

The Greeting of Mr. William H. Anderson

The New Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League, to
the Temperance Forces of New York

In accepting this responsible position in this special ministry of righteousness I am deeply sensible of the important part the Empire state must play in helping or retarding the fiercest and the most vital of the specific moral contests facing this generation.

I was never called into the regular gospel ministry, but have an ever-present consciousness of a direct call to consecrate my profession, the law, to this special work designed to give the church a fair chance and help her discharge her responsibility. I have never sought any place in this movement. At first I shrank from the New York proposition and was pleased to find that obligations elsewhere seemed imperative. But since it became clear as a duty I have rejoiced in the opportunity for service, and approach this new work unafraid, fortified in the confidence that God Himself will do at least nine-tenths of the work through the onward movement of civilization as that which is vital in the religion of Jesus Christ makes its way among men, and assured by experience that in whatever of the remaining portion rests upon me I will have Divine guidance and Divine help so long as I keep in harmony with the Divine spirit and purpose.

Not Hopeless in Light of Miracles Already Performed.

Judged by ordinary standards the task before the Anti-Saloon League is hopeless in New York. Untold wealth is at the command of the liquor traffic. Of the ignorance of those who do not know that liquor is hurting them, and the selfishness of those who do not care that it hurts others, and the apathy of good people who both know and care in a negative and passive way, it is hard to tell which is the greatest obstacle. Collectively they are appalling.

But a moral reform based upon the fundamental principles of Democracy, if conducted with any sort of decent intelligence is ultimately A SURE THING. The Anti-Saloon League is twenty years old. Fourteen of those years I have spent in the ranks. After what I have seen with my own eyes, I am in no position to question miracles testified to by others. Thirteen years ago, a mere youth of 26, without experience or any real knowledge sufficient to qualify me for the work, I found myself in an emergency placed in control of the work in the third largest state, containing the second greatest city of the Union. The opposition noticed our futile efforts, if at all, only to sneer. Men accounted wise according to political standards said:

"You will never pass a local option bill in Illinois in a HUNDRED YEARS." That was thirteen years ago. That very measure has been law for the townships, cities and villages of that state for nearly seven years, and about 40,000 square miles of territory have already been voted dry under it, and it has been definitely decided, in the light of the showing made by woman suffrage, that the greatest city in the country except New York will have to face the liquor issue under it within the next few years. What explanation is possible other than that God is directing this movement?

New York is many times more hopeful NOW than Illinois was THEN, for the nation has come far in these few years.

Adjust League to New Opportunities.

My purpose is not to try to square the work in New York to the plans or methods employed elsewhere in the past, but to adjust the work in New York to the growing needs and widening opportunities of the present moment.

I wish to bear testimony to the worth of the service performed by the men who have labored in this state in the past, and especially to the splendid board of directors which has held things together during these last months, and more particularly to Dr. Robert Bagnell, president of the League, who has assumed these burdens in addition to the pastoral cares in a great charge that would be a full load for any man.

I wish to make it clear once for all that in outlining the most aggressive policy that ever has been proposed in New York state I do not mean even the slightest implication of criticism or reflection upon what has been done in the past. Who would be so foolish, even if he thought it, as to try to prove that mistakes had been made in the past when the work itself is founded upon the faith that He whom we serve is able to overrule even mistakes for good? These early workers in New York labored in days when there was no ultimate victory in sight, when the going was heavy. The new national movement under which thirty-six states of the Union can come to the rescue of the moral and patriotic element of New York by making the nation clean gives us a hope today which they never had, and our work will be easier because of what they did.

Pastors and Churches Hold the Key.

The passage of a federal shipment law over ex-

2

ecutive veto and the fact that the League's declaration for national Prohibition is taken seriously are ample justification, if any were needed, of the League movement, the League methods and the League work which, if not spectacular at first, has laid a safe and solid foundation for the victories that are to come. The graphic demonstration of the power of the Christian temperance people when aroused and organized imposes, especially upon the churches, a new responsibility. With the aid of the pastors as captains of the host by co-operation in speaking from their own pulpits, by personal influence and by opening their pulpits to give the expert League representatives a chance to enlist their members, we can make a victorious fight even in New York. Wherever the pastors have taken hold the movement has gone forward to victory. The New York League needs to complete its equipment, concerning which I will have something to say later. It needs many more workers. These can be secured and supported if the individual churches of the denominations which are on record against the saloon will generally co-operate. When the pulpits in New York City and state are open once a year as generally as they are in other states, the work done in these other states can be duplicated here.

On the other hand, I believe that the pastors of New York will be as ready as anybody to co-operate when offered a program that, while giving a sane and practical immediate issue, heads directly toward the ultimate goal and always helps but never hinders the efforts of those God-fearing, man-loving people who have the vision to conceive the utter destruction of the liquor traffic and the courage to attempt it. I accept for the Anti-Saloon League the full weight of its end in this mutual proposition.

I ask no favors for myself but for co-operation in behalf of the cause and the constituency which I represent. I ask no odds beyond the expectation that Christian temperance people when in doubt as to the wisdom of an action or a policy will give the benefit of the doubt to their natural friends rather than to their natural enemies until they can obtain the full facts. I ask no indulgence except just a little time to get started and not much of that, for within a few weeks we will be prepared to announce the details of a carefully matured, aggressive program which will commend itself to the judgment not only of Christian temperance men, but of all other fair, intelligent, patriotic citizens.

The following is the brief formal statement of general policy which has been given the public:

BRIEF GENERAL STATEMENT OF POLICY AND PROGRAM.

The Anti-Saloon League of America is committed to national constitutional Prohibition. Two obstacles stand in the way: (1) Ignorance; (2) Greed. Those who are ignorant of the destructive nature of alcohol and the economic and moral blight of the traffic in it must be TAUGHT. Those who know better but carry on the traffic for gain and those who protect them for graft must be FOUGHT.

The first necessitates the greatest campaign of temperance education ever undertaken in America, including the distribution of literature in many languages and ultimately the employment of workers of different nationalities and involves such questions as industrial efficiency and the public health.

The second, in New York at present, involves a comprehensive, elastic legislative program that will allow every citizen of the state, whether he lives in the country, a small town or a big city, to exercise in some manner his inherent right of self-defense by voting directly and effectively against the liquor traffic.

The Raines law of New York is good enough as a tax law. As a means of regulating the traffic where the people want it, it is probably as good as any and better than many. The present commissioner of excise, so far as I can ascertain, and I have taken pains to find out, is a high-grade, conscientious official who is administering this law efficiently and honestly. But as a means of enabling the people to rid themselves of the liquor traffic where they do not want it, the Raines law is a fossil, belonging to the stone age of temperance reform. It is designed to protect the liquor traffic as a revenue producer and imposes needless handicaps upon the effort to eliminate it completely as a public nuisance and menace. It is a brake upon the wheels of the water-wagon.

The Anti-Saloon League does not contemplate any attempt to repeal the excise law with its restrictive features so long as any portion of the state licenses the sale of liquor, but the new program will make it possible to suspend its operation wherever it stands in the way of the desire of the people to prevent the issuance of any license whatever.

The liquor interests and their Tammany allies fooled away their opportunity to appease the people by merely extending the local option features of the excise law. Public sentiment has passed that station. From now on they will be up against a proposition with teeth in it.

Mr. Barnes Brings His Suit

The Albany Politician Whom Some People Have Called a "Boss" Resents Anything Which Interferes With His Pose As a Gilt-Edged, Perfumed, Denatured Political "Leader."

Mr. Barnes has brought suit. We forecasted this in last week's American Issue by stating that he might have to bring a civil action to "save his face." There has been wide-spread comment all over the state and we understand that in the newspaper offices the feeling is one of wonder that a man who has been shot at verbally as much as Mr. Barnes should get peevish all at once.

There were undoubtedly two reasons. Mr. Barnes made a false step in threatening criminal proceedings under the assumption that a technical violation of the postal laws had been committed. It was very evident from the letter of his attorneys that it was intended to use this as a club to force a retraction on the whole proposition. Fortunately the Superintendent was able to show by evidence outside of his own testimony that he knew nothing about the address on the envelope, which, it may be noted in passing, was delivered to Mr. Barnes, the postal authorities evidently thinking it was not a violation of the law and having no trouble in locating him from that description.

We would be willing to bet a juicy red apple against the hole in a doughnut that if Mr. Barnes had known as much about this to begin with as he does now he would have kept quiet and that he would never have thought of starting the civil suit if it had not been necessary to make some kind of a demonstration in order to cover his retreat. A criminal proceeding requires the assistance of the United States district attorney in federal matters or of the district attorney for the county under the state law and we assume that Mr. Barnes realized that neither of these gentlemen in New York will allow themselves to be used to pull political chestnuts out of the fire for Mr. Barnes by endeavoring to stretch the criminal law to cover something that was never intended to come within its provisions.

If Mr. Barnes had kept quiet the whole matter would have died. A comparatively small number of the papers printed the first open letter to him and none of them in New York so far as we have seen to date printed the second open letter, which was a defiance, but the bringing of the suit, regardless of the outcome of it, will bring the matter to the attention of every citizen of the state.

We presume the second reason for bringing the suit was the hope that it would shut the Anti-Saloon League up for the campaign, but according to the Baltimore newspapers, if Mr. Barnes had asked the people who have been acquainted with the Superintendent, he would have guessed again. The following is an editorial from the Baltimore Evening Sun:

POOR MR. BARNES!

We have no particular sympathy for men of his stamp, but still it is a little pathetic to note the blithe way in which Boss Barnes has gone about attacking brother Anderson. He seems to have about as much comprehension of what he is doing as a lamb might that would start out to extract the teeth of a lion. He evidently knows nothing about William.

Incidentally many other individuals and journals, including Collier's Weekly, on a notable occasion, have said worse things about Mr. Barnes than ever Mr. Anderson did. We wonder why he didn't sue them. If he really is of the opinion that Brother Anderson will make an easier victim than the others, he is in for a terrible awakening.

And the following is from the Baltimore News, which was hostile to the Anti-Saloon League's program and which had some very sharp differences of opinion and clashes with the Superintendent personally:

INTO ANDERSON'S GLOVE.

It is rather evident that in his rigorous attention to other and perhaps more pressing duties, "Bill" Barnes has not had time to get on to the curves of "Bill" Anderson. Down in this neck of the woods, where we understand him much better, everybody knows that the superintendent of the New York Anti-Saloon League is chuckling in his sleeve that the leader of the Republican party in the Empire state has sued him for libel.

To be sued for libel, on an issue such as Mr. Barnes has made, is pretty close to Mr. Anderson's heart's desire. There are few things we are sure, that he would wish for more ardently, and, victorious or defeated in the court martial he will be almost equally happy. If Mr. Barnes had asked almost any one in Maryland, he would have received advice that would have made this display impossible. Mr. Barnes has hit the ball right into Mr. Anderson's glove.

The service of the complaint was made personally on the Superintendent in the office of his counsel on Monday, the 6th, and he immediately sent out the following statement to the press:

The statement by Mr. Barnes that I asked him to pass the optional local Prohibition bill is absolutely untrue. I asked him to permit the representatives of his own Albany county organization who were in a position of commanding influence in the assembly to help the speaker out of a hole by permitting a vote on the merits of the bill, as is proved by the entire correspondence, including that with the speaker himself. Of course, if Mr. Barnes admits that giving the bill a fair chance would have been equivalent to passing it, that is highly interesting. The statement that I charged doing or asked him to do anything unlawful is equally untrue.

After we called Mr. Barnes' bluff about criminal proceedings in state and federal courts, there was nothing left for him to do except bring this civil suit. The fact that he now goes back and starts it in Albany county, where, according to a statement of Collier's, which was not followed by a libel suit, his personal organization extends to the jury system, is significant. This suit is evidently a piece of political buncombe for public consumption in New York and outside to bolster up his failing political fortunes. It will not silence the Anti-Saloon League for a moment. I shall refrain, of course, from discussing the merits of the particular issue which he has taken to the courts, but there is plenty of other language left with which to get the truth to the people, a project in which Mr. Barnes himself is rendering invaluable assistance at the present moment.

Mr. Barnes denies that he did anything to kill the optional local Prohibition bill and attempts to define the term "Boss." I would suggest that a boss is a big politician who chooses his lieutenants with such discrimination and enforces such discipline that he does not have to resort to the crude method of verbal orders. Does he deny that Mr. Malone, the chairman of the excise committee, and Mr. Hinman, the majority leader, belong to his own Albany county organization and would like to please him? Does he pretend that he wanted this bill passed? Does he deny that he expects help from the liquor men next fall in return for the killing of this bill by a Republican assembly? He claims to be an admirer of Lincoln. Does he so disregard Lincoln's wisdom as to believe that he can fool all the people all the time?

The spectacle of Mr. Barnes, the imperturbable, he of the iron nerve and steam roller, who controls an organization which has ridden roughshod over the necks of the Christian temperance people for years by the use of the power derived from the joint support of the liquor and vice interests, flying shrieking to the courts to pull the Anti-Saloon League off him, his fragile machine and his trembling followers is one of the biggest pieces of political farce comedy which has been staged in recent years.

If your local newspapers have printed Mr. Barnes' statement charging that we had sought to get him to do for us what we criticized him for doing for the liquor men and that we had asked him to help pass the bill, etc., it would be well to insist that the local papers

4
print at least the first paragraph, which is a denial of this charge, whether they use the rest of the statement or not. All that we have a right to INSIST upon is that they print so much of the statement as denies any unfavorable charge which they have printed.

The whole proposition is taken as a joke throughout the state generally. The New York Tribune has a cartoon which will be reprinted in this number of the paper provided the cut can be made in time at Westerville. The Tribune had the following editorial:

FIE ON MR. BARNES.

Politics will be a dull affair if Mr. William Barnes has his way and the courts declare it a libel to call a man in his position a "boss." What becomes of The Issue if this word is barred? In state and city for two or three decades the entire electoral energies of the people have revolved around the "boss." Immense majorities have been rolled up on the cry, "boss." Laws have been passed because it was believed that the "boss" didn't want them.

The word which Mr. Barnes doesn't like is the handiest word in the whole vocabulary of politics. The popular reaction to it is sure and swift. What would a campaign be without it, or an editorial page? It is the touchstone of the popular conscience. It represents all that America fights against one month of each year and winks at the other eleven.

We thought better of Mr. Barnes than that he would attack so solid an institution as this. Isn't he, after all, the defender of our constitution and of whatever is? Almost this persuades us that he is a recaller at heart, like the reckless colonel himself; for here he is trying for all he is worth to recall "boss!"

The World also printed an editorial, as follows:

IS "BOSS" A LIBEL?

Bringing suit against Superintendent Anderson of the Anti-Saloon League, for \$5,000 in libel damages, William Barnes, Jr., of Albany, objects to the word "boss" applied to himself as "an odious and opprobrious epithet."

Is "boss" so bad? The Dutch "baas" known from Java and Surinam to Cape Town, has spread from New Amsterdam over the United States, meaning "master" or "foreman." Mr. Barnes is the Republican foreman on the legislative works in Albany; as chairman of the state committee he acknowledges some influence upon matters figuring in the party platform—including, presumably, direct primary bills.

There may be good bosses and bad bosses, as easily as good trusts and bad ones. The man who made the latter distinction, Col. Roosevelt, was not so long ago described by followers of Mr. Barnes as the "boss boss." Senator Platt gloried in the fame of an "easy boss." Benjamin B. Odell, Jr., won the "boss's" title as a perquisite of his prowess in displacing his elder. Mr. Barnes' grandfather, Thurlow Weed, was called a boss; in an early day, Martin Van Buren was one; though the word was not then so often used. He became president, nevertheless.

Whether "boss" is a libel seems, upon reading Mr. Barnes' complaint in detail, to depend upon the contest. Yet if a boss objects to the term there is a substitute. Ex-Gov. Sulzer said last fall, in referring to a gentleman briefly and disastrously prominent in political news, that "he usually spoke of Mr. Murphy as 'the chief.'" As a sufficiently exact tribute to legislative influence, while avoiding the word mislikes, why not "Chief Barnes?"

The New York Evening Post likewise commented editorially:

MR. BARNES' LIBEL SUIT.

One may call Mr. William Barnes a boss defender of the constitution, or a boss champion of the courts, or a boss publisher, or any other phrase in which the word "boss" occurs as an adjective denoting special ability; and he will not object. But boss as a noun Mr. Barnes will not tolerate, and he has just sued for libel the superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League in this state for calling him "boss of the liquor end of the Republican party." Whatever may be the outcome of the suit, Mr. Barnes has already done a service to politics and the state by supplying us with an exceptionally comprehensive definition of what a boss is supposed to be, and what Mr. Barnes claims he is not, supplemented by various moral apothegms which ought to be reprinted in pamphlet form and distributed among all the Republican election district captains in the state. As, for instance: "Popular government breaks down when an outside agency is able to control the action of the representatives of the people chosen to the legislature." Such an agency appears in the person of the superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League when he attempts to influence Mr. Barnes to use his influence to promote certain bills in the legislature. What influence does Mr. Barnes exercise other than as the boss humorist of an Albany evening newspaper?

From all over the state come letters from the pastors the general tenor of which is "Hit 'em again," and we are looking forward to anything but a dull time.

Collier's in 1912 had the following to say about the jury system in Albany where Mr. Barnes has brought his suit:

The Barnes' organization does not stop at the judges on the one hand or the tenderloin on the other. It runs through the entire system. The jury system in Albany county is as much a part of the Barnes' organization as the Lincoln League or the county committee.

The jurors in Albany county, grand and petit, are selected by high-up members of the ring. The jurors themselves are made up of Republican officeholders and ex-officeholders, and of men who vote the organization ticket, but who pose as Democrats. Of the 150 grand jurors residing in Albany in 1911, 122 were enrolled voters; 100 of these were Republicans and twenty-two Democrats. Out of 25,859 votes in Albany there was a difference of 750 votes between the Democratic and Republican parties at the last presidential election. Of the seventeen grand jurors from Cohoes, twelve were public officeholders and ex-officeholders.

Of the 171 trial jurors, fifty-seven were officeholders, ex-officeholders, or relatives of officeholders. The names of these jurors are handed in by the ward leaders. No one is indicted whom the ring does not want indicted, and when indictments are returned, they are held over the heads of men and dismissed upon compliance with the demands of the ring. George Addington, the present county judge of Albany county, was prior to his election as judge, the district attorney of Albany county. On December 19, 1907, just before retiring as district attorney, he dismissed without explanation, 465 indictments against alleged offenders. There are now pending in Albany county upward of 850 indictments. Six hundred and sixty-one of these were found prior to the election of the present district attorney. The law requires these indictments to be filed in the office of the clerk of the county, while the bonds for the appearance of defendants are required to be filed in the office of the clerk of the court. But the district attorney has a different rule. All indictments and bonds are filed in his office. He explains that this has been the custom in Albany county. Besides, he says, the indictments are not safe in the county clerk's office. When asked particularly about the pigeon-holing of those indictments, the district attorney said that it was a good way to control a defendant. The votes of the 850 individuals now under indictment in Albany are sufficient to turn any election in Albany one way or another.

What They Say About New York's Superintendent

Further Introduction of Mr. Anderson by Way of Editorial and Other Comment from Secular and Religious Papers

It will be a matter of interest to the pastors and constituency of the Anti-Saloon League of New York that the coming of Mr. Anderson to this state as superintendent has been regarded as a matter of national importance. Our clipping bureau has brought in clippings announcing his coming and outlining his plans from such papers of national reputation as the Philadelphia Public Ledger, the Atlanta Constitution, the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Toledo Blade and the Chicago Tribune.

The seven leading New York city daily papers the morning after Mr. Anderson's arrival carried a total of nearly six columns, containing a very full and fair outline of the League's new plans and aggressive policy. This is probably more publicity than the temperance cause ever received in one day from the papers of New York. Most of the evening papers of the same day also carried stories.

The explanation of this is doubtless found in the following quoted from the two column and a half story in the Baltimore Sun announcing Mr. Anderson's resignation in Maryland to come to New York. (The capitals are ours.)

A Practical Worker.

For Anderson has been no theorist. He has worked along practical lines and while his methods have been frequently characterized as disingenuous and unfair, there is no doubt that he matched the other fellows at their own game and frequently went them one better.

There was no trick of politics, no parliamentary device to which, to use an everyday expression, he was not "hep."

He studied Maryland politicians and the game of politics as it is played in this state as a scientist studies a strange bug under the microscope. He was ready for any jump the bug might make. He learned its habits and its structure, and his intimate grasp of political situations, his knowledge of the careers of Maryland politicians and of their affiliations, has been a constant source of surprise to his opponents.

How He Fought Battles.

The dominant idea of his campaign in this state has been to keep the people informed of the situation as he and the Anti-Saloon League saw it, and to this end he used advertising space in the newspapers freely and liberally. No campaigns against the liquor interests have ever been so generally exploited both in the advertising and in the news columns as has been his. CONSIDERABLE COMPLAINT HAS BEEN MADE FROM TIME TO TIME ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF SPACE THAT ANDERSON HAS BEEN GIVEN IN THE NEWS COLUMNS OF THE PAPERS, BUT THE REASON FOR THIS HAS ALWAYS BEEN THAT ANDERSON FURNISHED NEWS THAT WAS WORTH PRINTING.

It made no difference to the newspapers whether they were in favor of or opposed to his propaganda; so long as he made news they were willing to print it. AND HE MADE THE NEWS. In this particular at least he far outclassed his opponents.

This does not mean to imply that Mr. Anderson was without enemies in Baltimore for it is inevitable that a man who has fought as hard and made as much progress against the liquor traffic should have stirred up tremendous antagonism. During the last few years about nine pastors out of ten in Maryland introduced him as "the best loved and worst hated man in the state."

We have selected in such manner as to cover the widest possible range and give the most diversified and complete characterization of the man who has just settled down in New York state and accepted as his job, without any limitation as to time, the effort to solve its temperance problems.

The selections cover Illinois, Maryland and New York, the states where he has worked and the one to which he has come.

The Baltimore Sun, the great paper of Maryland, and its evening edition, were the only city dailies which commented editorially on his promotion and his work, the others, which were hostile, remaining silent beyond a few flings in their news columns. The Sun is not a temperance paper. It never at any time advocated the League's program, and it is self-evident to every person who knows newspapers that no big city daily would give such recognition to a man engaged in the temperance reform unless he had compelled the respect even of his enemies and those who disliked him. The following is its first editorial, December 18:

Anderson to New York.

Aside from the question of whether the local option proposed is right or wrong, and aside from the question of whether the superintendent has been wise or unwise in the details of his leadership, we must all admit that William H. Anderson is a good fighter and that his removal to a larger field will leave a void in this state. He came here seven years ago and he has put definiteness and life into the temperance cause. The cordiality with which he is hated by his opponents is a testimony to his earnestness and efficiency. But those who think that local option goes away with him are paying him an undue personal compliment.

Friends and enemies alike will take a keen interest in the kind of fight that shapes itself around Mr. Anderson in the great state of New York. He has become such a figure in our local life that all may feel a certain pride in his promotion and an interest in his larger activities.

The Evening Sun, December 30, the day after the farewell banquet to Mr. Anderson, at which a massive silver-mounted cut glass punch bowl was presented to him, had the following editorial;

A Stirrup Cup at Parting.

All Mr. Anderson's admirers were not present at the farewell dinner to him last night. Some of his fiercest foes are among those who, though not present, paid secret tribute to his prowess. Whether we like his methods or not, and whether we believe in his propaganda or not, all the world loves a straight-out, uncompromising fighter, who hits out from the shoulder, and hits to hurt. The man who can retire with undiminished prestige from a Waterloo such as Mr. Anderson met at the last election in Maryland, and go not to a St. Helena, but to a larger field of activity, has a quality about him that men prize. A stirrup cup at parting, from his new punch bowl, to the bold captain of the cold-water crusaders!

A Presbyterian Editor Who Has Known Him From the Start.

The Continent, the leading Presbyterian paper in America, published from New York, Philadelphia and Chicago, whose editor, now living in New York, was in Chicago as editor of the Interior, during all of Mr. Anderson's superintendency of the League in Illinois, makes the following editorial comment:

The Anti-Saloon League has come nowadays to a high enough state of organization to be able to swing its heaviest forces wherever the battle goes heaviest. This is an enormous military advantage. An example is the transfer of William H. Anderson from being League superintendent for Maryland to be superintendent in New York. Anderson has had a tremendous battle-training in this war, and the rough-liquor folks have been poking at him for a dozen years to find a flaw in his moral constitution and haven't yet "got anything on him." So the League very naturally assigns him its hardest job. In Illinois first Anderson laid the foundations for what has become, all in all, the most successful state league in the country. In Maryland later he has taken a state which literally cared for none of these things and led it up to the point where state prohibition is acknowledged by even the liquor men to be an imminent possibility. May Mr. Anderson do as much comparatively in New York.

ATribute from His Own Church in Baltimore.

The following is from The Methodist, the local paper of the Methodist Episcopal conferences in Maryland, and is selected from a full page editorial. Baltimore Methodists showed their confidence by electing him twice to the general conference, the first time when he had only been in the state a year and the second time at the head of a delegation with 148 votes out of 150 ballots cast:

As an organizer and sympathizer of the work of the League he is without a peer; of keen analytical mind, splendid memory, perfect poise, an integrity that has never been questioned by even his enemies, and absolutely unafraid, he is a foe to the liquor evil that can meet all comers without excuse or apology. One and all are impressed with his unquestioning faith in the righteousness of his cause and his thorough dependence upon divine aid. While a clean fighter, he is relentless and uncompromising and is never on the defensive, withal delivering blows that are terrific, and accepting punishment without a quiver. A man with an unlimited capacity for work, at it all the time and always at it, there is never a time when there is not something doing in the headquarters of the Anti-Saloon League of Maryland.

A man of these qualifications could not do otherwise than build up an organization that will not lose momentum by his removal.

The following from the Epworth Herald, the official organ of the Epworth League, which is the young people's society of the Methodist Episcopal church, Mr. Anderson's own denomination, includes part of an editorial from another Maryland paper:

"Fighter, Builder, Brother."

William H. Anderson, late of Illinois, late of Maryland, is now, for the second time "of New York." He becomes superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League in that state and it is no weakening task. But that is one of its allurements, in Brother Anderson's eyes.

A Maryland paper which doesn't like his organization has this to say about his work:

And no one will gainsay this—Mr. William H. Anderson is a fighter, and a fighter from a long way up the creek. A two-handed, never-say-die, always-coming-at-you fighter. He has caused more sleepless nights for gentlemen whose tendency it is to rest and rest well than any other imported citizen that has decorated the burg of Baltimore in the last half century.

He knows ring tactics.

He can hit, duck, get away and hit again, with wonderful agility. He has a very scientific left-hand jab, and carries a sure knock-out in his mailed right fist.

Mr. William H. Anderson has never been defeated. He has been outnumbered times, and overpowered once or twice. Also times without number he has been pushed temporarily out of the ring. But when the gong sounded for the next round, Mr. Anderson was back, pleading for more.

No matter what the cause is, you have to honor a man who can take a licking, and another licking, and then three or four more lickings, and say to the crowd: "I dare you to do it again."

Wherever Mr. William H. Anderson goes, we wish him luck. And whoever his successor is, he will have a full No. 12 size pair congress elastic-sided boots to fill.

All of which is true as it is technical in its rhetoric.

But this same Anderson is a builder as well as a fighter. He made the Illinois Anti-Saloon League a power, and the Maryland Anti-Saloon League a power, by knowing construction work, and doing it, as well as by discovering how to fight with wild beats at Ephesus.

He goes to his greatest work, thus far. As in Illinois and Maryland, he will develop a group of astonished antagonists, because he fights, but

he will make friends and helpers of those who look for a saloonless land, because he can create sentiment, and give it form and make it march!

Every Epworth League Chapter in the Empire State will find Superintendent Anderson ready to help in any place of need. The Third Departments should all take him in as a member-at-large.

We quote now from the New York Press of Sunday, January 11, some extracts from a two column feature story under the following head:

"New Anti-Saloon Head Is Practical Politician."

It was characteristic of William H. Anderson, the newly appointed superintendent of the New York Anti-Saloon League, that his first overt official act should have been a manifesto declaring war on Tammany Hall and the brand of politics that organization represents. During all the fifteen years Anderson has been working for the Anti-Saloon Leagues of various states he has been warring against politicians, big and little, and frequently his war has been successful.

Anderson is no ordinary reformer. He is not a soft-voiced, pious, idealistic individual, waiting patiently for the Anti-Saloon millennium. On the contrary he is a fighter. He is a lawyer, not a parson, and he fights with the abandon of a man who loves a scrap.

His methods are entirely political, almost Machiavellian. He can take advantage of opportunities, twist circumstances to serve his ends, in a way that a master politician might envy. He comes to New York from Maryland, the state which produced Arthur Pue Gorman and Isador Raynor, and fully half of the citizens in that state are willing to accord him the palm as the most astute political fighter there.

Mild in His Appearance.

He is as mild-mannered a man as ever clipped a politician's wings. He is tall and, while slender, boasts broad shoulders. A small head, perched high, accentuates to a remarkable degree his lengthiness, and proves the delight of the cartoonists. His face, with the exception of a small, dark brown mustache, is smooth and so devoid of lines as to be almost bland. Maybe inscrutable is a better word than bland. The cheeks are pink, and the eyes large and round, like those of a child. One suspects the mustache hides a mouth more youthful than he would like his opponents to realize.

But this face, with its remarkable youthfulness, is an asset rather than a drawback. It makes his opponents underestimate him. When, after five years as superintendent in Illinois, Anderson came to Maryland seven years ago and took charge of the moribund league there, the wisecracks and politicians laughed at him. He looked so youthful, so guileless, so cherubic, they couldn't take him seriously.

So that when those of them who aspired to election to the state assembly found letters in their mail one morning, signed by Anderson, demanding to know how they stood on the proposed local option bill, they laughed at his temerity, and, for the most part, straightway forgot about it.

Judge their surprise one day not long before election to see a large advertisement in the papers, addressed to the churchgoing voters of their constituencies, telling of the neglected letters, and declaring them, the candidates, to be by their very silence allied to the "depraved liquor interests." This manifesto contained a lot more phrases, adjectives and adverbs that spoke well for Anderson's mastery of anathemic English, but were not calculated to increase the general esteem with which the political cohorts viewed him.

They blustered, and attacked, and threatened, and laughed, but many a legislator found his looked-for majorities cut down by half when the returns were counted. Anderson hadn't been able to keep them out of office, but he had made them realize he was a foe to be reckoned with.

Anderson comes to New York at an auspicious time. He won't, it is agreed, close up the Great White Way for quite a few months yet, but the chances are all in favor of his giving some of the politicians the most interesting years of their careers.

The Chicago Tribune.

The Chicago Tribune, the greatest paper of Chicago, which Mr. Anderson left eight years ago, in a half column story about his intended removal to New York, under head, "Will Beard Tiger in New York Lair," refers to him as

Well-known as superintendent for several years of the Anti-Saloon League of Illinois. . . . Mr. Anderson is a native of Illinois and is known in Chicago and in the state as one of those who made the Anti-Saloon League a factor and local option an issue in this state's politics.

Mr. Anderson's most relentless opponent in Maryland was the Free Lance, who writes every day a column on the editorial page of the Evening Sun, and who especially abominates reforms of all sorts and is opposed to practically everything that the church stands for. While opposing the Anti-Saloon League and its program with all of his versatile powers, this man, the most widely read newspaper writer in Baltimore, always recognized Mr. Anderson as a fair fighter and worthy opponent, and his farewell tribute with its frank statement of opposition to the cause is perhaps the most significant of all the testimonials to his effectiveness.

A Tearful Tribute to a Foeman.

The departure of the Hon. William H. Anderson will leave a large, jagged cavity in the politics of Maryland, and take away much of the spice and savour from the prevailing theology, and from the communal divertisement and recreation. In brief, he will be missed—which is more than could be said of nine other emigrants out of ten. In the midst of a commonwealth of dubs and me-toos, of joiners and uniform-wearers, of play-actors and platitudinarians, he has stood out as a truly distinguished man. Put him beside any other acknowledged leader of the moment—for example, the mayor of Baltimore or the governor of Maryland—and at once his enormous superiority becomes evident. He has gone further in five years than any other man has ever gone in twenty, and he has done it against greater odds. When he came among us he was the butt of all the barroom scaramouches, and the majority of so-called politicians regarded him as beneath their notice. He departs for pastures new with a large number of these erstwhile scornors docilely eating out of his hand, and with the rest of them painfully aware, even in the moment of victory, that they have had a hot tussle with him.

Personally, I haven't the slightest belief in the Hon. Mr. Anderson's cause, nor in the good faith of most of his followers, but I have more than once called attention to the surpassing cleverness of the man, and it is a pleasure to do so once more. The job that he undertook was obviously beyond the reach of native talent. After nearly a generation of agitation and turmoil, the cause of Prohibition was plainly on the verge of ruin. The best leaders it could muster were easy marks for any politician who chose to have fun with them. They had no cunning and they had no sense. Then came the Hon. Mr. Anderson—and in less than five years he had organized every county in the state, brought every effective dry trooper directly under his command, and pushed the local option bill so close to passage that the politicians suffered the worst scare of their careers. Such a feat called for a man of the highest energy and sagacity, and such a man was the Hon. Mr. Anderson. The boozehounds will swallow many a keg of hypochlorite before ever they look upon his like again.

Of all the qualities that helped him to get as far as he did, I am inclined to think that the most valuable of all was his capacity for taking punishment. The moment he set foot in Maryland an organized effort to get his goat was inaugurated, and it kept up unceasingly down to last election day. His past was searched with spotlights and microscopes; he was scientifically tempted to lose his head; he was led into countless pits and ambushes; herrings innumerable were dragged across his trail; he was pricked and irritated day in and day out; there were even attempts to lure him into fisticuffs, and so into public disgrace. But all this baiting failed to shake him. No clout was ever so staggering that it kept him from striking back; he never bit at the poisoned bait so temptingly set before him. From first to last, he kept his eye on his number. Even at the end, with the ground suddenly yanked from under him and his heels describing a parabola through the red-hot air, he still held a firm grip upon himself and emitted no pathetic yell, and was not above snickering at his own disaster.

Most of the more ill-natured attacks upon the hon. gent., I daresay, were inspired by sheer resentment of his unprecedented toughness. To the professional politician, the average "moral leader" appears as nothing more formidable than a harmless mountebank, a flabby bladder of wind, a fellow too puny and ineffective to be taken quite seriously. But here was one who conducted his jihad with all the ferocity of a menaced ward leader, and what is more, with all the tricks. He knew the game; he was a politician himself. He could take a beating, and he could administer a beating. Naturally enough, the discovery of gifts so secular, in one so pious caused consternation, and equally natural, it was at once assumed that the dishonesty which went with them in the other politicians also went with them in Anderson. But, as I have said, the proof never followed the accusation. It is very curious, indeed, to remember how much was said (and whispered) of Anderson's hypocrisy and avarice three or four years ago, and how little is heard upon the subject today.

If the hon. gent's departure means a serious and perhaps fatal setback for the snoutish Anti-Saloon League—and I assume that it does, for even another Anderson, if he can be found, will be a long while getting to where this one has left off—if the Anti-Saloon League, as I say, is hamstrung by this bereavement, then the majority of sane and patriotic men will not repine. But meanwhile, and in parting, let no one forget the positive good that Anderson has done, for all his violence and for all his failure. He has smoked out and exposed the worst of our political charlatans; he has made the professional politicians feel and understand the full force of an aroused public opinion; and, best of all, he has made the opposition turn to virtue as to the one practical escape for him. The liquor business is cleaner in Baltimore today than it has ever been in my time. I believe that the impulse to this belated cleanliness came from without, and that it had its origin in the devastating onslaught of the Hon. William H. Anderson.

From the Christian Advocate.

From a column and a half article under the head "New York's New Leader" in the Christian Advocate of New York city, the official organ of the Methodist Episcopal church, we take the following extracts:

The introduction by the Anti-Saloon League of a Prohibitory constitutional amendment at Washington and the determination to back it up with the greatest possible force led to the selection of Mr. Anderson, one of the most potential Anti-Saloon League officers in the country. From his physical stature and personal presence he would be picked out of any company as a leader. He has keenness of intellect, breadth of information, singular loyalty to duty and is a powerful and relentless foe of the liquor traffic.

Mr. Anderson is a prominent Methodist layman and has been an efficient and conspicuous member of several general conferences.

Report of His First Address in New York.

The following is the report of Mr. Anderson's first public address as superintendent of the New York League, sent to the Christian Advocate by Rev. Robert L. Clarke, D. D., pastor of the Tabernacle Methodist Episcopal church, the largest church in the city of Binghamton:

William H. Anderson commenced his public work as New York state superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League in Tabernacle Methodist Episcopal church, Binghamton, Sunday morning, January 4. That he intends to lead the Anti-Saloon League in a vigorous battle against the liquor interests of the state was plainly manifested.

The personality of the man impressed his congregation favorably from opening sentence to final ringing appeal. He is not only dominated by a profound conviction of the rightness of his cause—many narrower and less effective men are that—but his fair, broad-minded, and logical putting of the thing impressed all that here is a safe business-like man who will do things. The oft repeated statement made by men one to another as the service closed was a satisfied "At last something will be done."

He outlined the policy to be pursued by the League as two-fold. First: the broadest educational campaign ever undertaken in this country involving the circulation of literature in many languages and ultimately the employment of workers of different nationalities and covering such questions as industrial efficiency and the public health. Second: an elastic, comprehensive legislative program.

Such a clear cut comprehensive survey of the saloon question as William H. Anderson gives not only stimulates but educates.

Rev. O. R. Miller of the New York Civic League Backs Down From His Co-Operation Proposition When the Anti-Saloon League Accepts It

He Attacks the Merits and Good Faith of the Anti-Saloon League's Optional Local Prohibition Bill and Makes the Claim that He Was Misrepresented, In Order to Cover his Repudiation of His Own Offer—He Has Thus Forced the Anti-Saloon League to Make a Frank Statement of Facts—Read the Deadly Parallel and Then Decide Who is to Blame if there is a Lack of Co-operation in New York.

(By Superintendent Anderson.)

We were congratulating ourselves and receiving the congratulations of many pastors over the era of co-operation and good feeling which we believed to have been inaugurated by the introduction of the optional local Prohibition bill under the conditions set out in the American Issue on February 11.

The facts in brief were that Rev. O. R. Miller, superintendent of the New York Civic League, had written Dr. P. A. Baker, general superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of America, offering to yield the leadership in temperance matters to the Anti-Saloon League on certain conditions, which were set out explicitly in his letter. So there could be no possible quibble or question we published Mr. Miller's letter, or that part of it containing the proposition, so that the pastors and general public could see just what we were accepting, and then we accepted it in a positive and unequivocal manner and followed up our acceptance by a tender of co-operation to Mr. Miller in the other branches of reform work.

We were therefore astounded to have Mr. Miller come out in the Reform Bulletin, the little weekly organ of his organization, and attack the bill which had been framed in harmony with his specifications. In nearly fifteen years in reform work we have never before had our confidence so grossly abused by a fellow reformer.

We think the fairest and best way is to print in parallel columns Mr. Miller's two statements, which are as follows the capitals for emphasis being ours:

WHAT MR. MILLER SAID TO DR. BAKER, NATIONAL ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE SUPERINTENDENT, ABOUT CO-OPERATION WHEN HE THOUGHT THE NEW YORK ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE WOULD NOT AGREE TO IT.

I admit there is enough for our League to do in fighting other bills, such as defending the Sabbath, fighting racetrack gambling, impurity, political corruption, etc., but a very large part of our constituency are equally interested in an aggressive movement against the saloon as represented by the Prohibition principle and they are urging that we, who have been so successful in reform work, should continue to press aggressively the temperance battle in this state.

But, so far as I am personally concerned if the Anti-Saloon League of this state will drop the policy of local option and WORK ONLY FOR THE

PRINCIPLE OF PROHIBITION AS APPLIED TO LOCAL BILLS, GIVING THE PEOPLE GREATER POWER TO VOTE OUT THE SALOON, AND PRESS AN AGGRESSIVE FIGHT FOR THE PASSAGE OF SUCH BILLS, and will agree not to compromise at any stage of the fight for a local option bill, for any unit, then I will recommend to our board of directors that the New York Civic League yield to the New York Anti-Saloon League the full leadership in all this fight and we will fall in behind and HELP IN ANY WAY THEY SUGGEST FOR THE PASSAGE OF SUCH A LOCAL PROHIBITION BILL.

I put in the condition that the Anti-Saloon League must not compromise at any stage of the fight for a local option bill for this reason. I am sure from my wide knowledge of the conditions of this state at the present time, after having spent so many years here, that if the reform forces all get together now when the reform elements are in the ascendancy and press aggressively for the passage of a county Prohibition bill that the liquor men will be only too anxious to compromise quickly on the passage of a city local option bill, but there must be no such compromise on the part of your League.

WHAT MR. MILLER SAID ABOUT CO-OPERATION AFTER THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE HAD ACCEPTED THE PROPOSITION IN THE ADJOINING COLUMN.

Anti-Saloon League's Local Option Bill.

Assemblyman Gillett, of Yates county, introduced the local option bill of the Anti-Saloon League last Tuesday. It is a very long bill covering twenty-five pages of manuscript. It is called the "Optional Local Prohibition Bill" but upon a careful reading of the bill it is evident that it is not really a Prohibition bill, but simply a local option bill, with some good provisions added to help in its enforcement.

It provides for local option in all third class cities, that is, all cities under 50,000 population, and for all territory in counties outside of cities and for any election districts in any city or a combination of adjoining election districts. Section 10 of the bill provides that at the end of two years another vote can be taken on the license question in any subdivision of the state which voted dry two years before, and if a majority of the people are in favor of the saloon then the same territory becomes wet again, and it makes no provision for prohibiting the manufacture of liquor in any county or subdivision when the saloons are voted out.

These last two features are the most objectionable features of the whole bill from the standpoint of many leading temperance people in this state. Had the bill made no provision for reversing the vote when the people once voted out the saloons—as long as the law stands on the statute books—then it would have been a Prohibition bill; but as it distinctly provides for the possibility of a vote every two years on the license question, and it makes no provision for prohibiting the manufacture of liquor, it is purely a local option bill.

However, it has several good features for helping to enforce the law which we can heartily commend. Among these good provisions is one which provides that any person can secure a warrant for the search and seizure of liquor in any place where they have reason to believe the law is being violated. Another section of the bill provides that any place where liquor is sold in violation of the law may be abated as a nuisance. Another section protects dry territory against the shipping in of liquor from wet territory in the state.

These are the leading good features for the enforcement of the law and they are all commendable. BUT THE NEW YORK CIVIC LEAGUE NOW HAS PENDING BEFORE THE LEGISLATURE A NUMBER OF BILLS COVERING ALL THESE GOOD FEATURES AND SOME OTHERS NOT COVERED BY THIS BILL, which when passed will help greatly in the enforcement of our present local option laws, and any other local option or Prohibition bills that may be passed in the future. These bills have been described in recent issues of The Bulletin.

The Bulletin Editor Not Properly Represented.

On December 9, the editor of The Bulletin, as state superintendent of the New York Civic League, wrote a letter to the national superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League urging that as that League had officially endorsed National Prohibition it should endorse the same principle hereafter when pressing for the passage of local temperance measures in the various state legislatures, especially here in New York, and also urge that the Anti-Saloon League support the county Prohibition bill which had been endorsed by all the other leading temperance and reform organizations of the state. We assured the superintendent that if his League would endorse such a bill or a genuine Prohibition bill even of a smaller unit, no matter what the unit was, that the writer would recommend to the board of directors of the New York Civic League that it yield to the New York Anti-Saloon League the full leadership in the fight on this bill.

But as now already explained the Anti-Saloon League's bill is not a local Prohibition bill, hence, no matter what their interpretation of our letter to their national superintendent, we are not of course, under any obligation to support a bill which does not cover our proposition to them.

We leave it to the temperance public whether this is not about the most astonishing backward flip-flop that has been pulled off recently. Mr. Miller has only himself to blame if the inference is drawn that he was evidently strong for co-operation WHEN HE BELIEVED THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE WOULD NOT CO-OPERATE. We say that he believed that the Anti-Saloon League would not because he has been saying all over the state of New York that it would not co-operate with the other forces and we presume he would not have told this if he had not believed it. So that it is positively clear, in case his earlier statements about the League were in good faith, that at the time he made this proposition to Dr. Baker he believed it would not be accepted, and that the League would also refuse to stand for the principle of Prohibition. Now when we take him up and accept his proposition he backs off and attacks the Anti-Saloon League's bill and accuses the League of misrepresenting him in order to cover his retreat.

We are entirely willing to leave it to the sense of justice and fair play of the pastors of New York whether we not

8 warranted in believing that we have been trifled with and in feeling a sense of outrage that we should be so treated by a Christian minister who is the representative of a reform agency that appeals to the Christian churches to back it in an effort to clean up the dirty politics of New York state.

Which of These Two Was His Motive?

We believe that there could have been only two possible purposes in writing that letter. First, and honest, sincere desire for genuine co-operation in order to advance the cause of righteousness generally and of temperance specifically. Or second, a desire to put the Anti-Saloon League "in a hole" to the advantage of the Civic League by making it appear that the Anti-Saloon League had refused to co-operate with other agencies and had refused to stand for the principle of Prohibition, both of which charges Mr. Miller has made with freedom in the past. We do not undertake to pass judgment on the question of which of these motives actuated Mr. Miller, but we shall proceed kindly but frankly to set out some facts from which the pastors may draw their own conclusions.

Why It Concerns the "Discussion."

The question may be asked, "Why bring this matter in now?" The answer is easy. Mr. Miller undoubtedly has the confidence of some of the pastors in New York state and he has sought to put us in the attitude of trifling with them and the defense of our own good faith is essential to our present campaign. The question may be asked, what has that to do with the "Concerted Discussion?" Why should this difference of opinion be brought to the attention of the pastors just before they are asked to preach on this bill? There are several reasons. In the first place, we refuse to attempt to hoodwink any representative of the church. We don't want a pastor preaching in favor of the Optional Local Prohibition bill unless he is satisfied that the bill can be defended by Christian ministers, and so the question as to whether Mr. Miller's strictures upon the bill are well-founded goes to the very essence of the "Concerted Discussion" proposition.

Tried To Trick Us.

If Mr. Miller had simply refused to co-operate with the League, or if he had simply criticized the Optional Local Prohibition bill, we would have had no ground for complaint, but the inference is unavoidable that he came at us with a "heads Miller wins, tails the Anti-Saloon League loses" proposition. In short, he made a proposition of co-operation to be valid and binding **PROVIDED THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE TURNED IT DOWN**, but to be repudiated by him if the Anti-Saloon League accepted, on the ground that it had not complied with necessary conditions.

Sole Issue—Is the A. S. L. Bill an Honest Local Prohibition Bill?

When the whole matter is summed up and boiled down, it resolves itself into a very simple issue of fact—viz.: **WHETHER THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE BILL IS IN FACT AN HONEST LOCAL PROHIBITION BILL?** If it is not, if it is a liquor bill in fact, then Mr. Miller's criticism is absolutely warranted and his criticism of it is praiseworthy. On the other hand, if it is in fact a genuine local Prohibition bill, if it does mark a real advance, then Mr. Miller's criticism is unwarranted, and he is then placed in the position of either not understanding the bill which he has criticized, which would be an exceedingly uncomfortable position for a man who claims to be a moral leader, or else he will stand convicted of bad faith.

Are Driven To It In Self-Defense.

It is with extreme regret and reluctance that we feel compelled to go into the case, but he has attacked our good faith and drives us to it in self-defense. We shall not spend much time discussing the Anti-Saloon League's own bill, because that has been sent to every pastor in the state and a large number of them at least have read it. Any man who has not read it and has lost or mislaid his copy will be furnished a duplicate upon request. We will accept the verdict of any set of intelligent, unprejudiced men as to its merits. But we are compelled to set out a number of illuminating collateral facts which shed great light on the **VALIDITY** and the **SINCERITY** of the **CRITICISMS** made upon this bill, and we assume that Mr. Miller recognizes that he who criticizes must expect to run the gauntlet himself and must expect to be called upon to prove that he is not vulnerable to his own criticism.

An Apparent Wilful Untruth.

After enumerating some of the law enforcement features the Reform Bulletin says (the black caps are ours):

These are the leading good features for the enforcement of law and they are all commendable, but the New York Civic League now has pending before the legislature a number of bills covering **ALL** these good features and some others not covered by this bill which, when passed, will help greatly in the enforcement of our present local option laws and any other local option or Prohibition bills that may be passed in the future.

The above is appalling. As a jocular statement uttered with a smile in bantering praise of one's own work it would be entirely permissible, but as a deliberate statement of fact put out in cold print it is absolutely false, and we have the proof. We presume he did not know that we would find out that a certain very important enforcement feature which we admit we did not originate, but took from the laws of a state that has made great progress in this direction, was incorporated in a bill which the legislative representative of the Civic League was trying to get somebody to introduce after the A. S. L. measure had appeared. Now if the Civic League had bills which covered **ALL** these features, what is the need to have this introduced again? If it did not, **WHY TELL THE PEOPLE A FALSEHOOD?** And if the Civic League had these remarkable features all the time why were they not incorporated in the hybrid monstrosity known as the "county no-license" bill, or "county Prohibition" bill as he calls it in the last number of the Bulletin? Isn't it a little extreme to condemn a bill that is good enough to borrow something from?

Let Him Produce Those Enforcement Features.

We respectfully tender to Mr. Miller space in the American Issue for the publication of all of the enforcement features in his various bills which he claims constitute the equivalent of the Anti-Saloon League's bill **WHICH HAD BEEN DRAFTED AND ACTUALLY INTRODUCED** under the auspices of the New York Civic League **AT THE TIME THE LEAGUE'S OPTIONAL LOCAL PROHIBITION BILL WAS GIVEN OUT TO THE PUBLIC** so that its various features could be appropriated. And we respectfully submit that it is up to him to come across with them for that purpose or stand convicted of wilful untruthfulness in an effort to "knock" another organization.

Anyhow, Scattered, They Would Amount To Little.

Anyhow, the mere fact that these provisions were scattered around over a whole bunch of bills in case it had been true, would not signify anything. That has been the folly of attempted temperance legislation in New York in the past, viz: Scattering the temperance strength over a lot of measures. The Anti-Saloon League waited until it had in proper form a bill upon which it can stand until it is passed or Prohibition comes. We may modify some minor details pursuant to the suggestions and constructive criticism of the friends of the movement, but neither the structure of the bill as introduced or any of its material points will need any change whatever.

Will Not Deal With a Man Who Is Untruthful or Tricky.

We are willing to co-operate so far as possible with anybody who acts square, but we must decline to entertain any further proposition of any sort looking toward any kind of dealing or alliance with the New York Civic League under Mr. Miller's management until he makes good on the proposition which we accepted in good faith and until he further purges himself of the apparently wilful misrepresentation outlined above.

Mr. Miller's general comment as a whole, might be characterized as a faint noise from the bottom of a pit dugged for somebody else than the present occupant.

Local Option is Option to Prohibit.

The Bulletin says: "It is evident that it is not really a Prohibition bill, but simply a local option bill." **MARVELOUS!** We are getting to an elucidation of some fundamental facts more quickly than we had expected. If the editor of the Bulletin were a lawyer he would know that, starting with a condition of liquor as the temperance movement did start, the only possible original option was option to **PROHIBIT** and that local option in its correct sense is "the option or right to prohibit locally the sale of alcoholic liquor."

We wonder what becomes of this fearful charge now that we admit it. The Anti-Saloon League's "Optional Local Prohibition" bill **IS** a local option bill in the strict technical correct sense of that term, but it is **NOT** local option according to ordinary New York or Raines law standards. And it was to prevent just this confusion and to spoil in advance just such blunderbus criticism that we took pains to put a distinctive label on it to distinguish it from the Raines law sort of local option.

A. S. L. Bill Is Purely Restrictive.

The Raines law provides for a frank voting in of liquor. The Anti-Saloon League's local Prohibition bill is purely restrictive all the time. The best evidence is found in the complaints of the liquor traffic that it cannot be used to bring saloons into territory which has gotten rid of them under some other legislation. If it did that it would be the

9
liquor sort of local option. But this question was worked out ten years before we ever thought of encountering Mr. Miller or his Civic League and Reform Bulletin.

A Chance To Win Presupposes the Possibility of Failure.

Of course, as intelligent members of a popular government endeavoring to keep at least one leg on the ground with all of our aspirations, when we get into a fight we recognize the presence of the other party as a belligerent. We recognize that the power or option to prohibit presupposes the option **NOT TO**, or the option to **CEASE** to do so. For example, if a man takes a gun to a burglar he runs the risk, of course, that the burglar may throw him down and tramp on him and take the gun away from him and possibly beat him over the head with it if not actually shoot him, but we never heard that seriously advanced as an argument for leaving the gun over the fireplace and going out to meet a burglar on a dark night with bare hands.

Same Principle—Differs Only In Degree.

State Prohibition is simply state option and national Prohibition is simply national option, and as will be found laid down in defense of this bill in our analysis, the League maintains as a fundamental principle that the local option of the smaller unit must always give way before the majority rule of the larger, another proposition which was wrought out into bomb proof form ten years before we ever heard of Mr. Miller.

The Sunday Baseball Analogy.

It has been suggested that the argument in favor of the Sunday baseball bill now before the Legislature is the same argument that the Anti-Saloon League is using for its local Prohibition Bill, and that this therefore conclusively shows that the Anti-Saloon League is wrong.

Oh fudge! Let's take this out and look at it. Mr. Miller is opposing the Sunday baseball bill—that is, local option on Sunday baseball, and properly so. But if the entire state had legalized Sunday baseball would Mr. Miller oppose a proposition to allow a city or a village or a county to PROHIBIT baseball on Sunday? That is this case exactly. Saloons are legalized throughout the state. The only option in New York is option to PROHIBIT because in the absence of the exercise of an affirmative option licenses will be granted.

Exploding an Imaginary and Not the Genuine Local Option.

Mr. Miller is industriously "beating up" a man of straw in his charges that the Anti-Saloon League is standing for local option. He has conjured up his own conception of local option and is vigorously pounding **THAT**. The point where he and many other good people go wrong is that he has failed to comprehend or refuses to recognize that regardless of his view of local option the only kind of local option that the Anti-Saloon League stands for is **OPTION TO PROHIBIT**.

Proof Too Strong to Be Waved Away.

The proof of this is the fact that the Anti-Saloon League's bill cannot be used to bring saloons into any territory that has gotten rid of them in some other way, and as we set out in our article of February 14, this bill has been repeatedly recognized by radical Prohibitionists as an honest local Prohibition bill. Hon. Oliver W. Stewart, a member of the Illinois Legislature in 1903, while he was still National Chairman of the Prohibition party, speaking of the bill without the most of the present enforcement features, said: "I will support it because it is an honest Prohibition bill. It does not provide for license anywhere."

Theories Fall Before FACTS.

And anybody who will take the trouble to scrutinize the measure will discover that this is absolutely true. It is restrictive in its form. The first vote under it is a vote on the question of imposing restrictions. And even if the people are unable to hold their restrictions it still provides no affirmative license features, no tax or anything of the kind, but merely puts the people back where they were when the first vote was taken. The liquor men cannot gain a thing under it. The worst that can happen is for the temperance people to fail to hold what they gain in the first place and it gives them another chance at it.

But the fact that Mr. Miller does not understand this is no evidence that the bill is bad. There are lots of good things that lots of good men do not understand. That is Mr. Miller's misfortune, not the bill's fault.

If the Temperance People Lose the Saloon Wins, Of Course.

Two objections are specifically urged by Mr. Miller against the bill. First, "if a majority of the people are in favor of the saloon then the same territory becomes wet again." This is childish. Of course it does. But can Mr. Miller or anybody else suggest any plan under Heaven to prevent it? Mr. Miller is now working for a state-wide Prohibition bill. Suppose it is passed and the people elect a legislature in favor of its repeal and the legislature meets and repeals it. The state becomes wet again. Suppose a constitutional amendment were adopted by a vote of the people and the people did not like the experiment and had another amendment submitted to repeal or do away with their first one. The state would become wet again. Suppose Congress submits a national amendment to the states and some three-fourths of them adopt it. While of course we do not anticipate the possibility of it, yet if another Congress should submit an amendment abrogating the first one and three-fourths of the states should ratify it the country would become wet again. Why even the laws of the Medes and Persians can be changed or abrogated by putting the Medes and Persians out of business. As we understand it only God Almighty is able to lay down a law which is irrevocable and He has the advantage of knowing everything and being sure that there are no mistakes in His.

He Would Stake the Law Itself on the Chance Fortunes of an Election.

The difference as a matter of practical operation between the "county no-license" bill advocated by Mr. Miller and dropped when the League announced that it had something more sensible and more effective, is that by the attempt to block self-government Mr. Miller's method of operation would result in losing this **WHOLE LAW** if there was a reaction, whereas the Anti-Saloon League's proposition is simply to lose the Prohibition status of a particular community while leaving the law in force as a weapon for other communities and later to be again employed by the same one.

Under A. S. L. Plan Can Try Again.

For example, take Rockford, Ill., which voted under the measure upon which the New York bill is based. The liquor men by fraud and otherwise carried Rockford wet after two years' dry experience, but after two years of wet object lesson the law was invoked again, the city went dry and will probably stay dry,—at least its business men think so. Under the Miller proposition the city would have **lost its law** the first time and had the fight all to make over again even to get the right to vote, whereas under the League proposition it had the right whenever it got ready. But, Mr. Miller may reply, the liquor men would have had to repeal the law by act of the legislature and could not have done it. Yes, we thought of that too. And they came so all-fired close to repealing it out in Illinois that there was no pleasure in the sensation while it was pending and on the Miller basis it would have gone as sure as fate, for the only thing that saved it was that it merely left the question open for the people to decide—that is, it was a self-government law. If it had been a measure which of itself gave all the advantage to the temperance people nothing could have saved it, and on account of chaotic political conditions there has never been a legislature since in that state that would have been certain to re-enact it.

Didn't Think It Was Wise To Overlook It.

Mr. Miller's second main objection to the Anti-Saloon League's bill is that it doesn't prohibit the manufacture of liquor. We admit it frankly. We left it out on purpose. That belongs to the state Prohibition program. It is idle to claim that any real temperance object would be served by stopping the manufacture of liquor in a certain community to be shipped for sale in some adjoining wet community so long as the aforesaid wet community had a manufacturing establishment of its own. To put in the manufacturing clause would have simply made it harder to pass the law and much harder to vote a community dry. We did not consider it intelligent tactics. We want the manufacture of liquor prohibited of course, but we will get to that more quickly if we make some actual headway and win even a small victory which is headed in the right direction than if we content ourselves eternally with glorious defeats.

Fakery, Pure and Simple.

Now to return to the proposition that our bill is a local option bill because it will allow a community to lapse back wet again. We wish to say deliberately and emphatically that any pretense that there is some magic which can make a community perpetually dry in spite of the wishes of its people is unmitigated fakery.

Escaped Because Not Taken Seriously.

The only reason why the county no-license bill which Mr. Miller advocated and which he asked the Anti-Saloon League to support was not riddled, was because nobody, either the legislature, the newspapers or the liquor men, took it seriously; nobody except the good people who, relying upon the Reform Bulletin, believed that they were having a real run for their money instead of being led into an untenable position in support of an indefensible proposition.

How Quickly He Dropped It.

The quickness with which Mr. Miller dropped this bill after the Anti-Saloon League announced that it had a bill which was not vulnerable to the objections urged against the so-called county no-license bill and that it would do in better shape everything that that really **COULD** do, and that we would if necessary explain why, is interesting and eloquent.

Didn't He Know, or Was He Fooling Them?

Mr. Miller has gotten himself into a very unpleasant dilemma where he faces the inference either that he did not know that the "county no-license bill" would not stand a ghost of a chance but would be torn to pieces the minute that it was regarded as serious, or else that if he did know he was willing to delude the people so long as nobody showed up with the ability to propose a better bill and the nerve to tell why it was better.

Will Draw a Diagram of It if Necessary.

We have no desire to keep any controversy going but it has been an invariable rule of this management when somebody else "started something" in the way of an unwarranted attack to finish it ourselves or at least see that it was finished on terms that were satisfactory. And if Mr. Miller insists upon it we will sometime, when we are not pressed with more important matters, print in full the bill which he had the good people of the state shouting for and show just wherein it was lacking.

He Didn't Drop It Soon Enough.

It is now proposed with great seriousness that the county no-license bill was dropped "because the state was ripe for Prohibition" following the National Anti-Saloon League convention and the general lining up of forces for Constitutional Prohibition. This sounds "splendiferous" and "magniloquent." The only flaw in it is that Mr. Miller still advocated his county no-license idea to Dr. Baker as something that the Anti-Saloon League should come to, at a date about a month **AFTER** the Columbus convention and was manifestly standing by it until the Anti-Saloon League made plain two things. First, that we did not intend to be put in a hole; and second, that we did not intend to swallow that ridiculous bill which Mr. Miller has since dropped like a hot potato. The writer could not preserve his self-respect as a lawyer and have seriously advocated that measure which the Anti-Saloon League has been condemned by Mr. Miller all over the state of New York for refusing to support. And Mr. Burke, our attorney, agrees heartily on this proposition.

Why A. S. L. Bill Stands the Test.

We are not surprised that Mr. Miller did not have a perfect bill. We know by experience that there is not anybody who can draft offhand an absolutely perfect bill that meets all requirements. The reason why we have such unbounded confidence in it and are ready to back to the limit the League's "Optional Local Prohibition" bill is because it has been exposed to the bitterest fire of the liquor traffic, the destructive criticism of the ablest lawyers the liquor men could employ, and the constructive criticism of dozens and scores if not literally hundreds of good temperance lawyers, and we mean the word "good" to apply to their professional standing.

So Inconsistent As to Drop to the Level of Comedy.

But to say in the face of the agonized howls of the liquor traffic and the testimony of the newspapers and the approval of the overwhelming majority of the pastors that the Anti-Saloon League's bill is "not a Prohibition bill" strikes us as the limit of absurdity for another reason. Mr. Miller's vaunted "county no-license" bill was **AN AMENDMENT TO THE RAINES LAW WHICH IS FRANKLY A LICENSE LAW**. Recognizing the incongruity of the situation the party who drafted it evidently tried to take the curse off of it by putting in provisions which made it a legal monstrosity. For a man to stand for such a measure and then to criticize a bill which in one state has cleaned up 40,000 square miles and started another state direct for absolute Prohibition as an immediate issue, is not cause for quarreling but for **LAUGHTER**. It is not serious but **FARCE COMEDY**.

Miller Helps Strengthen a Notorious License Law.

But this is not the worst. Mr. Miller criticises the Anti-Saloon League because he says its bill makes it possible for a community which has once voted out saloons to get them back, and yet Mr. Miller is today working hard for amendments to the Raines law.

Now let us probe a little into this. The Raines law is a frank liquor law. It is a tax law, or commonly known as a license law. It is a revenue measure. It has a local option feature which was put on as a sugar-coating to get the temperance people to agree to this measure, which was designed to fasten the liquor traffic on the state, and even this local option feature is hedged about and made as difficult as possible. Anything which makes a better law out of this is strengthening the grip of the liquor traffic. That is, it is improving a license law so that it is more tolerable to the people and stirs up less protest.

And Assists in Making Liquor Traffic More Respectable.

Mr. Miller, for example, takes great credit for the fact that he is fathering provisions to prevent the sale of liquor to houses of prostitution and to increase the age of minors to whom liquor may be sold from 18 to 21.

The net result of this is to make the saloon more respectable by reducing the abuses which are incident to the liquor traffic unless prohibited by special statute. On the other hand the Anti-Saloon League does not want to make the traffic respectable. It refuses to make any effort to improve the Raines law. It repudiated the suggestion of the Raines law as a basis for its new legislation.

Why Help Liquor Men Fortify Themselves?

The League is not opposing these restrictions which brace up the license law. We do not consider it worth while dividing our constituency upon matters which are in the last analysis purely incidental. In Baltimore, for example, we did not oppose the increase in the license fee. We recognized that high license was a stage, like the measles, that a community had to go through. We recognized that the ultimate fight between Prohibition and the liquor traffic would be one of Prohibition against the best liquor bill which the liquor interests could devise and the sooner they get their liquor legislation perfected the sooner we get down to the real issue. In Baltimore the net results of increasing the license fee was to reduce the number of licenses more than a thousand in six years—from 2,408 to 1,403. But the point we are getting at is that the liquor men did this for their own protection to avert popular wrath. **WHY SHOULD WE HELP THEM?** We consider that it is a gross misuse of trust funds to help the liquor interests brace up a liquor law.

Miller Himself Guilty of Aggravated Form of Offense He Charges Us With.

The effort to extend the units which may vote on the question, made by the Anti-Saloon League of New York in times past is on a different basis, but our opinion even of that is shown by our prompt refusal to try to build our local Prohibition structure on a rotten foundation. Somebody may say this is a reflection on the past management of the Anti-Saloon League. It is not so intended. But we wish to emphasize that we are **NOT PROTECTING** past administrations or anybody else at the expense of efficiency or the rights of the people.

The present situation is that Mr. Miller is criticizing the Anti-Saloon League for recognizing that this is a government of the people and for following the best usage in matters of temperance legislation, and at the **SAME TIME** is **HIMSELF** working to strengthen a liquor law so that it will be more responsive to public sentiment **AND YET STILL RETAIN THE LICENSE SYSTEM**. Why the liquor men are delighted to have temperance people do this for them.

Not Opposing His Bills, But His INCONSISTENCY.

We wish to make it clear that we are **NOT OPPOSING** or even criticizing these bills of Mr. Miller's, if they are **MERE INCIDENTS** of his program, though we consider that it would be highly improper to spend the money of some good deacon or some washwoman whose boy is in danger of going to the dogs, to help the liquor men make the Raines law more satisfactory to the people. We are not objecting to Mr. Miller's bills. We are objecting to his **MONUMENTAL INCONSISTENCY** in **PATCHING UP A LIQUOR LAW** and then criticizing our bill which started clean from the ground up. He ought either to quit trying to improve the Raines law or else quit criticizing the Anti-Saloon League's legislation which has declared independence of the Raines law. A man should not try to blow hot and cold with the same breath.

Two Nuts for Mr. Miller to Crack.

We suggest two questions for Mr. Miller: (1) If local option is such a horrible thing as he makes out when he is discussing what he says is a local option proposition from the Anti-Saloon League, why does he not come out for the repeal of the present local option law? Why does he not come out from among the unclean things of the present exercise system? Why is he not consistent in advocating the repeal of that so that the decks can be cleared for a state-wide Prohibition proposition?

(2) If the present local option law is good enough for him to stand for—so good in fact as to justify his patching up the license and regulatory features of it, why is it such a reprehensible thing for the Anti-Saloon League to propose a **BETTER** law that extends the right of self-defense against the liquor traffic vastly farther?

We offer him space for a reply.

Prefer His Co-Operation But Don't Need It.

We shall be very glad to have Mr. Miller co-operate but his failure to do so will not cause the League to swerve a hair's breadth from its course or change its plans to the extent of the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." We are not going to quarrel about leadership. The Anti-Saloon League intends to **DO BUSINESS**. If anybody in the state of New York prefers to cast in his lot on the temperance question with a purely local state leadership which is spread all over the reform field to the extent of forty or fifty bills on a score of different subjects for eugenics to race track gambling, and which was quite content with a proposition which the Anti-Saloon League spurned **UNTIL AFTER THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE HAD SPURNED IT**, why any such person is welcome to follow his wishes with the Anti-Saloon League's blessing.

Willing to Trust the People's Judgment.

The Anti-Saloon League relies on the sober common sense of the people. We have had enough of a verdict already expressed in New York to satisfy us as to what the outcome will be. We do not intend to lose a minute's sleep.

If it becomes necessary we will draw a diagram of some things and we shall be just as brutally frank as the circumstances seem to require. And the people of New York state need not be hoodwinked or exploited on the temperance question unless they refuse to accept the truth which the Anti-Saloon League will give them from time to time in the ordinary course of business in the development of a constructive policy upon a sane, practical and decent basis.

Nobody Can Hold a Club Over Us.

It has been intimated that if the Anti-Saloon League is too frank that somebody will tell something to the discredit of the League or League men in times past. All right, let's have it. If anybody has anything on the present management of the League or has anything that indicates that the League today is not an efficient and trustworthy representative of the Christian churches it is his duty to come forward with it. We have encountered all kinds of blackmailers and have the comforting consciousness that there isn't a man on the face of the earth who can crack a whip over our heads.

A Flat Defiance to the Enemies of the League.

We admit that in the course of the years out of the large number of men employed by the New York Anti-Saloon League a few scoundrels sneaked in before they were discovered. While this has nothing to do with the present and the future, if this is what is wanted we are prepared with particulars that will be exceedingly disconcerting to some of those who have been loudest in their complaints, and we hereby tender a cordial invitation to any person or persons to start in, for to be perfectly frank about it there are some things that we are aching to say provided we can justify ourselves by proving that we have been driven to it in self-defense. Furthermore, we make the assertion that every man on the Anti-Saloon League force in New York today is a high-grade Christian gentleman and if anybody can **PROVE** anything to the contrary about any man on the force, such man will be fired instantly. And we hereby throw down this flat challenge to all enemies of the League. If you have anything, come up with the proof or be set down as a bluffer and a slanderer.

Worse Things Than Refusing to "Co-Operate."

The Anti-Saloon League is willing to co-operate with anything that looks like business but it will not hesitate to refuse to enter into any proposition that is foolish, just for fear of being accused of refusing to co-operate. There are worse things than refusing to co-operate, one of which is to follow the example of Lincoln's orator who "threw back his head, shined his eyes, opened his mouth and left the consequences to God" without using the judgment that God had given him.

We expect to make mistakes, but they will all be headed in the right direction, and we are not going to make again those which have been made in the past. We insist at least on having a new crop of our own that are up to date. **BUT WE INTEND TO GIVE THE PEOPLE A RUN FOR THEIR MONEY.**

State Prohibition in New York Desirable, But Not An "ISSUE."

The Anti-Saloon League is for Prohibition. Its management in New York is for Prohibition and we presume we will not be called upon to stop real work to prove that fact until those who may question it can show up more **RESULTS** which **THEY** have accomplished in that direction, but state Prohibition in New York now as an immediate issue would either not be noticed or else would be used by crafty politicians to divide the temperance forces and prevent the passage of what can actually be passed soon by some intelligent hard fighting. The very idea of state Prohibition in New York by state vote or legislative enactment is absurd because the nation will not wait that long. Whoever induced the "Allied Forces" to declare for immediate Prohibition, however pure and praiseworthy his motives may have been, led them up a political blind alley, and away from the firing line, unless it was the intention of the Allies simply to nail the flag to the masthead and then pitch in and help secure the passage of this Optional Local Prohibition bill.

A Sense of Humor Would Have Saved Him.

It therefore seems incontrovertible that Mr. Miller's proposition of co-operation and of resigning the leadership in the temperance fight to the Anti-Saloon League was intended to be valid only for use as capital if it refused, and not as a rule of conduct to govern the Civic League if perchance the Anti-Saloon League really wanted to co-operate. A well-developed sense of humor would have kept him from making this ridiculous blunder. The moral to this tale is, "don't bluff unless you can stand to take your own medicine in case you should be called." Thanks to Mr. Miller's letter to Dr. Baker, the Anti-Saloon League has been able to make as clear as a headlight down a dark alley **WHO IS RESPONSIBLE** if there is no co-operation.

Does He Prefer the A. S. L. or the Brewers?

We hereby formally and cordially, for we think this whole thing is too good a joke on Mr. Miller to feel very angry about it, accept **AGAIN** his proposition to back up the Anti-Saloon League in any honest local Prohibition bill. And his unfortunate little blunder in this matter, provided he rectifies it, will not in the least deter us from renewing our offer of friendly assistance in other reform matters in which he may represent the same constituency which looks to the League for leadership in temperance matters. And as we go on about our own business we express the friendly hope that we may yet have his hearty though belated blessing on the Optional Local Prohibition bill. And if he prefers the company of the brewers, distillers and saloon men, who are all opposed to the bill, to that of the Anti-Saloon League we will still love him enough to pray for him.

Optional Local Prohibition or Nothing—Which Is He For?

The issue is exceedingly simple. Through the action of the Allied Forces and of Mr. Miller himself in dropping the county no-license bill, whatever the reason for it, the fact remains that the Anti-Saloon League's bill is the only thing which stands between the ideal of Prohibition and **NOTHING**. The issue is whether this bill or nothing shall be passed pending Prohibition. The field has been cleared and the issue simplified by Mr. Miller's own maneuvers. The liquor interests are against this bill. From the returns thus far received the overwhelming majority of the churches are for it. We simply ask, "As between this bill and **NOTHING**, which does Mr. Miller favor?"

12.
How Speaker Sweet Helped the Liquor Traffic
Although a Church Man and a Temperance Man at Home and Elected as a Protest Against the Old Organization Mr. Sweet's Actions at Albany, Which Spoke Far Louder Than His Professions at Home, Helped the Tammany Democratic Liquor Ring and the Liquor Ring of His Own Party to Kill the Optional Local Prohibition Bill

(By the State Superintendent.

Although strange to the state, so far as any personal acquaintance is concerned, we know just exactly what the politicians were going to do to the optional local Prohibition bill. We did not know these particular politicians, but all politicians are alike. The liquor traffic is the same varmint in one state that it is in another. The politicians who help it are all tarred with the same stick. We not only recognize the stick, but we can identify the brand of tar, owing to the strong smell of brimstone.

There was a big fight to try to defeat Mr. Barnes' candidate, Mr. Hinman, for speaker, and some good and innocent temperance people heralded the election of Mr. Sweet as a great moral victory and as an assurance that moral legislation would have a fair chance. The League indulged in such illusions.

On January 15, the superintendent, for the purpose of getting the record right and as a matter of fairness to give Mr. Sweet the benefit of the doubt, wrote Mr. Sweet as follows:

I presume that you will name your committee Monday night and I trust that you will give especially careful attention to the committee to which measures like our proposed local option bill will be referred.

It is not our task to ask you to name a committee which shall be in favor of our proposed legislation, though of course we should be delighted to see that, but we believe that in behalf of the Christian citizenship of the state we have a right to ask, and also that you would be disposed to grant even in the absence of a request, a committee which will at least make some kind of a report upon this legislation and bring it for a vote upon its merits before the assembly. The League recognizes that where this is done and the organization of the body is not used to strangle a measure no responsibility rests upon the Speaker beyond his own personal vote, for we try to be fair and we admit that we have no right to ask a Speaker to pass a measure for us if we have not the necessary votes. If we cannot win on the merits of our proposition when it is given a fair chance, then we might as well recognize squarely that we need to do some more educational work.

The above completely explodes Mr. Barnes' allegation that we sought to get him to "PASS" the local Prohibition bill, for what we asked him was to help the speaker out of a hole and all we asked the speaker to do was to give the bill a fair chance.

The speaker's reply to this letter was so palpable an evasion that it simply confirmed what we felt morally certain of to begin with, so we waited until his committees were named and then the superintendent published the following signed editorial in the American Issue of January 31:

THE SPEAKER, THE EXCISE COMMITTEE, POLITICS AND TEMPERANCE LEGISLATION.

The Anti-Saloon League indulged in no raptures over the election of Mr. Sweet as speaker of the assembly. Fourteen successive years in politics and close dealing with legislatures and politicians generally and a large amount of experience, much of it exceedingly disappointing and unpleasant, with men of the highest character and best of intentions who ultimately through obligation for their election became the victims of a system which was too strong for them to overthrow, made us disposed to save the rejoicing until we had learned a little more.

Of course, we consider the defeat of the candidate most wanted by Mr. Barnes, the Republican boss, to be a gain, and we recognize Mr. Sweet's good record on the temperance question and the fact that he is regarded as a high-toned Christian gentleman, and we shall not at any time discount his intentions. However, his first PERFORMANCE has been disappointing. Of the excise committee we do not now undertake to say how many are square and straight-out in favor of local option and good temperance legislation. Of course, he also appointed on this

committee such an outstanding man as Mr. Knapp, of Chemung, who came into prominence in connection with the Elmira upheaval. The chairman of the committee, however, is one of Mr. Barnes' Albany members who is supposed to owe his election to a considerable degree to the liquor element, and with this kind of a line-up we shall see what we shall see.

In outlining the plans we have stated that ultimately and probably before long the League would lock horns and there would be a clear issue with Tammany. We used Tammany as a type. Mr. Barnes is identically the same kind of a politician in the Republican party that Mr. Murphy is in Tammany councils, and the crooked Republican machine works with the crooked Democratic machine. Both derive much of their power from the liquor and vice interests. Both can be expected to oppose anything that will give the people more actual power on the liquor question, and we expect to have to oppose one quite as hard as the other. Neither will make any concession unless it becomes plain that it is a matter of necessity, and as a rule neither has sufficient intelligence to comprehend the growing strength of moral sentiment.

In one sense this excise committee in the assembly is encouraging. It looks like the political allies of the liquor traffic in this state, are preparing for a hard fight. It looks like a recognition on their part that some real business is about to start. We sincerely hope that in the melee it will not be found that the speaker has permitted himself to be put into an untenable position on this question. As stated above we give him full credit for his good intention but we have no confidence in the political crowd which, judging from the New York papers, he has placed in control of the assembly committees. We shall give him the benefit of the doubt, but as the situation develops we shall tell the truth as it discloses itself without fear or favor. We admit that the speaker cannot be expected to use the power of his office to pass temperance legislation if there are not votes enough to pass it. If the legislation the League stands for is reported out of committee so that the assembly can vote upon it on its merits and the machinery of the assembly is not used to strangle it in committee, then the speaker will be responsible only for his own vote, and we have no doubt that that vote will be cast for any sane, reasonable temperance measure.

This editorial was written for the deliberate purpose of avoiding any seeming attack on the speaker before he had shown his hand, but for the purpose of being brought out after the session as proof that we knew just exactly what was coming. It will be observed, also, that we made a few feeble remarks about Mr. Barnes even at this early stage of the proceedings. It will be observed further that we declared publicly we were not asking the speaker to pass our bill but to give it a fair chance.

It was a matter of common and open report throughout the state, and especially around Albany that this excise committee was going to kill the local optional bill immediately after the hearing. Various papers printed a dispatch from Albany that it would be killed immediately. The League from the beginning intended to force action of some kind. That we knew what was going to happen was proved by the fact that we prepared on Monday and Tuesday in the New York office, letters to every assemblyman telling him what the committee had done, which letters were shipped on Tuesday and mailed from Albany after it was done on Wednesday evening. This much we had mentioned before.

We also had a letter to Speaker Sweet prepared in advance, carried to Albany from New York and mailed after the committee had voted to smother the bill. This letter contains the case very clearly and fully so the speaker could not claim he had been taken by surprise; and it was after the receipt of this letter that he refused to do a thing to help and while seeking to escape the commission of an overt act, permitted the power of his position to be used and the whole influence of the assembly organization to weigh against the effort to get a vote. He did not vote for the bill and lacked the red-blooded courage to come into the open with the crowd he was protecting and record himself against it.

Some More Things That Clinch the Case On the Speaker.

While we haven't space to tell anything like ALL we know, we will tell enough more so that our constituency will understand that we do know what we are talking about and that there is no question about Speaker Sweet's culpability. In the first place Mr. Gillett, who had expressed a willingness to do it, and another Republican who had also agreed to make the motion to instruct the rules committee to report the bill, each told us that he would see the speaker after the hearing and before the session Thursday morning. Mr. Burke wrote a letter to the speaker in duplicate to his hotel and his office in the capitol, mailing it by special delivery on Wednesday evening, telling him that Mr. Gillett would call upon him and that Mr. Gillett would make the motion if he, the speaker, would give the assurance that it would not be regarded as an unfriendly act, and asking him to say the favorable word. Mr. Gillett, after visiting the speaker the next morning, declared in the face of repeated urging that he did not want to make the motion. The other man, after going to see the speaker, came out and likewise stated that he did not want to make this necessary motion. So the League was thereby forced by this attitude of the speaker to appeal to a Democrat elected on the temperance issue in a Republican district whom the speaker could not control.

Of course, the sub-heads in the following letter, heretofore referred to, have been put in for emphasis and were not in the letter as mailed to the speaker.

New York, March 18, 1914.

Hon. Thaddeus C. Sweet, Speaker,
The Assembly Chamber,
Albany, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

I desire to call your attention to the situation which you have created in regard to our Optional Local Prohibition bill and enlist your co-operation in the effort to save it. If you give such help as we have a right to expect in view of your church and temperance affiliations provided you are free to act as you wish, we have no desire to parade the fact that you were asked. If you do not help we shall be obliged to let the people know the facts in order that they may understand that failure to get action on this bill was not due to our neglect.

Didn't You Know Where This Committee Stood When You Named It?

While we recognize that you are a Christian temperance man, we believe you did not give the Christian temperance people of the state a square deal in the appointment of your Excise Committee, which is notoriously wet. I was personally in Albany when it was named, covering the field for our attorney, Mr. Burke, who was temporarily absent, and although a total stranger I learned inside of twenty-four hours that the committee was wet. Mr. Burke on his return discovered the same fact without any suggestion from me and reported to me within twenty-four hours of his arrival that the best we could possibly hope for was 7 to 6 against us and that in his judgment it was worse.

If two total strangers could find this out so quickly it is hardly possible that you with your experience were unaware of that fact.

Plenty of Influence When You Wanted to Use It.

As proof of the soundness of our conclusions I would call your attention to the fact that on the bill which eliminates the provision of the law limiting those who can protest against a license to within 300 feet of the licensed place only three voted for the temperance side. Only one of the committee favored the prohibition of the sale of liquor to disorderly houses and inmates of same. Only five voted to increase the age of minors within the prohibited class from eighteen to twenty-one years.

Of course the committee met later and reconsidered its vote on this last bill, but, we are informed, only after you, as Speaker, asked that it be done, which, by the way, establishes the fact that you have influence with the committee when you wish to use it, and that you do not hesitate to exert that influence where you desire to do so.

Not Province of Committees to Smother Legislation.

Your Excise Committee has denied a chance of life to the Optional Local Prohibition bill which in a few short weeks has received an endorsement from the churches such as no such measure ever received in New York state in the same length of time.

It is the province of committees to facilitate legislation, not to smother it. Committees are supposed to eliminate trivial and vicious propositions but not to stifle the demand of the public conscience. They are intended to help a legislative body represent the people and not to protect a special interest like the liquor traffic. They are intended to be servants and not masters of the assembly.

Try to Blame It On the Democrats.

You may say and in fact I understand you have said, that you did not select the Democratic members of the committee. Some of us have been in this work a dozen years or more. We know practical politics as it is practiced. We know that you could tell the minority leader that you wanted some men handed up to you for this committee who if not actually in favor of the legislation would at least vote to report it out, and you could have secured compliance with that request if you had wished to do so.

Could Have Protected Yourself and the Bill.

But, assuming, for the sake of argument, that you are under obligations to take whatever was handed you by the other side, you still had ample opportunity to protect yourself by naming men of your own party who would get action on this question and save you from responsibility. But instead of this you named some liquor Republicans, including an out and out liquor chairman. By so doing, whether intentionally or unintentionally, you gave control of the liquor question to Tammany and its representatives on the committee and permitted it to strangle this bill and put the blame on you and your party. If this was intentional, which we do not believe, why of course we have nothing further to say. Having located responsibility our hunt would be at an end until another time. If it was not intentional then it is up to you to save the bill from the predicament in which it has been placed through your action.

Which End Will You Take—They Are Both Hot?

In short in appointing a wet committee you must have intended one of two things: First, to permit this bill to be killed if those controlling the legislature wanted to kill it; or second, to intervene in its behalf yourself and give it a fair chance in spite of the committee. If the latter was your intention the time for help has come.

We have not at any stage of the proceedings asked you to force the passage of this bill. We have not asked you to use your influence to secure a single vote in favor of it. We did not even ask you to appoint a committee on which there should be a majority in favor of it. All that we asked at the beginning and all that we ask now is that you shall see that it gets before the assembly for a vote on its merits. In this we are safely within our rights and all legislative proprieties.

Will You Let the Liquor Politicians Use You?

It is notorious that the Tammany Democratic organization is in alliance with the liquor traffic. It is notorious that the Barnes Republican organization is likewise in alliance with the liquor traffic while protecting many of its up-state representatives from the wrath of the temperance people by killing temperance bills in committee so that they did not have to go on record. Nobody would accuse a clean high-grade man like yourself, elected as a protest against Mr. Barnes' control of your party, of having made any actual bargain with him, as the price of his finally throwing his votes to you, but if this bill is killed through the action of a hostile Excise Committee with a hostile Barnes' chairman whom you put into a position where he could do it, it will be as clear as daylight that you at least CONSENTED to it and that the Tammany Democratic and Barnes Republican liquor coalition, with your tacit permission, will have used you to kill this bill. We have confidence enough in you to believe that when you appreciate the situation you will not stand for being put in any such position.

What Big Republican Is Trying to Protect the Liquor Traffic?

If the representatives of the Republican party in the assembly were really in favor of the rights of the people and not committed to the liquor traffic they would pass this majority rule and self-government bill demanded by the moral element of the state and put the responsibility for defeating it upon the Democratic senate. If they not only fail to pass it but refuse even to permit a vote on it, then the Republican organization of the assembly gets down into the same attitude of subservency to the liquor traffic occupied by the Democratic organization of the senate. Under such conditions the people will have a right to ask: "Who in Republican circles is more interested in protecting the liquor traffic than in advancing the interests of the Republican party?"

Which Will You Protect—the People or the Saloon?

If there is a vote upon the merits of this bill then no party is responsible. If there is no vote then the organization of the party which controls the legislative body is responsible and you are its representative. If there is a vote you are not responsible further than your own personal vote on the question. If the people do not want this bill it will not hurt any member of the assembly to vote against it. If the people DO want it they have a right to expect that you shall not shield their representatives from taking a stand upon it.

At Least Give Public Notice That You Are Hands Off.

If a motion is made to instruct the Rules Committee to report this bill, which we are informed is the proper motion to make, we respectfully suggest that the least you can do, unless you actually want this bill killed, will be to make a public statement to the assembly before the vote, to the effect that you will not regard such a motion or a vote for it as an unfriendly move. Further, in order to put us into the same position which we would have had if you had not permitted the committee to be stacked against us, we think that you should actually use your influence with the assembly organization to see that enough votes are given for the proposition to insure the bill being brought before the assembly on its merits.

Will Pass the Bill or Show Why.

The Anti-Saloon League intends to pass this bill or show why blocked it. We are not asking this measure as a favor which the legislature may withhold or grant as it sees fit. We propose it as a right belonging to the people. We are sorry if insistence upon it embarrasses anybody but we have to discharge our duty to our constituency, and this fight has just started.

I sent Mr. Burke, our attorney and legislative representative, to tell you all this frankly and amicably, but you showed no disposition to consider the real merits of this proposition and seemed unable to realize that "the good old days" when the good people of the state could be waved aside or put off with more or less plausible excuses are past and that the temperance proposition in New York from now on means a fight in which no quarter will be given or asked until the legislature realizes that its proper function is to hand the liquor question back to the people for ultimate decision instead of trying to protect the liquor traffic from having to submit to the American principle of majority rule.

Right the Best Policy Even in Politics.

We appreciate, having seen any similar cases, the embarrassment of your position as a man of high personal character and standing acting as the representative, in part at least, of a political regime for which so much cannot be said. But the right is the best policy even in politics, and in the name of the federated churches which are determined not to accept defeat, we appeal to you as a Christian man to recognize that you may have "come to the Kingdom for such a time as this," and to stand for the rights of the people in order that existing conditions may be corrected and the liquor traffic be dethroned from its present position of power in the legislative halls at Albany.

Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM H. ANDERSON,

State Superintendent.

The speaker's reply to this letter was a weak communication to the effect that he was too busy to take up and consider the matters contained in it. Precisely, too busy doing the work of the Barnes' organization, which is a liquor organization in its sympathies and activity, to give consideration to this matter at the only time it would be of any assistance in the way of giving the people relief.

It has been suggested in the speaker's behalf by some advocates of reform legislation that he did the best he could. Can any intelligent, unprejudiced man believe that for a minute in the light of the above? The truth is that the speaker had such little regard for the temperance movement and such little respect for its representatives at Albany that he did not even put up a respectable or intelligent bluff.

The Crude Clumsiness of the Supposedly Big Politicians.

The liquor interests have been so thoroughly entrenched in the politics of New York state that they do not believe there could be any change, and while the net result was highly effective so far as defeating the bill was concerned, the work of some of the big politicians was about the crudest we have seen in recent years. If the Republican organization of the assembly had been trying to play politics and had had enough respect for the temperance people to take the temperance movement seriously it would have passed a good strong home rule measure like the League's bill through the assembly and put the odium on the Tammany crowd for defeating it, and then gone blandly around the state house and "winked the other eye" and made peace with the liquor interests by saying it was keeping the decent element quiet and the bill could not get through the senate. This is the way, in substance, it is done in most of the states where the politicians recognize that the temperance movement is strong and growing stronger. It is not that the New York politicians are lacking in astuteness, but that they think the temperance people and the temperance leaders are.

How the Good People Were To Be "Flin-Flammed."

The most that Speaker Sweet and the Republican organization did was to pass one bill patching up in a slight degree the excise law. We knew in advance that this was to be done to placate the temperance people and incidentally give a few of them something to crow about and on which to base a plea for further support. We did not know at first just what bill was to be so favored. It was understood between the organization and certain alleged reformers that if some sort of a so-called temperance bill got through the assembly it would make a good talking point whether anything was done with it in the senate or not. We have some interesting details as to this agreement right from the so-called "temperance" side. These "temperance" people were "easy" though, or they would have made the speaker agree to club this comparatively harmless bill through the senate, too, as he could easily have done by threatening to retaliate on some senate bills if they refused such a moderate favor; provided they had really wanted to get the bill through.

The excise committee was so strong, however, for the saloons that it overshot the mark and voted to kill EVERYTHING, and the speaker, after being reminded of the promise to put this bill over, personally saw his and Mr. Barnes' chairman of the excise committee and the committee was called and the chairman changed his vote in order that this bill covered by this "working agreement" might be reported

14
out and put on its passage and it was so reported and passed the assembly, but, of course, failed to get by the senate. It is interesting, though we do not undertake to say whether it is more than a mere coincidence, that parties interested in passing this particular bill after the session sought to protect the speaker by claiming that he had done the best he could for moral legislation, presumably because he helped carry out this crooked little bluff, and without reference to his attitude on the one piece of legislation that had a possible chance and really amounted to something in the way of enfranchising the people. And if there is any further attempt in certain quarters to protect Speaker Sweet, we shall tell a little more of the particulars, which, however, we do not care to bother about unless somebody gets between the Anti-Saloon League and those who helped kill the legislation desired by the people.

Are Mr. Barnes and the Liquor Interests Now To Reward Mr. Sweet?

We are advised, and are informed that it has been published in some of the newspapers, that Mr. Sweet evidently does not intend to be a candidate for renomination but that he was down at Albany seeing some of the leaders with reference to his candidacy for state comptroller.

Is this part of a deal? Is this the speaker's reward as a matter of original understanding or as a last hour proposition to protect him since it became apparent the Anti-Saloon League would expose the real facts in the case. Or is it, on the other hand, a personal determination on the part of the speaker growing out of his recognition that he is so mixed up with the Barnes and Tammany liquor crowd and the liquor traffic itself that he cannot fool the good people back home sufficiently to be nominated and elected to the assembly again? Or is he using this opportunity to force Mr. Barnes to do something big as the price of keeping his mouth shut in Mr. Barnes' libel suit against the League superintendent? Or did Mr. Barnes think of the suit himself?

If the Barnes' organization gets behind Speaker Sweet after his appointment of a Barnes' lieutenant as chairman of the excise committee and another member of Mr. Barnes' personal Albany county organization as majority leader and the consequent killing of the optional local Prohibition bill by a committee and assembly so organized, the people of the state can draw their own inferences without any help from the Anti-Saloon League.

What the League will do remains to be seen and depends somewhat on conditions, but we believe there are many people in the state who will not vote to help the liquor interests reward Mr. Sweet with a fat state office at their expense.

The delayed roll call on the optional local Prohibition bill is here set out in full. We have requested the editorial staff at Westerville to be exceedingly careful in reading the proof so there will be no mistakes in the names.

It will be remembered that both the Democratic and Republican liquor machines sought to prevent a record vote on this bill, but as explained in the American Issue weeks ago, the League broke through and forced a record.

It will be observed from this roll call that we had a majority of the votes cast on the proposition, and the majority would have been greater but the speaker shut off further recording of names by ordering the clerk to read the result, evidently fearing to have too big a majority shown. We failed to get the bill put on its passage because an unusual and drastic motion like the one to instruct the rules committee to report the bill requires a majority of all the members elected. We have no doubt that the bill would have received a constitutional majority and passed the assembly if it had been given a fair chance by the Barnes lieutenant, who was the chairman of the excise committee and the other Barnes lieutenant who was the majority floor leader, and by the speaker, the church man and temperance man elected as a protest against the Barnes organization, who helped these Barnes men and the Tammany ring to protect the liquor traffic.

The man who is not recorded at all and cannot give a satisfactory explanation should be considered against the bill. The League has destroyed all chance of anybody claiming that he was unfairly treated, for in order to be perfectly fair, since there was no hurry, the League sent a personal letter to every member of the assembly who was not recorded as voting, making clear that it would accept as conclusive the statement of any man who had a good reason for being absent and who declared himself in favor of the bill and stated that he would have supported the motion had he been present.

In reply to this letter the League has heard as follows:

From MR. JAMES H. WOOD, of the Fulton-Hamilton district, who says that he was actually present and voted in favor of the motion and voted loudly enough to have been heard, and who at first was unable to secure a copy of the original roll call. Mr. Wood's statement is accepted as conclusive, satisfactory and final.

From MR. S. R. GREEN, of the Sixteenth district of Kings county, who writes that he was at lunch when the vote was taken that he is in favor of all such measures and will always vote for them—which statement is satisfactory and conclusive.

From MR. CHARLES A. BREWSTER, of the First district of Steuben county, who writes that he thinks all bills should be reported out of the committee, and would have so voted. Mr. Brewster was excused by the speaker on account of sickness in his family, and calls our attention to the fact that in the last session he voted for measures recommended by the League; this reply is satisfactory and conclusive.

We also have letters from MR. S. CLINTON CRANE, of the Twenty-third district of New York, and MR. ALVAH W. BURLINGAME, JR., of the Seventeenth district of Kings, and from MR. WILLIAM F. MATHEWSON, of the Twenty-third district of Kings, which, while not so explicit in their terms are satisfactory in tone and general spirit, and have been interpreted by the office as satisfactory.

We consider that doing justice to these six men instead of printing their names as "dodgers" without explanation, with the possibility of getting the list into the hands of somebody who would not see a later correction, has amply justified the delay in order to secure a list that gives every man a square deal **AND NO MORE.**

While, of course, occasions may arise when time cannot be spared and things will have to be done quickly, the League, although refusing to shield or protect anybody from the truth will endeavor to be absolutely fair to every man.

The following is the roll call:

15 RECORD OF ASSEMBLY ON LOCAL OPTION BILL.

The following men voted in favor of the motion to have the local option bill reported out of the committee—39:

Name	REPUBLICAN County	District
Mr. Arnt	Kings	10
Mr. Ahern	Onondaga	1
Mr. Blakley	Westchester	1
Mr. Chase	Greene	1
Mr. Cheney	Chautauqua	1
Mr. Christman	Herkimer	4
Mr. Eadie	Queens	4
Mr. Fairbank	Clinton	
Mr. Ferry	Allegany	
Mr. Flamman	Kings	20
Mr. Gillett	Yates	
Mr. Hiltton	Erie	2
Mr. Howard	Schuyler	
Mr. Jones, S. A.	Chenango	
Mr. Knapp	Chemung	
Mr. Knight	Wyoming	
Mr. LeFevre	Ulster	2
Mr. Lockwood	Kings	5
Mr. Mackey	Delaware	
Mr. Maier	Seneca	
Mr. Moore, W. S.	Tioga	
Mr. Nelson	New York	21
Mr. Pratt	Washington	
Mr. Tallett	Madison	
Mr. Talmadge	Suffolk	1
Mr. Webb	Cortland	
Mr. Wheeler	Ontario	
DEMOCRAT		
Mr. Haight	Onondaga	2
Mr. Martin	Westchester	2
Mr. Squire	Schenectady	
PROGRESSIVE		
Mr. Dunlop	Rockland	
Mr. Fish	Putnam	
Mr. Garrison	Dutchess	1
Mr. Henschel	Bronx	34
Mr. Meyer	New York	27
Mr. Patton	Bronx	35
Mr. Sulzer	New York	6
Mr. Thayer	Erie	8
Mr. Warner	Monroe	1

The following men voted against the motion—31:

Name	REPUBLICAN County	District
Mr. Adler	Monroe	2
Mr. Bockes	Otsego	
Mr. Ellenbogen	New York	15
Mr. Malone	Albany	2
Mr. Murphy	Suffolk	2
Mr. Springer	Cayuga	
Mr. Wilson	Wayne	
Mr. Smith, J. A.	St. Lawrence	2
DEMOCRAT		
Mr. Emdon	Oneida	1
Mr. Farrell	Kings	7
Mr. Greenberg	New York	26
Mr. Kelly	New York	12
Mr. Kerrigan	New York	11
Mr. Kiernan	New York	24
Mr. Kramer	Kings	13
Mr. Lane	New York (Bronx)	33
Mr. McCue	New York	16
Mr. McElligott	New York	7
Mr. McGarry	Queens	2
Mr. McGrath	New York	20
Mr. McKeon	Kings	8
Mr. Nehrbauer	Queens	1
Mr. Phelan	Kings	15
Mr. Schimmel	New York	4
Mr. Smith, A. E.	New York	2
Mr. Tudor	New York	14
Mr. Walker	New York	5
PROGRESSIVE		
Mr. Bleeker	New York	10
Mr. Moore, B. E.	New York	22
Mr. Schaap	New York	31
Mr. Sufrin	New York	8

The following failed to make any record whatever—80:

Name	REPUBLICAN County	District
Mr. Baxter	Albany	3
Mr. Bewley	Niagara	1
Mr. Boyd	Orange	2
Mr. Brennan	Kings	11
Mr. Brereton	Warren	
Mr. Ruecheler	Onondaga	3
Mr. Burlingame	Kings	17
Mr. Conkling	New York	29
Mr. Crane	New York	23
Mr. DeWitt	Ulster	1
Mr. DuBois	Dutchess	2
Mr. Fuess	Oneida	2
Mr. Fuller	Oneida	3
Mr. Gage	Montgomery	
Mr. Garbe	Queens	3
Mr. Grant	Lewis	
Mr. Green	Kings	16
Mr. Grimler	New York (Bronx)	32
Mr. Hinman	Albany	1
Mr. Hoff	Kings	18
Mr. Hopkins	Westchester	4
Mr. Jones, J. G.	Jefferson	2
Mr. Karutz	Kings	22
Mr. Kenyon	Essex	
Mr. Langhorst	Kings	4
Mr. Law	Westchester	3
Mr. McDonald	Franklin	
Mr. Machold	Jefferson	1
Mr. Magee	Livingston	
Mr. Mathewson	Kings	23
Mr. McQuiston	Kings	1
Mr. Montgomery	Orange	1
Mr. Phillips	Monroe	4
Mr. Preswick	Tompkins	
Mr. Quick	Broome	
Mr. Seaker	St. Lawrence	1
Mr. Seelye, G. T.	Saratoga	
Mr. Simpson	Kings	12
Mr. Stoddard	New York	25
Mr. Sullivan	Chautauqua	2
Mr. Sweet	Oswego	
Mr. Thorn	Erie	9
Mr. Wells	Genesee	
Mr. Wood	Fulton-Hamilton	
DEMOCRAT		
Mr. Brewster	Steuben	1
Mr. Campbell	New York	13
Mr. Coughlan	New York	1
Mr. Donohue	New York	9
Mr. Dox	Schoharie	
Mr. Eisner	New York	17
Mr. Gallup	Monroe	5
Mr. Geyer	Erie	3
Mr. Gillen	Kings	2
Mr. Goldberg	New York	18
Mr. Golden	New York	3
Mr. Greiner	Erie	7
Mr. Hearn	Erie	5
Mr. Hoyer	Columbia	
Mr. LaFrenz (Ind. Dem.)	Kings	14
Mr. Quigley (Ind. Dem.)	Erie	4
Mr. Ritz	Monroe	3
Mr. Schwartz	Rensselaer	1
Mr. Seely, J. L.	Steuben	2
Mr. Smith, G. H.	Sullivan	
Mr. Taylor, F. J.	Kings	3
Mr. Taylor, T. D.	Rensselaer	2
Mr. Tusholka	Erie	6
Mr. VanName	Richmond	
Mr. Varhus	Erie	1
Mr. Willard	Cattaraugus	
Mr. Williams	Niagara	2
Mr. Wright	Orleans	
PROGRESSIVE		
Mr. Findlater	New York	28
Mr. Ittleman	Kings	6
Mr. Karpen	Kings	21
Mr. McRoberts	Kings	9
Mr. Murray	New York	19
Mr. Scheidemann	Kings	19
Mr. Weed	Nassau	
INDEPENDENT		
Mr. Bolyston	New York	30

Among those not voting, Mr. Preswick was present in the chamber and in his seat and refused to vote.

The speaker, Mr. Sweet, was in the chair and did not vote.

Mr. Gage voted in the open for us, as a member of the excise committee, hence his failure to vote cannot be construed against him.

Mr. Hinman, the majority leader, was in the chamber seated near the clerk's desk when the vote was called, hence it was a mere dodging of the vote on his part.

Mr. Hopkin's silence is clearly hostile as he voted against the bill in the committee.