CLUBS TO BE LICENSED.: IMPORTANT PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE EXCISE LAWS. New York Times (1857-1922); Dec 9, 1888;

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2009)

## CLUBS TO BE LICENSED.

IMPORTANT PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE EXCISE LAWS.

The Commissioners on revision of the excise laws unanimously decided at their meeting in the Bible House yesterday morning to incorporate in the bill they are to hand to the coming Legislature a provision that all clubs and kindred organizations wherein liquor is shall be required to take out a license. Crosby said during the discussion that he knew that every reputable club in the State would be willing and ready to take out such licease, and that it was principally formulated to get at those associations in this State which are formed exclusively of drinking men solely for the purpose of getting liquer without the attendant expense of a license. The Commissioners also decided to draw the line sharply between "hard" and "sort" beverages, and to that end advised that while the maximum license for liquor should be \$750 that for beer should be but\$150.

They also advised, in order that the men now in the saloen business should suffer as little loss of money as possible in being forced out of it, that the liquor license in cities for the first year after the passing of the bill should be \$400, for the second year \$500, and for every year thereafter \$50 additional until \$750 per year was reached, at which figure the licenses should stand. The beer license is to rise from \$500 and \$1500 per \$1500 per \$1500 per \$500 per \$1500 per \$150

\$30 to \$150 in about the same proportion.

Frederic R. Condert said in relation to the club license: "As a citizen I think it an excellent measure and a good step toward promoting high license principles. All reputable clubs will doubtless be willing to adopt the idea, not because they hold themselves to be en the same level with the numerous drinking associations that exist under the title of club, but because they will see how extremely difficult it would be to frame a law that would effectually discriminate between the two."

Richard Katzenmayer said in the same connection that, while he did not think it right for clubs that kept bars simply and solely for the accommodation of their members and not for money-making purposes to be forced to take out an expensive license, yet if the law requiring such a procedure should be passed he was sure the respensible clubs would be the first to uphotd it. "I think," said he, "that the four walls of a respectable club should give as much privacy and freedom of action to a member as do the walls of his home, and I rather expect the matter to come into the courts before the clubs will submit."