

**Chicago Traction Disbursements.**

Continuation of the inquiry by the Board of Supervising engineers into certain expenditures of one of the Chicago traction companies (pp. 243, 254, 301), discloses a curious state of affairs. Although the "settlement ordinances" which were rushed through the City Council two years ago at an all night session and over Mayor Dunne's opposition, were advocated at the time as people's ordinances, which the companies were reluctant to accept, it now appears that the campaign expenses for securing their adoption were lavishly supplied, share and share alike, by the traction companies themselves. Whether the campaign fund was used for bribery is not yet ascertained. Nor is it likely to be; for the inquiry of the Board of engineers has to do only with the question of whether the campaign fund, lawyers' expenses, etc., shall be credited to the company which claims this allowance in its joint account with the city. The other company has not made the claim.

+

At the session on the 5th of the Board of Supervising Engineers engaged in the inquiry noted above, it appeared that numerous payments, more or less legitimate in themselves, had been made by the claimant company at the time of the traction negotiations. Isaac M. Jordan, a brother-in-law of Judge Grosscup, figures frequently in the item of lawyers' fees for services to the company. "Expenses on account of tunnel," not otherwise explained, were incurred monthly to the extent of \$200 a month. To George W. Wickersham, now Attorney General of the United States, there went \$200,000; and C. L. Krauthoff, another lawyer, got \$200,000 more. David R. Forgan, the banker, got \$2,500 in one item which, it is explained, he applied to the financing of the "Straphangers' League" (vol. ix, p. 1110; vol. x, p. 147), a campaign organization supposed at the time to have sprung up spontaneously in the public interest among street car passengers. At a public meeting on the 3d ex-Mayor Dunne said that the corruption fund supplied by the two traction corporations totaled not less than \$600,000; and in a subsequent interview he said: "The money spent by the traction companies was used to carry the ordinances in ways known politically. One saloon-keeper got \$2,000 two days before the election, I am told. Whether any of the money was used to get the votes of aldermen I do not know. I have been told repeatedly that two prominent politicians got \$50,000 each. I decline to state whether they were Democrats or Republicans or to give their names."

+

The subject in its present aspects is fairly summed up in the following excerpts from an edi-

torial in the Chicago Examiner (Hearst) of the 6th:

There seems to be no dispute as to the fact that the traction companies raised a large "educational" fund and spent it to secure the adoption of the settlement ordinances in April, 1907. . . . The Chicago City company did not attempt to charge up its "educational" fund to operating expenses, thereby reducing the city's share of net traction receipts. The Chicago Railways Company was less generous. Engineer Arnold, as chief auditing representative of the city, has just forced the Chicago Railways Company to pay its own "educational" expenses, as the Chicago City Company has done. This point is of really secondary importance. Public interest centers in the proved fact that the two traction companies spent huge sums in their battle for the passage of the ordinances. . . . We lay little stress on the popular rumor that the real "educational" fund of the traction companies was nearer \$1,000,000 than the \$600,000 named by ex-Mayor Dunne. . . . The point is that if the fund was no more than \$400,000 or \$500,000, as the present investigation seems to show, the public has a right to know why and how this large sum of money was spent. When the settlement ordinances were on passage the public was informed that they were expected to win on their merits. There was no mention of an "educational" fund at that time. But it is significant that the chief champions of the ordinances were aldermanic agents of the corporations. Also that certain publications, hitherto lukewarm, made noisy advocacy of the ordinances as the crucial vote drew near. Engineer Arnold, after disallowing certain items, washes his hands of the whole affair. He says he has no commission to follow the investigation further. But there should be some agency, with the public interest at heart, that will take up the investigation where Mr. Arnold lays it down. It is not a light matter when an ex-mayor of Chicago charges a huge "slush fund" as a prime factor in the passage of the settlement ordinances. There should be some method of getting at the facts. This is exactly what special grand juries are for.

+ +

**Cleveland Traction.**

In accordance with previous arrangement (p. 325) the city council of Cleveland met with the city officials and the officials and representatives of the street car company in public session on the 29th as a committee of the whole to consider the settlement ordinance introduced in the council a week before. A counter ordinance, prepared by John G. White, was then proposed by the street car president, Mr. Andrews, and Judge Tayler explained the differences between the two ordinances by stating, as reported by the Plain Dealer, that "they were differences largely of quantity and quality of control by the city over the street railway company." At the next meeting, on the 1st, a formal contrast of the differences was presented and discussed. The differences numbered from 40 to 50 points. The meeting continued on the 2d,

and on that day Mayor Johnson stated in the course of the negotiations that if an agreement is not reached by May 15, the city will then be "in position to sell franchises on open streets to the highest bidder." The vital points involved in the discussion are the questions of the maximum rate of fare to be allowed, the date at which the city's reserved right to purchase shall become effective, and the extent of control over operation to be vested in the city council.

+

As the council franchise, prepared by Newton D. Baker, city solicitor, was presented, it provided for a sliding scale of fares, to be raised or lowered from time to time as the receipts yield less or more than enough to allow 6 per cent dividends. This scale ranged from a five cent cash fare with 1 cent for transfers, down to a 2 cent cash fare; and the requirement was made that the company should begin at the point on the sliding scale of 3 cent cash fares and 1 cent for transfers. In opposition to this proposal, the company insisted upon 6 tickets for a quarter as the starting point. At the close of last week's sessions it had been tentatively agreed that the 5 cent cash fare be eliminated from the sliding scale, and the maximum be 4 cents cash fare, with 1 cent for transfers; except that the council proposed and the company objected to a rebate of 1 cent on transfers when used, as a feature of the maximum rate of fare to be allowed. This difference is reported by the Plain Dealer as probably not of sufficient importance to cause a deadlock.

+ +

#### Woman Suffrage in Illinois.

A hearing on woman suffrage measures (p. 322) is to be had at 3 o'clock on the 14th in the hall of the House of Representatives of the Illinois legislature at Springfield, before a joint session of the House and the Senate Committees having the measures before them. These measures are three in number. The first is for an amendment of the Constitution. This would allow women complete suffrage rights throughout the State. It is in charge of Senator W. M. Brown. The next is Senate bill 119, introduced by Senator Billings, which would allow women municipal and township suffrage, and a vote for a few other officials. It has received the unanimous recommendation of the Senate elections committee. The third measure, the Chicago municipal suffrage bill, proposed by the Charter Convention (p. 274), would give only Chicago women the right to vote at municipal elections.

+

A special train over the Chicago and Alton Railway, with a round trip fare of \$5.55, has been engaged to leave Chicago at 10:30 a. m. on the

13th (tickets to be obtained of the General Passenger Agent in the Rector Building on the 12th or 13th), for the accommodation of friends of the movement. The train will stop for half an hour at several of the principal towns on the way, and suffrage speeches will be delivered from the rear platform to audiences gathered by local suffragists. On the evening of the 13th the visiting delegation will attend the Illinois College and University suffrage oratorical contest to be held in the State House; on the morning of the 14th they will go to the State House to meet their respective legislators before the session begins at 10 o'clock; at 3 in the afternoon they will attend the committee hearing; and in the evening from 8 to 10 they are to be received by Governor and Mrs. Deneen. The speakers announced are the Hon. Oliver W. Stewart, Mrs. Ella S. Stewart, Mrs. Charles Henrotin, Jane Addams and Catharine Waugh McCullough.

+

An opportunity has been offered by the committee chairmen to anti-suffragists to be represented at the hearing on the 14th before the two committees. To this offer, Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin, president of the Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, has replied in a letter stating that the association "is composed mainly of ladies who are not inclined to act in public ways" and "whose work has hitherto been such as could be done in the quiet of the home," but that "the eruption this year of the suffragette movement, with its sensational methods, seems to have produced an emergency," and they "are preparing to appear at the hearing April 14, in small numbers perhaps, but" they hope "in sufficient force to insure attention." The Association is preparing a paper for the occasion, in which it will make the contention that "Socialism is the bitter foe of the Republic and that woman suffrage is a thing without which Socialism cannot exist."

+ +

#### Servia Yields to the Powers.

The annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria (p. 324) became an accomplished fact when in the national assembly of Servia, on the 1st, Mr. Milovanovics, the minister for foreign affairs, read the text of a note dictated to Servia by the Powers; and the assembly, receiving the note in absolute silence, tacitly acquiesced in the arrangement dictated. The note was to the following effect:

1. Servia declares that her rights have not been violated by the annexation by Austria-Hungary of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and accepts the Powers' decision to annual paragraph 25 of the treaty of Berlin.
2. Servia will not protest against the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.
3. Servia will maintain peaceful relations with Austria-Hungary.