BOX

17

FOLDER

187

Public Welfare Bill-Police and Vice Laws

1912-1913

Herman J. Witte
Attorney
25 Broad Street
New York

CABLE: "HERMATIW" N.Y.

78
1

September 11th,
1 9 1 2.

To Honorable William J. Gaynor,
Mayor, City of New York.

Sir:-

Prompted by your reply to the questions of Mr. Buckner, as I read it in today's World, regarding the matter of Disorderly houses, i.e. that you had studied the question and read authorities upon the subject, but had never formulated any policy, - I write you the following for your information.

At the time of the Lexow-Dr. Parkhurst investigations in this City some years ago, ministers in general throughout the Country began to agitate this same question. At that time I resided in the City of Cincinnati, of which Col Deitsch was then the superintendent of police, and with whom I was closely associated. Col. Deitsch was a man, and as a Police Official absolutely honest, and as such was recognized, and stood high in the estimation of every citizen.

A committee of ministers about this time waited upon Col. Deitsch to demand a general house cleaning of all disorderly houses and houses of assignation. After the Committee had stated their case and demands, an adjournment was taken to meet again a week or ten days later, at which time Col. Deitsch gave his answer, - that to do as demanded by them was unfeasable that history from time beyond the memory of man failed to show that in large communities, the social evil could not be entirely suppresed or entirely wiped out by attempting absolute suppression that he could not comply with their demand, but that this evil could be regulated, and in a manner that might result in much good.

Col. Deitsch at this meeting detailed to the committee the regulations he had in mind and intended to put into effect, and the policy he intended to adopt to enforee them, the position he took, and the ideas advanced by him were fully approved.

5

Following this meeting the Police Department had

W.J.G.

printed a form. A number of these were furnished to the keepers of disorderly houses and places harboring women of ill repute, together with instruction as to the Department's demands in relation thereto.

This form in effect embodied many questions to be filled out, bearing upon the identity of each inmate or any woman seeking accommodations for herself at such places, namely:- NAME ----- DESCRIPTION, INCLUDING APPAREL WORN ----- AGE ----- IF PARENTS LIVING, NAME AND ADDRESS, ALSO IF AN INMATE OF A DISORDERLY PLACE BEFORE ------ WHERE ---- ALSO LAST PLACE SUCH PARTY HAD BEEN STOPPING AT OR IN THE HABIT OF VISITING?, and under "REMARKS" ---- APPARENT AGE (if a minor) AND ANY PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OR INFORMATION SUCH KEEPER MAY HAVE REGARDING SUCH PERSON.

This form when filled out had to be forwith forwarded to Police Headquarters when it was at once given attention, checked and filed. If the girl whose description it contained was apparently, by the report, under age, or a girl or woman who had never before been an inmate of a disorderly house or before followed such life, she was immediately sent for, and every effort was made to discover how she came to go to the place, - who sent her, and at the same time efforts were made, to, if of age, dissuade her from entering into such life, and if destitute and prompted by some discouraging situation, she was sent to a benevolent home, pending efforts in her behalf to enable her to rejoin her family or return to her home and friends. At the same time these records and the circumstances connected with all cases were not open for public information.

While this was all a mere Police Regulation, unenforceable by any law, and which could not be enacted by reason of it attempting to ratify an unlawful business - still the failure to promptly and truthfully fill out and forward these reports, was followed by immediate arrest and closing of the house. Any one of the reports on file being used as evidence to obtain a conviction, each being a self admission of conducting such place. On the other hand, if such police regulations were conformed to, and the place conducted to outward decency and free from interior disturbances, they were without any molestation on the part of the Police Dept. condoned.

Police officers were not permitted to enter or visit these places, raids were only permitted upon the direct order of the Superintendent of Police, - excepting some happening in the place calling for immediate action of the District Commander.

These women knew and understood that their immunity from police action depended solely upon their own good faith in observing the regulations prescribed and laid down for them by the Police Department.

During the first year, by this method of regulation,

W.J.G.

in a city of less than 350,000 population, several hundred young girls and women were saved from following such life, in many cases. missing and reported lost young women were quickly found, and in some cases led to men and women being criminally prosecuted for sending, or taking such women or a young girl to such places to become an inmate or caller for the purpose of prostitution.

I have written the foregoing, prompted by no other idea, than that itymay interest you, and my having personally observed condtitions connected with this question, both here and abroad, and the outcome and results as developed in Cincinnati, upon the formulating and putting into effect of the plan and policy mentioned, with which I had much to do on account of my identification with the Police Department of that City at that time. And that I believe it is one of the feasable policies and regulations this question calls for.

Of course there were other measures followed by the Police Department in connection therewith, such as restricting to places already known as such, the prohibiting of maintaining a place of any kind where not before conducted, and the matter of physicians certificate as to the condition of such women, and the burden of expenses for medical care at the Hospitals when any found diseased, etc.

Criticism or approval as to its weight and effect in New York or elsewhere depends upon its source. The policy followed by Col. Deitsch regarding this subject matter in Cincinnati was approved by Bench and Bar as well by all leading citizens in both profession and commercial life - and so recognized by the Press.

I have the honor to be

yours very respectfully,

Herman J. Witte

HJW/HAB

OFFICE OF
THE COMMISSIONER

September 13, 1912.

Hon. William J. Gaynor,
Mayor, City of New York,
City Hall,
New York City.

S i r:

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 12th, enclosing a communication from Mr. Witte, stating the manner in which prostitution was regulated in Cincinnati.

The regulation of this evil is one of the oldest questions which has confronted civilized government. While many attempts have been made at regulation I know of no place where it can be said to have been satisfactorily controlled. The Police Department can have no policy with reference to this question other than to enforce the law. It would appear to me that one of the best things that could be done would be to take the enforcement of this law absolutely out of the hands of the police, whose work should be confined to the protection of life and property, and place the enforcement of the moral laws in charge of a special service, absolutely independent of the Police Department. The headship of a force of this kind might be entrusted to a board of our leading ministers of various denominations.

Very respectfully,

Police Commissioner.

February 10th, 1913.M

Dear Sir:

Since you called on me with the other members of your committee on the police which was appointed at the mass meeting, I have continued to consider the matter of taking away from the police department the enforcement of the law with regard to excise, gambling and prostitution, and conferring that power and duty upon a new department to be created by the Legislature. After your call I requested Assemblyman Greenberg not to introduce the bill he prepared for that purpose (and which I handed to you), until your committee had fully considered it. If such a bill is to be introduced I should prefer that it be under the auspices of your committee.

It is easy for the police to extort money from the keepers of hotels, saloons, gambling houses and houses of prostitution, under threats of entering their places and arresting and prosecuting them unless they pay for immunity therefrom. And such persons are certain to seek to bribe the police. I found that condition in full blast when I came in as Mayor. It had existed for many years. The hotels, saloons, gambling houses and houses of fornication

wa paying a weekly or monthly sum for such immunity. Th total sum was immense. I knew that the recipients wold not let go of this graft at my mere bidding. I have ben struggling persistently ever since to remove this condition. I think I have succeeded with regard to the saloon and hotel graft. I know that I have measurably succeeded in respect of gambling houses and houses of fornication. But to remove the evil entirely requires time, for it is of long standing and deep seated.

Police Commissioners Cropsey and Waldo have put many gamblers and keepers of houses of fornication out of business. The result has been to provoke some of them to reveal facts with regard to the bribery of the police. It seems to be lost sight of to some extent that all of these revelations of police bribery came from this enforcement of the law against the persons who made such revelations or their partners in crime. It was to be expected that enforcement of the law would bring about such revelations. Rosenthal, for instance, opened 12 different gambling places successively after Waldo was made Commissioner, but was put out of business every time. While the police were still in possession of the last place which he opened he made revelations against the police. The same thing occurred

in te case of Sipp whose house of fornication was supressed by the police. And the same is occurring with others. But most of the revelations which are being made are of things which occurred under former administrations of the city government, some of them as long as 15 years ago. The effort of certain newspapers to make it appear that these revelations are of occurrences which took place since Waldo became Police Commissioner will not, I am certain, deceive any intelligent person. The ignorant may be deceived for a time, but not the intelligent. Meanwhile, a considerable number of corrupt officials in the police department have been removed or compelled to resign. If we could get the old time grafters out, we would at the same time get rid of most of the graft. But it takes time and patience. They cannot be dismissed without strict legal evidence. This grafting in the cities in this country is of long standing, deep seated and inveterate.

But justice requires us to always remember that only a comparatively few of the members of the police force are thus corrupted and infected. There are not as many as 100 out of the whole force of 10,000. The great body

of the force throughout the city, in Brooklyn, in Queens, in the Bronx, in Richmond, and in most of Manhattan, is doing its duty faithfully day after day. It is only in two or three localities that this grafting evil exists. But the corrupt doings of the few corrupted policemen in these localities give the whole force a bad name, at all events in the minds of unthinking people. The result is an unfavorable effect on the whole force, more or less. It distracts it from its duty. And the indiscriminate abuse heaped on the whole force by corrupt and sensational newspapers for the derelictions of a few must of course have a bad effet also.

It therefore seems that it would be a wise thing to take away from the police force all supervision over or contact with thethree things I have mentioned and confer the same on a separate force to be created for that purpose. Of coursethat new force would also be subject to the same temptation, and would be corrupted more or less. But their misdeeds would not reflect on the police force. The police force would be engaged solely in preserving the peace, and keeping outward order and decency, and in the detection and prevention of ordinary crimes, in which the

opportunities for graft are small. It would have nothing to do with the enforcement of the laws concerning excise, gambling and prostitution, and would not be subject to the infection of corruption therefrom.

As I have said, this new force would be open to such corruption. But the danger thereof would be minimized if the commissioner of the new force were given the power to apoint and dismiss at will. That would enable him to select competent persons and to get rid of every member of the force of whom he had any suspicion. As it is now no member of the force can be dismissed except on common law proof showing him to be guilty of some dereliction. If the same rule would be made applicable to the new force, then I do not see that anything would be attained by creating such a force.

After careful consideration I am in favor of creating this new force. But I am not in favor of putting it under a board of commissioners to serve without pay. On the contrary, to be effective it ought to be under a paid commissioner who would have to devote all of his time to his duties. I have no doubt that better results in government are obtained from paid officials than from voluntary officials. I have all the more reason to be in favor of

this ne method, for the reason that I have adopted a similarmethod in the police force itself, andit has worked all. As you know, I made up a separate force within he force itself to deal with the three things which I have mentioned, and relieved the rest of the force from dealing with such things. To leave all of the captains and inspectors free to deal with liquor saloons, gambling houses and houses of fornication is only to make extensive corruption certain. I tried to bring the contact with these three things down to one point, namely, to the commissioner himself. To do that I created a separate force which was placed under the immediate orders of the commissioner. As you are aware, one of the three lieutenants put over that force by the Commissioner was corrupted. But the amount of corruption was reduced many fold, and I have no hesitation in saying that it was never less in the police department than during the last two years. But although that method has measurably succeeded I think a new force, wholly disconnected from the police force, would work out a still better result. And above all things, as I have already stated, whatever corruption there might be in that force would not reflect upon the police force.

I have a letter today from Assemblyman Greenberg who is restless about introducing his bill. I shall send him a copy of this letter, and it may be that he will wait until you have carefully revised his bill or drawn a new one. Or it may be wise for him to introduce his bill and have it printed so that it may be circulated. In that way we would get the cooperation of many others. I shall be glad to confer with your committee further about this matter, and to have a session with you in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

Mayor.

Allan Robinson, Esq.,
165, Broadway,
New York City.

February 11th, 1913.M

Dear Mr. Robinson:

Your letter of February 11th is at hand. I am not at all certain that a voluntary board coupled with an executive head, would not work well. I should think the judgment of you and your committee on that head would be better than mine, but it is a thing that we can maturely consider. I particularly thank you for your analysis of Mr. Greenberg's bill. Of course my great wish is that a bill be worked out by your committee, to accompany your report, and I will help you in that respect all I can. If necessary I will assign an Assistant Corporation Counsel to draft the bill in accordance with the principles which shall be settled on. If the thing is to be done, the sooner we have the bill in the Legislature the better.

Sincerely yours,

W. Gaynor,
Mayor.

Allan Robinson, Esq.,
165, Broadway,
New York City.

The Citizens' Committee

APPOINTED AT THE COOPER UNION MASS MEETING, AUGUST 14, 1912

GEO. B. AGNEW
MRS. W. H. BALDWIN
ROBERT S. BINKERD
THATCHER M. BROWN
A. S. FRISSELL
J. O. HAMMITT
CHAS. P. HOWLAND
RAYMOND V. INGERSOLL
MRS. CHARLES H. ISRAELS
MRS. HELEN HARTLEY JENKINS
MAX J. KOHLER
ALVIN W. KRECH
ORLANDO F. LEWIS
SAM A. LEWISOHN
WALTER LINDNER
HENRY MOSKOWITZ
W. W. NILES
E. H. OUTERBRIDGE
EUGENE A. PHILBIN
GEO. D. PRATT
ALLAN ROBINSON
WM. ALLAIRE SHORTT
ALBERT STRAUSS
F. S. TOMLIN
FRED H. WHITIN
WM. H. WILLIAMS

ALLAN ROBINSON, CHAIRMAN
HENRY MOSKOWITZ, VICE-CHAIRMAN
SAM A. LEWISOHN, TREASURER
ROBERT S. BINKERD, SECRETARY
JOSEPH P. COTTON, JR COUNSEL

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN, 165 BROADWAY.
TELEPHONE: CORT. 4790.

NEW YORK February 11, 1913.

Hon. William Gaynor, Mayor,
City Hall, New York, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 10 in which you refer to Assemblyman Greenberg's bill creating a department to deal with the enforcement of the law with regard to excise, gambling and prostitution. You also refer in this letter to the plan of this Committee for dealing with the vice situation. On behalf of the Committee I beg to express our appreciation of the consideration that you have given to our proposed report on this matter and we are glad to know that you approve the principle of taking away from the police force "all supervision from or contact with" excise, gambling and prostitution.

I beg to call your attention to an apparent misunderstanding on your part of one of the recommendations which our Committee has made. You say you are not in favor of having a board of commissioners to serve without pay but that, to be effective, the work should be done under a paid commissioner who would have to devote all his time to his duties. Our plan as submitted to you contemplated not only a board of commissioners to serve without pay but, in addition, an executive officer under salary. The board of com-

V4

missioners, as you describe them, were not to have administrative functions but were to act in an advisory capacity to determine policies and to study and recommend measures to cope with the three vices above referred to. They were to watch the action of the courts, decide the policy to be pursued in methods of gathering evidence, secure definite cooperation with other authorities, such as the State Excise Department, the United States Internal Revenue Department, the License Bureaus, etc., and with such civic bodies as might be counted on for support and assistance. They were also to advise with reformatory institutions on the methods of treating criminals and the effective methods of punishment, etc. The commission should represent public opinion in the matter of dealing with vices and should lead that public opinion as no police commissioner has heretofore led it. All these functions are, in our opinion, necessary to a proper solution of the problem which faces us, and cannot well be delegated to an administrative officer whose duties must confine him to carrying out policies rather than formulating them.

Enclosed herewith is a detailed criticism of the bill prepared by Assemblyman Greenberg, which bill I return herewith.

Very truly yours,

Chairman.

AR/R
Enc.(2)

Criticism of Assemblyman Greenberg's Bill Creating a Department to Deal with the Enforcement of the Law with Regard to Excise, Gambling and Prostitution.

This bill calls for an administrative board of small number, all residents of the City of New York, to be appointed by the Mayor to a term of four years and removal by the Mayor or the Governor. The salary of the chief of the board is to be $7,500. All other members are to receive $5,000. Under this board there is to be a deputy for each borough and a deputy in charge of detectives at $4,000 a year. Under these deputies are to be captains, lieutenants, sergeants, matrons, etc., modeled, generally, on the present police force with fixed salaries stated in the bill. The board is to have exclusive charge of the vices enumerated therein which include Sunday laws, amusements, white slaves, etc. It is to have complete charge of selecting the force, which is likewise to be discharged at will. The board is also to have entire charge of promotions and reductions in rank.

Although the bill is well worked out as to details, it seems to fall far short of hope of results for the following among other reasons:

1. While it creates a separation from the police it plans for no cooperation with the police.

2. It borders on the absurd in proposing what is practically a new patrolling force.

3. Its hard and fast military division of officers and

squads is unfortunate. Such a force ought to be really a secret service force. The plan of separate matrons, station houses, patrol wagons, etc., would entail great expense without promise of real result.

4. The plan for a paid board and a permanent force without any restriction seems to prepare the way for a political feast, for if the commissioners are to be paid the salaries above referred to the places are bound to become political plums. The plan seems to mean that the board itself shall be administrators of the law, whereas, in our opinion, it should be merely super-visory in character. In the nature of things a board or a commission is a poor administrator.

In general, the bill carries out the idea of separating from the police force the enforcement of the vice statutes but it provides a marvelously weak arrangement for handling such enforcement after a separation, with the prospect of a maximum of expense.

February 17th, 1913.M

Dear Mr. Robinson:

Your letter of February 14th is at hand. I suppose you have in mind to completely disconnect the police force from the enforcement of the so-called vice laws. Some have said to me that a small force could not know where these houses were located throughout the city, whereas the patrolmen and captains would know, it being their business to know every house, and that therefore the act should require them to report all such houses to the Vice Commission. But they would take pay for not reporting, and there would be your graft over again. Can we not wholly disconnect the matter from the police force, if we are going into it?

Sincerely yours,

Mayor.

Allan Robinson, Esq.,
165, Broadway,
New York City.

THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE

APPOINTED AT THE COOPER UNION MASS MEETING, AUGUST 14, 1912

GEO. B. AGNEW	CHAS. P. HOWLAND	SAM A. LEWISOHN	ALLAN ROBINSON
MRS. W. H. BALDWIN	RAYMOND V. INGERSOLL	WALTER LINDNER	WM. ALLAIRE SHORTT
ROBERT S. BINKERD	MRS. CHARLES H. ISRAELS	HENRY MOSKOWITZ	ALBERT STRAUSS
THATCHER M. BROWN	MRS. HELEN HARTLEY JENKINS	W. W. NILES	F. S. TOMLIN
A. S. FRISSELL	MAX J. KOHLER	E. H. OUTERBRIDGE	FRED H. WHITIN
J. O. HAMMITT	ALVIN W. KRECH	EUGENE A. PHILBIN	WM. H. WILLIAMS
	ORLANDO F. LEWIS	GEO. D. PRATT	

ALLAN ROBINSON, CHAIRMAN	HENRY MOSKOWITZ, VICE-CHAIRMAN	SAM A. LEWISOHN, TREASURER	ROBERT S. BINKERD, SECRETARY	JOSEPH P. COTTON, JR COUNSEL

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN, 165 BROADWAY.

TELEPHONE: CORT. 4790.

886

NEW YORK February 19, 1913.

Hon. William J. Gaynor, Mayor,

City Hall, New York, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

This is in reply to your letter of February 17. I had hoped to lay before you this week the draft of our legislative bills but the physical work of evolving this legislation is proving to be no light task and I cannot promise to have the bills ready before next week. Complete severance from the Police Department would mean a separate plant, station houses and matrons, etc. On the other hand, our plan contemplates such a separation as would permit the use of the police plant but would take from the Police Commissioner and the police force all contact with the vice situation.

Very truly yours,

Allan Robinson
Chairman.

AR/R

Feb. 21, 1913.

Dear Mr. Robinson:

The chairmen of the two committees, namely, Senator Wagner and Assemblyman McKee, called to see me yesterday with regard to the police investigation which they desire to make. I had supposed that they meditated some attack on the commissioner and myself. But their purpose is to get advice as to what legislation is necessary, and they have asked me if you would not come before them and give them advice on that head. I told them I thought you would be glad to do so. It now looks to me as though your bill has good prospects, as I think they will favor it. I told them of the intelligent work you and your committee were doing, and that you were drawing a law to create a separate force to enforce the excise, gambling, and prostitution laws. This is a private note to you to advise you of what the wish of the committee is. I certainly should be very glad to have you go before the committee and explain the legislation which you have in view. I am going out of town until Monday.

Sincerely yours,

Mayor.

Allan Robinson, Esq.,
165, Broadway,
N. Y. City.

THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE

APPOINTED AT THE COOPER UNION MASS MEETING, AUGUST 14, 1912

GEO. B. AGNEW
MRS. W. H. BALDWIN
ROBERT S. BINKERD
THATCHER M. BROWN
A. S. FRISSELL
J. O. HAMMITT
CHAS. P. HOWLAND
RAYMOND V. INGERSOLL
MRS. CHARLES H. ISRAELS
MRS. HELEN HARTLEY JENKINS
MAX J. KOHLER
ALVIN W. KRECH
ORLANDO F. LEWIS
SAM A. LEWISOHN
WALTER LINDNER
HENRY MOSKOWITZ
W. W. NILES
E. H. OUTERBRIDGE
EUGENE A. PHILBIN
GEO. D. PRATT
ALLAN ROBINSON
WM. ALLAIRE SHORTT
ALBERT STRAUSS
F. S. TOMLIN
FRED H. WHITIN
WM. H. WILLIAMS

ALLAN ROBINSON, CHAIRMAN
HENRY MOSKOWITZ, VICE-CHAIRMAN
SAM A. LEWISOHN, TREASURER
ROBERT S. BINKERD, SECRETARY
JOSEPH P. COTTON, JR. COUNSEL

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN, 165 BROADWAY.
TELEPHONE: CORT. 4790.

NEW YORK May 7th, 1913.

Hon. William J. Gaynor, Mayor,

City Hall, New York City.

Dear Sir:

The Citizens' Committee did not itself prepare the Wagner bill providing for the creation of a Department of Public Welfare.

The Committee submitted its report to the Legislative Committee at the first hearing of that Committee in New York City. A copy of that report is handed you herewith, and you will note that we recommended that the general jurisdiction of the Board of Social Welfare should correspond with the statutes relating to prostitution, gambling and liquor selling.

The Wagner bill which has now passed both houses of the Legislature and will presently come before you, was prepared by the Legislative Committee and in its first form as introduced on April 7th, it did not give jurisdiction to the new department therein created, over excise. To this extent it did not follow our recommendations. It is not our opinion,

however, that for failure to include excise this bill should fail of enactment. We believe it is of the utmost importance that the principle of separating vice enforcement from the police force should be made a part of the statute law, and it will be comparatively easy, when this principle has been established, to obtain an amendment transferring jurisdiction over excise matters to the new department.

Very truly yours,

AR/JH

Chairman.

Public Welfare Bill & other Remedial Measures

May 8, 1913. d

Dear Mr. Griscom:

I thank you very much for your letter about the Public Welfare Bill. I always had doubt about it. But Mr. Robinson and Mr. Outerbridge, and their fellow members on the Citizens' Committee, did so much in police matters, and were so much in favor of the bill that I acquiesced in it. In fact I thought the bill would turn out to be a good measure. But now it is before me I have to weigh every consideration in respect of it. I notice that the enforcement of the liquor tax law is left out of the bill. This has been for many years, and was at the time I took office, the greatest source of what is called police and official graft. I cut it off by a system of my own, but my successor may not feel he should follow in that course. Why it was left out of the bill is more than I can understand. But it may be advisable to make a beginning, and if I come to that conclusion I may accept the bill in its present form.

Sincerely yours,

Mayor.

C.A. Griscom, Esq.,
President, The Griscom-Russell Company,
90, West Street, New York City.

May 12th, 1913.M

Dear Mr. Rockefeller:

I am very glad to receive your letter of May 9th. I feel certain that the work of your society will produce data from which we can treat the whole subject more effectively. I am very carefully considering the so-called public welfare bill, and I am glad that you said a word about it.

Sincerely yours,

Mayor.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Esq.,
26, Broadway,
New York City.

May 12, 1913. d

Dear Sir:

Your letter is at hand. I agree with you that the so-called Public Welfare bill should be most gravely considered. The object is to do away with all grafting by the police. But I notice that the liquor traffic is not included in the bill. When I came into office that was the greatest source of grafting of all. I have done away with that grafting, but only with great difficulty. The police are tempted to take graft by those engaged in the prostitution traffic, the liquor traffic and gambling. The object being to relieve the police of this temptation, it seems to me that all of these sources of graft should be taken from the police, if any should. But I shall consider whether I ought to accept the bill in the form in which it is drawn as a beginning. Your third objection to the bill is that "no emergency exists" for it. There is much in this. Never was grafting in the Police Department at such a low ebb as during the last few years. It has been growing less and less for several years. And when we consider the fact that all of the grafting which

has been exposed of late in that department grew out of the enforcement of the law by the police authorities, we cannot help considering whether a new method is necessary. Every one of the recent exposures of graft have been provoked by the police taking possession of and suppressing unlawful houses. The police did their duty in suppressing houses, and the proprietors of them then began to reveal that they had been giving graft to the police in past years. Nearly all of these exposures of graft relate to occurrences several and many years ago. I think only two relate to occurrences less than four years old. The Police Department is doing its duty well, and the doing of that duty is bringing these exposures one after the other. In place of seeing this, some people are crying out against the Commissioner and the Department, and calling for new legislation, and the removal of the Commissioner. When we begin to holle indiscriminately, we are always prone to do something wrong or senseless. But I think from the large number of letters I am receiving on this subject that the intelligent public is discriminating in this matter. They perceive that the strict and honest administration of the law by the Police Commissioner is what is bringing on these exposures of graft, and that instead of condemning the police management, we need to uphold it. I have done

all I can in the matter and I think the Police Commissioner has also. The statement that the Mayor and the Police Commissioner are in any way opposing the exposure of graft and the punishment of grafters is too contemptible for consideration. Neone in the city believes any such thing. We began the enforcement of the law against crime on a consistent basis from the beginning, and we have kept it up consistently ever since. I expected to see more exposures of graft than have really occurred. Four captains of police have just been convicted of bribing a man called Sipp to leave the state. Did you ever consider how that was brought about? Let me state the case in a few words. Sipp had some infamous houses. He had been paying graft to the police for years, I suppose. He says that was the case. But the police under the present Commissioner prosecuted his houses, and even took possession of them as public nuisances. Sipp then came forward and accused two policemen of taking graft some years ago, and one of them recently. The policemen were put on trial at headquarters. They were also indicted by the Grand Jury. Sipp then left the state so he could not be called as a witness. I caused a criminal complaint to be made against him in order to have him brought back by extradition proceedings if necessary. I did this

because I suspected that he had been bribed to run away and stay away. When he was thus arrested in another state, he finally consented to come back. He then revealed how he was bribed by certain policemen to run away. They were then indicted and convicted the other day as I have told you. They were not inspectors of police as you have seen in the newspaper headlines. They had been demoted for other reasons long before these charges ever came up, all except one, who was afterwards demoted. You remember the abuse which I received when I took the proceedings to have Sipp brought back. And now we have the result. If I had let him go nothing more would ever have been heard of the thing.

Very truly yours,

W. J. Gaynor

Mayor.

DR. Addison W. Baird,
239, West 70th Street,
New York.