in many instances, indulged in the game. The evidence shows that at nearly every place herein mentioned, and many others, Henry Kipley, a brother of the present chief of police of the city of Chicago, was present behind the counter, keeping tab of the amount of money received and paid out with the cashiers of those gambling institutions. The evidence further shows that Chief Kipley knew that his brother was in these places, his brother was on duty in the police department as a detective, and under his oath of office and the ordinances of the city of Chicago, was bound to report the facts that came to his knowledge of the violation of the city ordinances to his chief.

The evidence further shows that in many of these other places not only Kipley, but other policemen and other detectives in the employ of the police department, were present and did know as a matter of fact that gambling was being run wide open in the city. And your committee does not believe that it is possible that the chief of police of the city of Chicago was not fully conversant of the fact that gambling was allowed, permitted and protected.

The evidence before your committee shows that there were more hold-ups and robberies, more violations of the law on the streets of Chicago, during the past six months, possibly, than ever in the city of Chicago in the same length of time. It is not strange, however, that when the ordinary policeman can see that gambling and many other forms of vice are winked at, if not openly protected, it is not strange, we repeat, that he should wink at other violations of law and have less respect for the enforcement of the law than he would have otherwise.

It was also shown by the evidence before your committee that opium dens were permitted to run in open violation of law, and that the keepers thereof paid a tribute regularly to the police for not molesting them.

Your committee, therefore, are of the opinion that the actual workings of the present police department of the city of Chicago, is far from what it should be or what it could be easily made.

VII.

THE MANAGEMENT, CONTROL AND PROTECTION GIVEN THE DEPARTMENT BY THE CHIEF OF POLICE.

Under our law, the mayor of every municipality is in fact chief of police. Next to him in authority is the superintendent or chief of police, who is supposed to be and is responsible in a very large measure, together with the mayor, for the condition and working of the police department. It is not strange, however, in view of the evidence before your committee, that the present police organization of the city of Chicago, is not what it ought to be. It is not strange that the ideas of many of the present policemen, and their actions, are not in harmony with the best interests of good government, for it is exceedingly hard, yea, it is impossible for the stream to raise higher than its source, and with a chief of police promulgating, as he said in his testimony before your committee, the ideas of the mayor with which he was in full sympathy, there never will be a good police force, neither will there be that protection of life and property and enforcement of the law that the good people of the city of Chicago have the right not only to demand but to expect.

The evidence before your committee first brings the present chief of police, very soon after his appointment into prominence, not in promulgating to his policemen orders for the preservation of property and life, but he first appears upon the stage as the originator of a great book scheme. Shortly after the present administration was in power, it was suggested to the chief by Captain Dollard, another police officer, that they proceed to make some money for the benefit of the department by having some public sparring matches, in common parlance known as prize fights, in the city, which is an open violation of both the State laws and the city ordinances. The evidence shows that Chief Kipley, in answer said: "I said I would help him in any way I could." When the prize fight scheme failed, the chief then proceeded, instead of discharging his duties as chief of police, to promulgate a great book scheme. This book scheme, the chief said, was practically originated by him, but submitted to the mayor for his approval. He then proceeded to employ some persons to go out and solicit from the general public funds and to those solicitors he gave the following letter:

"CHICAGO, November 5th, 1897.

To whom it may concern:

"The police department is about to issue a history for the benefit of their relief fund. Kindly make all checks payable to Walter V. Magnus, East Chicago Avenue Station, and any favors shown the bearer will be appreciated by

Yours truly,

JOSEPH KIPLEY, Chief of Police.

And this is written on the official letter head of the department.

Clothed with this letter from the chief of the police, Amos M. Atwell, a stranger in the city of Chicago, a man who had just got through with such a scheme in the city of Detroit, and who had been publicly declared through the newspapers to be a fraud, and who had been arrested in Detroit for obtaining money under false pretenses, all of which Chief Kipley admitted upon the stand he knew, he went forth with the letter of the chief, and the evidence shows that when he went to large corporations and presented this letter and unfolded the scheme, that they gave to him checks as high as \$1,000, and that these collections went on from day to day and week to week, and so far as the evidence shows, not more than four or five people in the city of Chicago were aware of the fact. The evidence shows it had originated in the mind of Kipley, approved by the mayor and Robert E. Burke. Kipley selected Magnus, an appointee of the mayor's, as treasurer, issued the letter to Atwell to go out soliciting funds, for which he was to receive 25 per cent., and Magnus 10 per cent., and the good work went on until in the neighborhood of \$8,000 was collected, and in the hands of Magnus, and then this committee began its investigation, Mr. Atwell going on the stand, answering part of the questions propounded to him and refusing to answer others, saying that the details as to the amount, and from whom, etc., was all in the hands of Magnus, the treasurer. We were promised by the city administration that Magnus would be forthcoming before the committee with books, papers, etc., but notwithstanding we made every effort to get Mr. Magnus, the treasurer of Chief Kipley in his book scheme, after a conference with Kipley, we were unable to get him before the committee and were finally informed by a representative of the city administration that he had gone to Hot Springs or some other hot climate.

The evidence before your committee shows that a number of similar schemes had been undertaken in various cities and also in the city of Chicago in times past; that they have always proved a failure, the only result being a large amount of money collected from different people by letter sent out by the chief requesting it, and seldom, if ever, a book published, and if published at all, one of no value whatever, the money practically all going by way of commissions, etc., to persons directly interested.

The evidence further shows that the Policemen's Benevolent Association proper, at the time of the Dreyer Bank failure, lost something over \$12,000; that when subscriptions to the book scheme of Kipley, Burke and Harrison

were solicited representations were made that the treasury of said association was depleted, and that if the subscriber would make a liberal donation, the association would not only be placed firmly upon its feet again, but that would end solicitations forever in the future for the support of the Policemen's Benevolent Association of Chicago. Shortly after this committee began its investigation, Chief Kipley and his man Magnus proceeded to devise a way to place the moneys which had been collected by them under the control of the Policemen's Benevolent Association, in whose name the subscriptions had first been solicited. Dollard was sent for and requested to accept this money as treasurer of the association, but he declined, stating that until he was directed by the directors of the association to place it in the treasury he would not do so. Then he was requested to accept it as an individual, pending action by that body and your committee, which he did. Subsequently the association repudiated this whole book scheme and declined to accept the money, which is still in the bank, to the personal credit of Mr. Dollard. We believe that this association acted wisely and by their conduct in the premises deserve the confidence and support of the people of Chicago.

Chief Kipley, while on the stand, admitted that he was practically a stranger to Atwell, and that he had heard of the charges against him in other cities, yet notwithstanding this fact he placed in his hands the letter above referred to and sent him out to solicit funds from the business people of the city of Chicago to forward this book scheme of his. And your committee is of the opinion that had it not been appointed and began its investigation, that the solicitation of funds would be rapidly going forward at the present time. With these facts as to this book scheme presented to the public, we leave them to draw their own conclusions, and Chief Kipley and his assistants in the scheme to make their own explanations.

To throw some further light upon the actions of Chief Kipley in this book scheme we quote from his evidence:

Q. What was the talk you had with him? A. The principal talk I had in the matter was between Atwell and myself.

Q. What was that talk? A. That was about soliciting funds.

Q. What was said to Mr. Atwell about that? A. Mr. Atwell wanted me to give him a letter to give a number of gentlemen here in the city, that is, endorsing this book.

Q. Did you do so? A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. What did you say in that letter? A. I said, while I can not recall the exact words, 'The official communication will be handed you by Atwell, who is soliciting funds for this book. Anything Mr. Atwell says in connection with this affair I will be responsible for,' or words to that effect.

Q. Were you pretty well acquainted with Mr. Atwell? A. No, I did not know anything about him much. I knew he was the promotor and solicitor of that. Mr. Magnus came with him and said he was all right.

Q. Whatever Atwell said and did you backed? A. You bet.

Q. Didn't A. D. Atwell get a check from the Illinois Central railroad for a thousand dollars? A. The check found its way into Mr. Magnus' hands.

Q. I will ask you if he did not get it? You said your instructions were not to take any checks at all? A. I said the money should be forwarded to Mr. Magnus.

Q. I will ask you to state if Mr. Atwell did not take a check from every man who subscribed. A. I can't say that. I don't believe it.

Q. What did you instruct Mr. Atwell to say to the Illinois Central when he went to them for that subscription? A. I did not give him any instructions at all. I told him just what he could do.

Q. Mr. Atwell is still in the employ of this book enterprise? A. Everything is at a standstill at present.

Q. What brought it to a standstill? A. Simply because we have had some criticism on the subject.

Q. Atwell has not been discharged? A. No, sir; but he is not doing anything just at present.

Q. What inquiry did you make about Mr. Atwell's standing before you gave him your letter? A. Mr. Atwell came to me and showed me some of the different works that he had been engaged on. He worked some on Byrne's book in New York and he also got up a book in Detroit.

Q. Did he tell you how many times he had been arrested for getting money on false pretenses? A. I can give you some information on that subject.

Q. That is more than Atwell will do? A. No, sir; he will tell you all he knows.

Q. He refused to do it. Did you know that when you talked with him about this book? A. I did not know anything about that.

Q. When you found out about that trouble, what did you do about it? A. I talked with him about it and he explained his version and satisfied me beyond question that he was all right.

Q. I will get you to state if you thought it was the proper thing to do as chief of police of the city of Chicago, to give to a man to go out among business men, corporations and manufacturing establishments of the city, a letter from you telling them that everything this man did and said you would be responsible for, if you knew he had been indicted and arrested and put in jail several times in different cities of the United States for defrauding the people out of money on this very same identical scheme? A. I don't believe it.

Q. Did you hear of it? A. I heard about Atwell but I never heard that he was guilty of the charge that you make, or has been arrested in every city.

Q. Have you heard Atwell was arrested a number of times? A. I read in the newspapers that he was arrested and has had trouble in Detroit.

Q. I understand you are responsible for what Atwell said and you did it with malice aforethought when you sent him out? A. I sent him out to do what he did; I think he is a successful individual.

Q. How long did it take him to collect the money? A. He has been at it for two or three months.

Q. What was Atwell to have for his collections? A. Twenty-five per cent.

Q. And Magnus to have 5 per cent; that makes 30? A. About that.

Q. How much would it cost to publish that book? A. That book we expected would cost us—we thought we could get the book out for about \$1.50.

Q. What did you expect to sell it for? A. A five dollar bill.

Q. What was the contract with these other people who subscribed \$1,000 and \$500? A. No contract; just a contribution on their part.

Q. Just a contribution on their part entirely? A. Yes; nothing unusual for the Illinois Central and other corporations to contribute to a matter of that sort.

Q. Will you give any other instance where the Illinois Central contributed \$1,000 for a book to benefit the police of the city of Chicago? A. I will give you a reason why they should.

Q. I am not asking you that; will you answer my question? You said it was not an uncommon thing for them to do such a thing. A. I do not think it is particularly unusual why they should.

Q. A moment ago you said it was not an uncommon thing for them to do it? A. There would be nothing unusual for them to do it, for the reason that all those big corporations are being enormously benefited by the effort of the police department, and if they are solicited to make contributions of that sort, there is nothing particularly wrong in it.

We think the above extracts from the testimony of Chief Kipley throws sufficient light upon the entire transaction, and the community will not be surprised when they learn that not only Mr. Magnus, since this investigation, has left the city, but Mr. Atwell's address is also unknown at the present

time, and that Chief Kipley is now practically engaged in the business of trying to find somebody to take the money solicited from the business men of Chicago off his hands.

“Q. Mr. Kipley, are you familiar with the ordinances of the city of Chicago? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you take an oath of office when you became chief of police? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was that oath? A. You will solemnly swear that you will enforce the laws of the State and the ordinances of the city.

Q. Is there an ordinance in this city against pool rooms, pool selling? A. Yes.

Q. I will get you to state whether or not there has been any violation of that ordinance since you have been chief? A. I have no knowledge on that subject; that is, no positive knowledge on that subject.

Q. Has anybody told you so? A. Well, it was said to me here some months ago that there were fellows around town who were selling pool, making pool, hand-books, and things of that sort.

Q. Have you a brother in the service? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What position does he occupy? A. He is a detective under the police department.

Q. Do you know whether or not your brother, during the months of October, November and December, from day to day, and from time to time, during all of these months, was in rooms in this city that were running wide open selling pools? A. I do not know of my own knowledge but there was a complaint of that sort.

Q. Did your brother ever report anything of that kind to you? A. No.

Q. Did your brother ever tell you? A. I complained to my brother.

Q. When did you complain to him? A. I said to him that it had been reported to me that he had been around these places, and I told him he had better save his money and keep away from those pool rooms. It had been intimated to me that he had got to be quite an enthusiastic better on horse races, and I told him to keep away from those places and save his money, and I tried to use my influence in getting him to stop.

Q. Did he take your advice? A. Well, that is very difficult for me to say. I don't know.

Q. What did he say when you called him down? A. He said he was not doing anything wrong; only went in there for the purpose of making a few little bets once in a while. I told him it was a violation of the law, and such things as that would not be tolerated, and that he was violating his oath of office by going into such places.

Q. Did he tell you that there were places of that kind and he had been betting a little occasionally? A. No, he did not.

Q. Didn't you tell this committee a while ago that he told you that he went in there just for the purpose of making a little bet now and then? A. I may possibly have added that remark.

Q. As chief of police of the city of Chicago, why did you not say to him as a police officer 'Go and arrest the men that are running that establishment, and stop it and keep your brother out of temptation?' A. I did.

Q. How many pool rooms have you pulled—how many men have been arrested and convicted for pool selling since you have been chief? A. I understood one fellow has been found guilty and fined \$2,000.

Q. Yes, but he was arrested by the sheriff of Cook county, indicted by the grand jury of Cook county, because the police would not do it. A. I don't know whether it was because the police would not do it, or because they could not do it.

Q. Well, it was because they did not do it. Do you mean to say that you, as chief of police, with 3,500 sworn men— A. Don't say 3,500 men; it is 2,500 men. Don't make it quite so strong.

Q. Do you say to this committee, that with 2,500 sworn policemen in this city, you are powerless to stop the public running of pool room in this city? A. I will say that I am powerless to stop a man from making handbooks, or selling pools confidentially to his friends.

Q. Do you know of any pool rooms being conducted in this city during the months of October, November and December? A. I don't know of my own knowledge. I never was in one.

Q. Did any of your 2,500 men ever report anything of that kind to you? A. I never had any definite report on that subject.

Q. They were giving the people a liberal government? A. Yes; things were running along very easy.

Q. Did you have any information, Mr. Kipley, during the months of October, November and December, that one, George Hankins, at No. 6 Plymouth place, was running a gambling house? A. No; I could not say positively.

Q. Do you know whether or not Hankins did run, during the months of October, November and a portion of December, a gambling house in which was played cards and poker? A. I have no positive information upon that subject myself.

Q. Did any of your 2,500 policemen report anything of that kind to you? A. No, sir.

Q. Has there been, so far as you know, a prosecution during these three months, for a violation of the ordinance prohibiting gaming? A. I can not recall any.

Q. I will get you to state if it is not a fact that a large number of pool rooms were running openly with a telegraph operator in the place, pools were being sold, money paid, and everything running at full blast? A. I never was present. I don't know anything about it.

Q. Was there any complaint to you of that kind of things being done? A. No particular complaint at all. The newspaper boys often came around and said there was pool selling going on at different places.

Q. Couldn't the police of the city of Chicago as readily have found these people who have been fined for gambling as the sheriff? A. Well, I don't know. I presume if a desperate effort had been made to look that kind of thing up, we might possibly have been successful.

Q. I will ask you if in the discharge of your duty, and in the interest of good government, you do not think you ought to have done that? A. I make it a point to do all the police business I can. While a man may come to my office and give information that a certain individual is violating the law somewhere, and it is a trivial offense, I do not pay so much attention to it as I do when a report reaches my office that a man has committed a serious crime, such as murder, that a serious crime has been committed on the outside. I should naturally abandon that part of it and take up the more serious offense, and I have been looking after serious crimes, such as burglary, robbery and the hold up of people, and I have made a desperate effort to suppress that, and if you have been watching the papers on that subject you will be obliged to compliment me.

Response: Yes, and you see some policemen are being arrested for holding up a man!

Kipley: Now, I want to say something—I want to say this. I tried that man yesterday. He got on the police department ten years ago, and he has always had a reputation of being a good officer, and the other morning he had been drinking some, and like everything else, became a little indiscreet, and started out to hold up a man, and got hold of a few dollars in that way, and under the impression, very likely, that he would never be discovered, and like everybody else, with his good record in the past, he was discharged

and reinstated, because many people vouched for him, and all said he was an excellent officer, but he stepped by the wayside and fell, and we had him arrested and discharged."

Then Chief Kipley's attention was called to the evidence in detail as to the amount of gambling going on in the city and the public pool rooms that had been running when he insisted that he knew nothing about it, and that such a state of affairs, in his judgment, was hardly possible, but that if the evidence, as stated to him, was true, the police surely ought to have known it. He was then asked about his order closing gambling houses and ordering the houses of that character to go south of Jackson street, and we quote the evidence on that subject:

"Q. Will you tell me the man that you told that this crap business had got to be stopped? A. I talked with the officers in a general way about it.

Q. When was that order promulgated? A. Within the last month.

Q. Within the last fifteen days, wasn't it? A. I guess about a month now.

Q. When was the order promulgated that these things must all go south of a certain street—south of Jackson street? A. That was very early. There never was any order issued on that subject particularly.

Q. What was the order? A. It was simply a conversation that I had with the newspaper men. I simply said: "Now, any fellow who wants to bet on horse races or anything of that sort can not be allowed to do it this side of Jackson street because we don't want this section of the town polluted with this class of things. We want those boys who have an inclination to bet on horse races to go south."

Q. What have you got against the people south of Jackson street? A. I like them.

Q. Is that the reason you wanted that stuff to go down there? A. Things are very lively in the lower part of the town, everything has a thrifty appearance, and everything—

Q. You mean south of Jackson street? A. North of Jackson; and things up south of Jackson are virtually dead; there is nothing going on at all, and the stores are all empty. There is nothing doing, and the property is depreciating in value, and the object was to liven things up a little bit."

We have quoted thus liberally from the evidence of Chief Kipley to show fully the character of the man who is now the present chief of police of the city of Chicago, and taking many of the answers of the chief as they appear in the record, together with his actions as such, if he is as he says, carrying out the policy of the present mayor of the city of Chicago, and as he further says, with which he is in full sympathy, it is not strange that the present system of police is in that chaotic and demoralized state in which we find it.

We can hardly conceive in this day of enlightened sentiment, of a man selected as chief of police of the second greatest city in the United States, when speaking of a police officer who, while under the influence of liquor, with his revolver in one hand, and his club in the other, assaults a citizen and takes from him his money on the public street, refers to it as being an act of indiscretion, and apologizes for him in every possible way. But our imagination must be even stretched further than that, when we recall the evidence from his own mouth wherein he says that a certain portion of the city over which he is appointed guardian, and whose sworn duty it is to protect life and property, and to enforce the ordinances, states that he has ordered gambling houses and all houses of that sort south of a certain street in the city, because business is dull and for the purpose of livening it up. How a man can reconcile statements of that character, backed up as they are in this case, by his actions as chief of police with his oath of office, is beyond the comprehension of this Committee, and it occurs to the Committee that if the mayor has at heart the welfare of the citizens of the municipality over which he presides, he could not do less than to remove a man whose ideas of justice and the enforcement of the law are such as Chief Kipley's evidence shows his to be.

Your committee beg leave to acknowledge material assistance in their investigation from the Civic Federation, Municipal Voters' League and a number of other organizations of a similar character and for a similar purpose in the city of Chicago, as well as a large number of letters received from citizens offering their assistance and giving directions and information to the committee, which was of great value. To all of these people the committee desire to return their thanks.

Now, in regard to the justice courts, the evidence shows that the present system of justice or police courts, as run, is a disgrace to the present civilization. It shows that justices' courts will open in the night time, policemen will go out and drag in men and women, 100 or 200, and even more at a time; that they are refused a trial at night, required to give a bond, for which the justice charges them \$1.00; that professional bondsmen are in attendance who will collect another \$1.00, and oftentimes much more for the poor unfortunate to go on his or her bond until morning, thus making several hundred dollars oftentimes in a night to the police justice and other officers connected with the court, and this is done, as your committee believe from the evidence, for the purpose of making money for the police justice, the professional bondsman and the police officers in charge of the arrest. The justices of the peace of the city of Chicago assigned to the police duty are paid a salary by the city, and under their contract required to turn all fees collected by them during office hours, and in the administration of their duties to the city, but are not required to turn in the money collected by them for services in the night time, nor are they required to turn in the costs collected in State cases. The evidence before the committee shows that in order to secure for themselves the costs, a large amount of the business was transacted in the night, and also a great many cases were brought in the name of the State of Illinois, thereby defrauding the city of Chicago out of all its fees that they properly should have, which would amount to thousands of dollars annually.

In conclusion, your committee deems the following facts to be shown from the evidence, and believes they have so shown them to the satisfaction of any person who will take the pains to read the evidence herewith submitted:

First. That the Civil Service law of the city of Chicago, adopted by the people thereof for their government, has been through the influence of the present mayor, practically set aside and held for naught.

Second. That the law, as administered by the present administration, is a sham and delusion.

Third. That the mayor removed from office the Civil Service Commissioners that were in office at the time of his inauguration without any authority of law whatever.

Fourth. That a large number of persons have been discharged from the police force without cause and in violation of law.

Fifth. That a large number of persons have been appointed by the police department at the suggestion of the mayor and with the consent of the Civil Service Commission, who, their records show, are wholly unfit for policemen.

Sixth. That the police pension law was being used for the purpose of retiring men well fitted to discharge their duties upon the retired list for the purpose of giving places to the friends of the administration in power, and that the police fund, which is a sacred fund, was being used for the purpose of paying these men, who should be upon the police force earning their living and who testified before your committee that they preferred to be upon the police force, and were able and willing to perform the service.

Seventh. That this investigation of the pension law will result in a number of men who are now on the pension rolls being put into active service, and thereby result in a great saving of that fund for the use for which it was intended, namely, disabled policemen and the widows and orphans of deceased policemen.

Eighth. That under the present city administration gambling and pool selling was allowed to run wide open, the evidence showing conclusively that a large number of houses were being publicly run as gambling houses and pool rooms, and that they were not molested by the police, and the evidence

tended largely to show that they were contributing to the police department for protection; that opium dens were allowed to run in various parts of the city, principally by Chinamen, and that they paid the police for protection; that the chief of police, with a few other members of the present police department, were engaged in a book scheme which, to say the least, was highly improper, if not absolutely dishonest.

Ninth. That the investigation of the publication of the so-called police book will protect the policemen's Benevolent Association from destruction, which would necessarily have followed had this book deal been consummated, and therefore that fund which is being used by that Association for the maintenance of its widows, and care and education of its orphans, will be maintained and continue to do good for deserving police officers and their families.

In conclusion your committee recognizes that the police department of any city, in order to be of the character that it should be and render that service to which the people are entitled for the protection of life and property, should be removed in some manner, as far as possible, from politics, and should be governed and appointed by some means and in some manner, so that they would be retained alone upon their merits and discharged only for cause.

Your committee have endeavored to simply call the attention of this honorable body to the facts as they found them, and the condition of things as they actually exist; that there is a great need of some remedy no one can doubt, but without assuming to make any suggestions or recommendations, we most respectfully submit the above for your consideration.

By order of the committee.

O. F. BERRY,
Chairman.