

## Boroughitis in Bergen County with a Review by Town

The Township School Law of 1894 was one of the most important acts of the New Jersey legislature, as it inaugurated sweeping changes in the management of school districts and has had far reaching consequences, even to this day. It decreed that all school districts within a township be consolidated under a single nine-member township board of trustees. Since all old district school boards were legislated out of office on July 1, 1894, county superintendents were required to call school-board elections at convenient places in each township district within thirty days after the law took effect (before August 1, 1894). The property of the several old school districts in a township were consolidated and the title transferred to the new consolidated district.

Each city, borough and incorporated town was to become a district by itself, unless the legal voters of such a municipality voted to consolidate with the township board at a meeting respectively called for that purpose. Under the new law, boundaries did not have to be changed, but children who resided at an inconvenient distance from their new district school could attend the nearest school in an adjoining district by obtaining written permission from the county superintendent. Money apportioned to the district for such child on the basis of the school

census was to be paid over for the benefit of the district in which the child actually attended school. The county superintendents also apportioned State school money to each township district as follows: a sum equal to \$200 for each full-time teacher; one-half of the remainder of the school moneys belonging to the county on the basis of the aggregate attendance of all children registered in a school district according to report of the state superintendent; and the balance on the basis of the last public school census. This new system of apportionment replaced the payment of flat fees per teacher (\$275) and per child (\$375). The editor of *The Hackensack Republican* thought, "Some schools will fare well under this division while others will not do so well." Under the new system, in June 1894, Bergen County received



Teaneck Public School District, No. 9

\$60,172.56 in state school funding. The apportionment under the new school law allowed \$270 to each district having less than 30 children, \$310 to each district having 30 to 44 children, and \$370 to each district having 45 children.

By consolidating all school districts in a township into a single district under one board of education, the new school law was intended to equalize educational opportunities afforded among poorer or richer, rural or urban school districts. On January 19, 1895, the Committee on School Law, chaired by John Enwight, county superintendent in Monmouth County, reported to the State Council of Education at the State School House in Trenton, on the reaction to three educational reforms passed at the last session of the legislature: firstly, the Narcotic Law, prescribing temperance text books; secondly, the Free Book Law; and thirdly, the Township School Law. Since the public generally perceived the three laws as one, the Township Law consequently had to carry whatever criticism was aimed at the other two. The Committee's report indicated 118 out of 159 presidents of boards of education received the Township Law favorably, with 49 Board Presidents in opposition (some even suggesting repeal). Some larger townships recommended the boards be increased so that each school district might send a representative, while smaller districts recommended their board be reduced to five members. The report concluded, "The township law must prevail, for behind this system stands the best educational thought of the country, upholding and defending it." It further noted no state where this system had been initiated had returned to the little school district as an educational unit.

Wealthier districts, however, circumvented the intent of the law by using the amended Borough Act to incorporate separate municipalities and school districts. Diagnosing borough fever, the editor of *The Bergen Index* observed how the various townships of Bergen County were "visited by an epidemic which there is no resisting. It attacks a village first as a murmuring complaint; in the latter stages of the attack the case is hopeless, and inevitably results in amputating the affected part from its township connection." Thus the various townships were "Boroughized" to death. The *Index* claimed that "sometimes an eruption of embryo officials mark the disease through its course, at other times a selfish antipathy to being taxed for other people is observed." Supposedly, "a soothing effect" generally followed the election of a mayor and other municipal functionaries.

In June 1894, *The Paterson Guardian* correctly noted

that "Bergen is the isolated representative of New Jersey's 21 counties that has gone into the wholesale borough business, and the lawyers look upon it as a good thing." In 1881, Rutherford incorporated as a borough and remained the only municipality of its kind in the county until Ridgely borough was formed in 1892. The Township School Law, however, touched off an epidemic of Borough Fever.

Further impetus was given to many independence movements since the new Township School Law was scheduled to go into effect on July 1, 1894. Election of new township school boards had to be held by August 3, 1894, and the race was on to make the most benefit of the provision that each incorporated borough could be a self-contained school district.

On June 14, 1894, *the Hackensack Republican* noted, "borough mania continues to spread in Bergen County and the possibilities are that it will not be checked in some time." Boroughitis was "assuming the force of rivalry between communities to determine which shall be the big fish and swallow its smaller neighbor, the contest not tending toward a survival of the fittest, however, so much as demonstrating which community has the smartest leaders."

According to *The Paterson Guardian*, some boroughs were incorporated to escape the responsibility of road taxes to be imposed for macadamizing the roads (namely, sections of Midland Township), others sought exclusiveness as a relief from political associations that were objectionable (possibly Democratic Eastwood), while control of a public school influenced local sentiments in one or two cases. Its editor, however, believed that "the most potent cause for the change of government is the increased number of public offices created." Writing at the end of June 1894, the *Guardian's* pundit carefully calculated that, within the span of only six weeks, attempts were made to incorporate "not less than 30 municipalities" from twelve out of the sixteen townships of Bergen County. Since each new borough would have at least eleven offices to fill, this created "220 additional posts for the bosses to hitch their followers to." Adding in new Freeholders to represent each municipality on the county Board and a host of minor appointive positions, the *Guardian's* mathematician came up with a

“list of 250 servants of the people necessary to guide the affairs of these woodchuck boroughs, not including school trustees that each municipality will have to elect when the new school law goes into effect after July 1.” As *The Bergen Index* dryly noted on June 30, 1894: “Counting the boroughs already organized and those in prospect, Bergen county will have at least 300 more public office holders at the close of 1894 than she had at the beginning of the year.” In the end, twenty-eight boroughs and one incorporated village were organized in Bergen County during 1894.

Freeholders-Elect Jacob Van Buskirk of Delford and Edward C. Sarson of Eastwood appeared for the first time at the Board of Chosen Freeholders’ meeting in Hackensack on June 25, 1894.

Friday, June 29, 1894, was the day of decision in Maywood, Riverside and Kensington. In the first reversal to borough mania, however, the proposed Borough of Kensington was stillborn, losing 65 ayes to 73 nays. On June 30, 1894, *The Bergen Index* reported that the “municipal tornado had struck Hasbrouck Heights, Lodi and Little Ferry, Woodridge, Garfield, Leonia, Palisades Park and Hillsdale.

On September 14, 1894 *The Bergen Democrat* reported that a bill was to be introduced at the regular session of the Legislature in January “to amend, if not wipe out of existence altogether, the present Borough act.” Writing on “BERGEN COUNTY POLITICS” and “Incidentally the Borough Craze” in its issue of September 16, 1894, State Senator Winton, editor and publisher of *The Bergen Democrat*, intimated that a bill would be introduced at the regular session of the Legislature in January next “to amend, if not to wipe out of existence altogether, the present Borough act. Bergen County, he noted, was “about the only county in the State, which affords a full and fair exemplification of the mischief which has followed the practical workings under the borough system.” He mused that some borough barely possessed enough population “to fill the numerous offices which pertain to the borough organizations which are within the township limits.” He thought the “Borough craze” might be regarded as a “roaring farce, if not for the fact that these numerous municipal orga-

nizations, each with a dozen office holders, is bound to prove a very expensive luxury in the near future unless abandoned.” The various county Boards of Election, Assessors and Chosen Freeholders had grown to “undreamed of proportions” with taxpayers paying the freight and lawyers reaping the profits. The Board of Chosen Freeholders had risen in numbers from sixteen to twenty-five and its expenses were expected to rise proportionately. Senator Winton believed that the size of this Board needed to be restricted by an act of the Legislature without delay to between five or seven members, thus assuring a large savings and more efficient service. Quoting from an article in the *Evening Post*, Winton agreed that “Home Rule” would unnecessarily inflate the costs of government:

Only a small percentage of the men elected to this responsible public office have any conception of financial matters and less about bridge building, which is one of their chief duties. But they have an idea that they must get as many bridges built and repaired in their own township as possible, and that the more they can pull from the public treasury for this purpose the greater will be their pull when the spring elections recur. The public service and the taxpayers naturally suffer under such a system, which ought to be radically reformed.

Responding to Senator Winton in a letter on “THE BOROUGH CRAZE” published in *The Bergen Democrat* of September 21, 1894, W. H. Martin of Montvale addressed the taxpayers of the county and especially of Washington township on the hidden social costs of Boroughitis, saying:

It would be a roaring farce were it not for the fact that many poor people will suffer to keep up the Mardi Gras tomfoolery. A borough in a wilderness! A mayor, councilmen, assessor, collector and dog catcher in the woods! What preposterous folly; what utter nonsense. Twenty-five Chosen Freeholders, and more in the woods waiting to come in. The taxpayers will, of course, have to pay the freight. A few dollars a year more of taxation to keep up this absurdity will not inconvenience some of us, but there are many in this township who have bought small farms, trusting with prudence, energy and economy to have a little home

for themselves in their declining years. To tax these people for such lunacy is criminal. It means one pair of shoes less for the children, one dress for the wife, and possibly a cheap overcoat for the old man to plod through the snows in Winter. Another phase of the borough craze is the ill-feeling engendered by the different partisans. It is a queer business anyway. But the people, God bless the people, they are all right. It is the chronic office seeker and small bosses that are to blame. Let us, one and all, bring such pressure on our legislators this Winter that they will send the whole business to the place Mr. Ingersoll says is not where it originated and properly belongs. I think it is Bulwer that tells a story about a worthy couple named John and Joan who had lived happily together for many years, until one unlucky day they bought a new bolster. Joan said the bolster was too hard, and John that it was too soft. So, of course, they quarreled. After sulking all day, they agreed to put the bolster between them at night. After they had thus lain apart for a little time, very silent and sullen, John sneezed. "God bless you," says Joan over the bolster. "Did you say 'God bless me'?" asked John; "then here goes the bolster."

I trust, my dear Mr. Winton, that you will continue the good work you have begun, and use your influence with the Legislature of the State of New Jersey to throw out or materially change this borough bolster, which has caused more ill-feeling among neighbors and friends than any Presidential election since the days of Washington.

Owing to the creation and multiplication of boroughs, the number of election districts in Bergen County rose in one year from twenty-nine to forty-three. Boards of election were required to organize their respective districts on October 9, 1894 and proceed with a house-to-house canvass to register the names of all legal voters. On October 1, 1894, the meeting of the Bergen County Board of Chosen Freeholders was attended by three new Freeholders: Elmer E. Williams (Republican) for Hasbrouck Heights, Garret M. Ackerman (Democrat) for Woodcliff, and Garret F. Hering (Democrat) for Montvale. Under advice of counsel, Andrew V. D. Snyder, Freeholder from Ridgewood Township, announced his resignation since he had been nominated as Freeholder candidate from the new Borough of Glen Rock. With twenty-three Chosen Freeholders in atten-

dance, the Board's membership at this meeting was the largest since repeal of the law which years before gave each township two representatives. New Freeholders from Glen Rock, Little Ferry, Midland Park and Montvale were expected to attend the November session.

Bringing its readers "Up To Date" on November 22, 1894, *The Bergen Democrat* counted thirty-four active or successful borough movements: Tenafly, Delford, East Rutherford, Riverside, Eastwood, Park Ridge, Westwood, Maywood, Hasbrouck Heights, Bergenfield, Schraalenburgh, Glen Rock, Cresskill, Woodcliff, Midland Park, Old Tappan, Montvale, Little Ferry, Carlstadt, Saddle River, Upper Saddle River, Allendale, Bogota, Leonia, Woodridge, Englewood Cliffs, Lodi, Palisade (Cliffside) Park, Wallington, Undercliff, Fairview, Teaneck, Ridgewood Village and Englewood. Furthermore, the borough question was being agitated at Highwood, Fairlawn, Garfield and New Bridge.

Twenty-seven Chosen Freeholders met at Hackensack on Monday, December 3, 1894, their number now augmented by the appearance of John D. Miesegaes from the Borough of Little Ferry. The fourteen Democratic Freeholders held a bare majority over the thirteen Republicans.

Commenting upon "THE GIRDLE OF THE YEAR" on December 27, 1894, *The Hackensack Republican* spoke of the closing year's leading incidents, referring to the contest between urban, suburban and rural interests:

The new school law and the borough craze — two features of political policy inextricably interwoven by the failure of divergent opinions to assimilate — have created an unusual degree of discord in several townships; but this is only an illustration in miniature of greater conflicts for supremacy in the highest branches of government. "Whatever is — is best," and in the end our politicians will reach their level, if not through their own wisdom, then by force of the popular will. Meantime our schools are making excellent advancement, keeping well in the position they long since assumed at the head of New Jersey's educational department, in face of the complication of studies that tend to clog the minds of youth.

While Englewood Township was arguing over the departure of Teaneck and Englewood Cliffs, Bergen County Senator William M. Johnson proposed two supplements to the Borough Act. The first supplement provided that all Freeholders elected by boroughs formed out of parts of two or more townships would go out of office on the second Wednesday of May 1895 and thereafter voters in boroughs now electing Freeholders would vote for a Freeholder at the annual spring election for the township in which the majority of the legal voters reside at the time of the passage of this act (and the same rule would apply to borough formed thereafter). In case of either doubt or dispute as to which township shall contain the residence of a majority of legal voters, the borough council or township committee interested might apply to the president judge of the Court of Common Pleas, who would then make a summary inquiry into the matter and his adjudication would be final. Borough votes would be added to those of the township and canvassed the same as the votes of election districts in a township. The second supplement provided that at least one half in value of the taxable real estate in a proposed borough needed to be represented on the petition for an order of election, and where the proposed boroughs to be formed of parts of more than one township, at least one half the taxable real estate from the borough limits in each township must be on the petition. Under the Borough Act then in operation required only one-tenth taxable value to be represented. Bergen County Senator Winton introduced a bill providing that, as of June first, third-class counties should have a Board of Chosen Freeholders composed of nine members. Reacting to these timely proposals, *The Hackensack Republican* noted on February 14, 1895: "The groundhog could not see his shadow, but the woodchuck borough sees the shadow of legislation that it doesn't like."

On January 25, 1895, *The Bergen Democrat* reported that the bill entitled "An Act to regulate the election, organization, powers, obligations and duties of the Boards of Freeholders in third-class counties of this State," recently introduced by the Senator from Bergen County, would limit the number of Freeholders to nine. In response, *The Englewood Press* thought the number of Freeholders should represent the township divisions of the County without regard to boroughs. The Tena-

fly Record agreed that the "the ridiculously large and ever-increasing Board of Freeholders should be permanently reduced to a sensible, working number" but would "be better satisfied if the bill provided for the division of a county into Freeholder districts based on population, or have a Freeholder from each of the fifteen townships of this county." It recognized, however, that "with the present numerous municipalities in the county, each a separate election district, such further divisions may not be practicable." Mr. Zabriskie introduced a Freeholder bill on the line of the suggestion of *The Tenaflly Record*, confining the number of Freeholders to the number of townships existing before the borough movement forced their dismemberment.

Tenaflly, boasting a population of over 1,500 residents, wanted a Chosen Freeholder of its own. During the weeks leading up to the annual spring election, rural politicians were reportedly "hugging store and bar-room stoves, devising ways and means to continue their hold upon the petty offices." On the second Wednesday in May 1895, the terms of the borough Freeholders expired, relieving the congested condition of the meeting room.

## Macadam Roads

According to an article on "Bergen County Roads" in the *New York Evening Post* of January 26, 1894, and re-published in *The Bergen County Democrat* of February 2, 1894:

After more than ten years of patient and persistent endeavor the advocates of good roads in northern New Jersey are witnessing the accomplishment of their mission within twenty miles of New York city, with the added pleasure of watching the steady expansion north and west of a public road policy that has had to contend with stubborn opposition from a sentiment wedded to the obsolete 'mud road' handed down from generation to generation for more than a century. It has been difficult task indeed to wean the average farmer from the entailed privilege of 'working out' his road tax, an obligation which he discharged at his personal convenience, by ploughing a ditch along the highway and throwing the dirt to the centre, where it was "worked" by pass-

ing vehicles. This operation was repeated yearly, the dirt being washed back to the sides with every recurring spell of soft weather.

This condition prevailed in the greater portion of Bergen County until, within the last five years, a strong sentiment in favor of macadamized roads gained a steady foothold. Under a Road Board Act the townships of Englewood, Ridgely and Palisades were enabled to divide their territories into road districts, each district raising its own fund and electing a commissioner to supervise the road work. Under this system the three townships on the eastern side of the county had the greater part of their highways macadamized when, three years ago, the townships in the middle and western border — which had done nothing towards modern road improvements — proposed that the Board of Chosen Freeholders should, under the new state roads laws, adopt certain leading highways as county roads, and bond the county for macadamizing them. This scheme was defeated and the controversy, which led up to its defeat, hastened a general desire for macadamized roads, until to-day there is probably no county in New Jersey with better public thoroughfares than Bergen.

The total amount of road money raised by direct levy and bonding from 1890 to 1893 inclusive amounts to the large sum of \$651,535. The amount of bonded indebtedness directly for macadam included in the above is \$302,000, as follows: Hackensack, \$60,000; Orvil, \$30,000; Ridgewood, \$50,000; Rutherford, \$50,000; Saddle River, \$90,000; Union, \$42,000. Figures show that Bergen County has raised for roads in four years, by direct tax and bonding, more than \$686,500, to which should be added about \$80,000 expended by private parties on public highways in their immediate vicinities.

Midland Township is now agitating a proposition to complete the work of macadamizing its remaining twenty-two miles of roads by bonding for \$75,000. Washington Township is also beginning to talk of bonding, and Franklin alone is indifferent, with the excuse of natural gravel roads.

While the people of Hohokus township, forming the extreme northwestern boundary of Bergen county, have refused to bond, preferring to spend their small annual appropriation in building "mud roads," one section of that township has obtained,

through private enterprise, several miles of the finest roads in the State. These run through and to Mr. Theodore A. Havemeyer's beautiful Mountainside Farm, which is reached from Mahwah and Ramseys stations on the Erie railroad. As an example of the work done by Mr. Havemeyer, it may be said that, in addition to keeping the road from Ramseys in order, he had improved the Mahwah road from its junction with Ramseys road to near Mahwah station, a distance of two and a half miles, at an expense of \$2,500 a mile. This large outlay was necessary to cut down ridges, fill in depressions, and thoroughly macadamize; the grades have been made very easy, and a great part of the road is perfectly level. Mr. Havemeyer found this road improvement necessary to make it possible to handle the great amount of freight carted to and from his farm, where he has more than 300 head of Jersey cattle.

Judge Phelps has also laid out large sums in building private roads through his Teaneck estate, which are open to the public, and in macadamizing public roads. The Judge almost annually stimulates solid road building in Ridgely and Englewood townships by giving a sum equal to that voted by a road district by which means he had Cedar Lane changed from a condition of ruts or mire to a fine roadbed, at a cost of \$1,000 for less than one mile.

### AS A CORRESPONDENT SEES IT.

The people of the township of Midland are still clamoring for good roads but cannot seem to get united upon a plan by which to obtain them. Four years ago they became tired and disgusted with the old system of scraping down the ruts and dumping a load of dirt here and there and then find themselves in hot water because the road master had encroached too far into some sand bank or had ploughed up the lawn in front of a residence. So the committee discarded that system and adopted a plan of raising by taxation the sum of five thousand dollars per year and macadamized as far as they could with that amount, the result of which has been very satisfactory and many miles of good roads can now be found which but a few years ago were almost impassable at certain seasons of the year. Now the question is how shall we get all the roads in the township done. Some say bond the township, while others say double the

year's appropriation. But how about the taxes? If you increase your appropriation from \$5,000 to \$10,000 per year you will just double your road tax. But if you bond you can so arrange the payment of the bonds that there will be no increase in the taxes. The people have been called together at two different times to consult upon the question, the first time to consider bonding for an amount large enough to macadamize about 16 miles of road at a cost of \$48,000. The evening being stormy only a small representation of property holders was present and some of those were dissatisfied because this street or that avenue was left out of the list to be macadamized. In order to satisfy those the second meeting was called, when the number of roads were increased and the amount raised to \$76,000, and in order to try and please everybody an additional \$5,000 was added by a motion made by H. P. Mahlin of Maywood, to enable the committee to complete little ends or necessary places omitted in the regular schedule. Now it seems that this scheme does not give entire satisfaction. Some people claim they were out of town when the first meeting was held and that the second meeting was not properly advertised. The town committee whose sole object it is to comply with the wishes of the people have invited the taxpayers of the township to meet at Friedman's Hall, Cherry Hill, on Tuesday evening, Feb. 6, at 7:30 p. m. to discuss the matter. Let all attend and all be ready to express their views in a friendly and neighborly way."

H. WESTON

In March 1892, the first official act of the new state superintendent of public instruction was to approve boundaries of five school districts in Washington Township. This caused the formation of two new districts out of what had been Districts Nos. 20, 21 and 22. The new districts were: Eastwood No. 68 and Hillsdale Terrace No. 69. It had long been realized that something needed to be done with the Hillsdale and River Vale districts on account of the enrollment of 75 to 90 scholars in each school under one teacher. The large territory of the district made it necessary for some children to walk two miles or more and many parents refused to sub-

mit to this state of affairs any longer. Adam Collignon (District Clerk), Daniel Van Horn and J. G. H. Knoner were appointed as Trustees for Eastwood (also known as Duncantown). Duncantown located between Westwood and River Vale, was named for the Van Dunk family. H. G. Hering (District Clerk), William W. Banta and Gilbert Bell were appointed for Hillsdale Terrace. In April 1892, a portion of Lodi School District, including Maywood, was set off as a new district No. 65.

On Saturday evening, February 25, 1893, citizens of the Oradell school district embracing New Milford (now Oradell) and Peetzburgh (now New Milford) came out in force to a meeting held at the schoolhouse to consider dividing the district. The residents of Peetzburgh had been clamoring for a schoolhouse of their own and no one seriously objected to the plan. Boundaries proved a sticking point as both districts wanted to embrace the water works since the Hackensack Water Company paid substantial taxes on their property and improvements. Oradell residents were not pleased when Peetzburgh captured the water works by vote. About a week later, S184 passed the State Assembly, authorizing boroughs to extend or reduce its territory according to the direction of a majority of voters. Assembly Bill 296, amending and supplementing an 1878 Act for the formation of borough government was signed into law by Governor Werts on March 11, 1893.

In Midland Township, bonding for macadamizing roads was the divisive issue. On November 27, 1893, 150 property owners of Midland Township attended a public meeting at Bogert's Hall in River Edge to further consider the question of bonding the township for macadamizing the public roads. Mr. Breckinridge presided and Mr. Bogert served as secretary. Mr. Fuller, a firm believer in good roads, delivered the principal address and, by report of The Bergen Democrat, nearly every man present wanted the township bonded and, by vote, \$75,000 was recommended as the necessary amount. It only remained for the Township Committee to take the steps required by law. When the said Committee met on December 2, 1893, however, opposition surfaced to

increasing the amount from \$50,000 to \$75,000 dollars and the question remained unresolved. The Midland Township Committee took initial steps toward bonding the township for \$75,000 on December 12, 1893. The Committee and its civil engineer, Leslie Menger, consulted with William M. Johnson, Township Counsel, and the necessary petition was prepared. The law provided that prior to the question being submitted to a vote, property owners possessing realty covering two-thirds of the valuation as fixed by the assessor in the same year had first to sign a petition, then an election followed. On December 15, 1893, the River Edge reporter for *The Bergen Democrat* noted that “people generally are in favor of macadam, and it will undoubtedly be carried.” Citizens of Midland Township met again on January 29, 1894, to consider the question of bonding for the purpose of macadamizing the roads; according to report of *The Bergen Democrat*, a “free discussion” ensued. At the initial meeting held at River Edge, the amount had been fixed at \$50,000, but had increased to \$75,000 at a subsequent meeting. Serious objections to the increase threatened to scuttle the whole bonding scheme. Accordingly, the original figure was substituted and it was “confidently expected that the bonding question is now settled in the affirmative.”

On Tuesday evening, February 6th, taxpayers of Midland Township filled Friedman’s Hall at Cherry Hill to discuss the question of road improvements by means of bonding. Town Clerk Joseph H. Weston called the meeting to order. Honorable Peter Ackerman was made chairman and J. Edgar Waite, secretary. Mr. Ackerman stated “he understood that the purpose of the Town Committee, in its desire to meet the wishes of the majority on the subject of good roads in which every property owner was deeply interested, is to abandon the proposition of bonding for \$75,000; and go back to the original intention of raising \$50,000 for macadamizing the main highways of Midland township.” Accordingly, the number of miles of roads to be worked had to be reduced and engineer Leslie S. Menger read the following list of thoroughfares that the Committee had selected after deliberation, attempting “to give each section of the township a fair proportion of the outlay”:

Road from New Bridge at Cherry Hill to the township line of New Barbadoes. All that part that is

not already macadamized.

Ridgewood Avenue from the Paramus road to the river road.

River Road from Ridgewood Avenue north to the township line.

Dunkerhook Road from Saddle River brook to the Paramus road.

Rochelle Avenue from Essex street north to Passaic street.

Spring Valley road from Passaic Street to Midland Avenue.

Midland Avenue from Saddle River brook east to the river road, except that part between station 74 and the Spring Valley Road.

Paramus Road from Arcola north to the Orvil township line. All that part not already macadamized.

Central Avenue from Maywood Avenue east to the Hackensack Commission line.

And building necessary culverts and drains.

As Mr. Menger explained that the macadam already put down in Midland Township was four inches deep and twelve feet wide, Nathaniel B. Zabriskie of Cherry Hill asked whether it was wise to bond for four-inch macadam. The engineer replied that this depth was common in other townships and in Passaic County. Albert James Bogert asked why the engineer estimated a cost of \$3,000 per mile (57¢ per foot) when Orvil Township was doing similar work for 44¢ per foot. The actual projected cost in Midland Township was to macadamize 15 miles of roads at 47¢ per foot (for a total of \$37,224), the additional cost being engineer’s fees, drains, et cetera. Menger explained that differences in cost were controlled by circumstances such as the use steam or horse roller, the distance that material had to be hauled, et cetera. In Midland Township, especially on Paramus and Spring Valley roads, the crushed stone would have to be hauled a long distance. He hoped that competition might bring the cost down to less than the estimated figure so that additional work might be scheduled. Chairman Ackerman explained that it would be impossible to macadamize the crossroads out of the \$50,000, but that improving the main highways would provide “an outlet to everybody, reducing the trouble and expense of carting heavy loads over soft roads to a minimum.” He placed the cost of



doing all the roads in the township at \$100,000, which he felt was more than the taxpayers could stand to pay. Butcher George F. Fisher loudly demanded a roadbed of macadam thicker than four inches: "Your four inches is no good. I can make as good a road with my soup, better!" As someone had manipulated his folding chair while he was speaking, Mr. Fisher, upon taking his seat "kissed the floor" with a great crash. After this hilarious diversion, Nathaniel B. Zabriskie thought the township had done wonders with its annual appropriation and suggested that, rather than incurring long-term indebtedness through bonding, the annual appropriation be

On February 15, 1894, the Maywood correspondent to *The Hackensack Republican* said, "the people of this town do not take kindly to the schedule of roads to be macadamized, because it does not include Maywood Avenue north of Essex street." Up in Oradell, the local reporter for *The Bergen Democrat* noted stirrings of independence and a shift in mood, saying: "Since the borough question arose, people are losing sight of the question of bonding for macadam." *The Hackensack Republican* flatly stated that "the proposition to bond Midland township for the purpose of macadamizing about fifteen miles of public highways does not meet the approval of certain citizens of New Milford and Oradell, for the reason as we are informed, that the schedule of roads to be worked does not recognize the two communities to the satisfaction of all the inhabitants, and the dissatisfied ones seek relief from what they believe will be onerous taxation by moving for incorporation as a borough." Strong opposition, however, arose from taxpayers within the proposed limits of Delford who look upon incorporation "as a thing hedged about by mysteries", and they feared its hidden costs. Initial steps toward borough incorporation were taken on February 12, 1894, when a meeting of property owners from both Oradell and New Milford in the lecture room at Oradell was "fairly well attended for the weather." Jacob Van Wagoner of New Milford was chosen chairman and J. Edgar Waite, secretary. By all reports, "the sentiment expressed was largely in favor, provided it didn't increase the tax rate to any

considerable extent or that powers vested in the government are not too great." A Committee of Five, chosen to give the matter further examination and report at an adjourned meeting the following evening, included: Jacob Van Wagoner, Hiram Bellis, Stephen Voorhis, Richard W. Cooper and Farnk Barnes. The proposed limits of the borough, if adopted, would include both the villages of Oradell and New Milford. The suggested boundary began at the Hackensack River in a line with Midland avenue, thence run west to Spring Valley road, thence north to Washington township line, thence east to the Flats road, thence south to the new school district line, thence west to the old Newkirk road, thence south to the bridge, thence along the west



SCHOOL HOUSE

School in the Hollow, New Milford

increased to \$10,000 for four or five years. Albert J. Bogert moved that the township raise \$50,000 by bonding for macadamizing the roads designated by Mr. Menger and Peter Zabriskie seconded his motion. The motion was then carried "without a dissenting voice." A large number of leading gentlemen now signed the legal petition requesting the Township Committee to bond for \$50,000. This petition had to be signed by more than one-third of the taxpayers (excluding such as pay a poll tax only) and representing two-thirds of the taxable property in the township. It was hoped that project could begin as soon as the roads were sufficiently settled to work. Under the proposed plan, the annual payment over twenty years would be about \$4,000.

bank of the river to the place of beginning. These lines were subject to change upon further deliberation, but satisfied the legal requirement that a borough encompass two square miles of territory. The Republican duly noted:

“There is an impression that the formation of a borough government will be an especial benefit in relieving its inhabitants from what some believe will be an onerous tax for macadamizing the roads in Midland township

session where at the chief topic was the selection of a name.” The special committee suggested the “Borough of Midland.” There was some protest when the committee’s report was accepted which, to some attending the meeting, implied adoption of the name. Mr. C. H. Storms suggested combining the last syllables of Oradell and New Milford but when called upon to spell it, he could not decide between Delford and Dellford. John G. Webb, who had heard that it was proposed to include River Edge, was on hand to protest. Lastly, the

presiding officers appointed a committee to secure signatures representing one-tenth of the taxable property on their petition and present the same to Judge Van Valen. On February 23rd, a petition with the requisite number of signatures had been presented to Judge Van Valen and signed by him. Almost half (\$15,000) of the taxable property represented on the Delford petition (\$31,000) came from inclusion of the Oradell Land Improvement Company, under the signatures of Elmer Blauvelt, president, and James C. Blauvelt, secretary. He ordered that an election be held in the Oradell lecture room on March 5, 1894. On the same day as the election, proponents scheduled a joint meeting of citizens from Oradell and New Milford to hear lawyer Cornelius W. Berdan discuss the borough incorporation law.

On March 1, 1894, *The Hackensack Republican* observed that the proposition to macadamize the public roads in Midland Township “appears to have produced a peculiar effect upon those residents who live along the River Road section. This includes all the principal villages: Cherry Hill, New Milford, River Edge, Oradell.” The reporter went on to explain:

For years there has been a contest between the River Road and Paramus people for prestige in control of township affairs, with the advantage generally in favor of Paramus. For an unknown reason some of the River Road residents oppose bonding although favoring a large annual tax for making good roads; they say they don’t want to pay double for their roads as will be the case, according to their argument, under bonding in order to escape the macadam tax. New Milford and Oradell are seeking incorporation



Midland School of 1898, Paramus

without any compensating return. It is claimed that the area above designated pays about \$2,400 road tax and gets about \$600 worth of road work, which is unsatisfactory to those who are moving for a borough; they point out that the borough will include the Hackensack Water Works, paying tax on a large assessment, which will make the general tax levy comparatively light.”

Yet two days after the meeting, the petition for borough government in Oradell, conveniently placed in the village post office, had garnered but one signature. On Friday night, February 16th, the committee reported back at a public meeting where they “had a prolonged

as a borough, and now some of their neighbors are agitating a similar movement.

It has leaked out that a quiet agitation is now being fostered to incorporate another borough out of parts of Fairmount, Cherry Hill, River Edge and New Bridge. This idea, if carried out, would give a borough of considerable proportion numerically and would enable aspiring citizens from each place named to gratify the laudable ambition for office.

The leaders in this movement argue that with the license money about \$500, the borough would have but a small sum to raise by taxation for roads; and that this with the other legitimate borough expenses, would come far below the assessment necessary for bond for \$50,000.

A gentleman interested in the new movement thinks it would be a good thing for all the villages named, and that if they start off with a mayor like Justice G. Webb, who would lend character and dignity to the government, there should be no doubt of a beneficial result.

One sentiment of opposition comes from the effort to take in New Bridge, which is out of the township and across the river, but it is argued that the same thing is apparent at Oradell, without the added benefit of about \$500 license money that will go on the roads. The movement is in its infancy, but its backers are energized and it is likely to develop in a few days.

One question that has come up in opposition with the borough movement along the valley of the Hackensack is: Where two or more post offices are included within a borough boundary, will each office retain its present name?"

With the promise of spring in the air, measures were reportedly "on foot looking to the incorporation of River Edge, Cherry Hill, part of New Bridge and Fairmount as a borough." The residents of Fairmount manifested strong and nearly unanimous opposition to the suggestion of including their portion of New Barbadoes Township with River Edge and Cherry Hill within the boundaries of a proposed new borough. The Fairmounters were reportedly "content" with their present arrangement, finding "their taxes are satisfactory" and their roads well maintained. The formation of a new borough government, they felt, would entail additional expenses. It was thought that the time would soon ar-

rive when Fairmount would be advantageously included within the boundaries of the Hackensack Commission (whose northern boundary was then Fairmount Avenue).

On March 2, 1894, The Bergen Democrat noted that "the question of bonding Midland township for macadam, it is argued, has much to do with the proposed change; however that may be, the roads will sooner or later have to be put in proper condition." Between 6:00 a. m. and 7 p. m. on March 5, 1894, the people of Oradell and New Milford voted in the Lecture Room on incorporation of their two towns into a borough to be known as Delford. A portion of Palisade Township, lying east of the Hackensack River, was included within Delford's proposed limits. Naturally, taxpayers generally discussed the question and "from appearances the majority favor the change while, of course, there are those who object to a borough and are content with the present form of township government." In the week leading up to the referendum, considerably more opposition was manifested to Delford's incorporation than had been anticipated and, at the designated polling station, both sides electioneered all day to further their cause and "animated discussions were in order." When the vote was finally counted, borough advocates won 89 to 29.

The election results from Delford did not immediately persuade the residents of River Edge to follow suit and, on March 9, 1894, The Bergen Democrat reported, "the proposed new borough, which is to include River Edge, does not meet with much favor." With the secession of part of its territory in mind, the citizens of Midland Township gathered at Bogert's Hall, River Edge, on March 13, 1894 for their annual election of township officers. The macadam question had not been settled and "appears to have gotten lost in discussion of the borough question." A week after the election, however, the Bergen Democrat reported that the "project for forming a borough government of River Edge, Cherry Hill and Fairmount has fallen through."

At the annual spring election, held March 13, 1894, the 125 voters of Delford were disfranchised. Consequently, Judge Van Valen held that the action creating Delford from parts of three townships was illegal, since

there was no provision in the law that allowed the formation of a borough from more than one township. Delford, therefore, was stillborn. In April 1894, the Legislature debated an act permitting the consolidation of two villages by popular referendum. Consequently, the people of Oradell renewed their effort for borough government “as soon as certain laws have been passed.” By April 26th, *the Hackensack Republican* could report “that legislation is under way that will remove existing obstacles to forming the borough of Delford upon the original lines, and it is believed that this will soon be carried through.”

On June 5, 1894, the mayoral contest in Delford was fought between two Democrats: Richard W. Cooper (on the Citizen’s Ticket) defeated Adolphus Landman in the borough’s first mayoral contest by vote of 82 to 44. Jacob M. Hill, a Democrat, was elected Assessor. Successful Republican candidates were: Jacob Van Buskirk for Freeholder and Peter Van Buskirk for Collector. As noted by the Oradell reporter for *The Bergen Democrat*: “It is plain that the utmost harmony does not prevail at the start of the new government.”

On January 4, 1895, the Delford Borough Council received accepted a petition requesting annexation of the Bart school and J. D. Newkirk properties in Palisade township; G. D. Demarest farm, then owned by the Delford Land Improvement Company, in Harrington township; and the Richard Van Wagener farm in Washington township.

In the first week of January 1895, citizens in what remained of Midland Township voted overwhelmingly to bond the township in the amount of \$30,000 to macadamized the roads.

### **River Edge (Riverside)**

According to *The Bergen Index* of June 9, 1894,

Moving in the wake of the borough procession, the voters of Peetzburg and River Edge are considering incorporation. Citizens of Cherry Hill and New Bridge are also discussing the matter in an informal way. The principal difficulty is how and where to draw the boundary lines satisfactorily. Cherry Hill and part

of River Edge are in Midland. New Bridge is divided by the Englewood and Palisades boundary, and River Edge is also partly in Palisades. The shake-up will alter the political map of the villages of that neighborhood, and finally the townships will be incorporated to death.

Steps to incorporate a Borough of Kensington, including what is now Dumont, but extending westward to the Hackensack River, taking in the Peetzburgh and River Edge (formerly Old Bridge) sections of what is now New Milford, south to Henley Avenue on Friday, June 29, 1894, set off a chain reaction, as *The Hackensack Republican* duly noted:

“River Edge is in labor over the important question [of borough incorporation]. Not so much because River Edge wants to be a borough as for the reason that Peetzburgh [section of New Milford] is holding meetings and squabbling over a borough proposition that includes a part of River Edge. If there is one thing River Edge is thrown into convulsions over it is the thought of having a part of its territory included in a municipality the controlling power of which lies east of the river. Therefore River Edge is awake, its leaders are doing some deep and quick thinking, keeping one eye and a half on the situation in Peetzburgh; and as an outcome we may expect to hear that River Edge will become a borough, electing Squire Webb mayor.

This morning papers have been prepared, and by tonight they will be signed, to form a borough out of River Edge and Cherry Hill, to be known as the borough of Riverside. The boundary will be: North by Delford borough line, east by Hackensack river, south by brook dividing New Barbadoes and Midland townships, west by the course of same brook. It was desired to take in a portion of Palisade Township, east of the river, but Kensington borough had already engulfed that section. Riverside will have water on three sides, and may be known as the marine borough of Bergen, with a navy and fleet collector, port warden, naval officer and all other dignitaries.”

One week later, on June 16, 1894, *The Bergen Index* reported that the necessary steps to form a borough had been taken by Cherry Hill and River Edge, which, upon incorporation, would be known as Riverside. It

claimed, “the contention here is not the matter of electing a freeholder, but the school question.” At Peetzburg, District Clerk Sankter raised the borough question, touching off a movement towards independence in that quarter. A preliminary committee reported at a meeting on June Sixteenth, after which, definite steps were to be taken.

The Republican dryly noted, “The chief reason why Delford, Westwood, Hillsdale and Park Ridge want to become boroughs is that they may avoid what is feared will be heavy macadam tax.” Unfortunately, it was not known whether incorporation implied “a determination on the part of boroughites not to improve roads in their own limits.”

The citizens of River Edge and Cherry Hill voted at Bogert’s Hall, River Edge, upon the question of a borough form of government on Friday, June 29, 1894. On the day of the referendum, the Bergen Democrat expected that the proposed formation of the new borough of Riverside would “undoubtedly be carried.” On July 3rd, The Bergen Index reported:

“The election was held on Friday which cut away territory from Midland township, and formed a separate municipality of the sections of Cherry Hill and that part of River Edge lying west of the Hackensack. This borough will henceforth be known as Riverside. The vote was very light, but very emphatic, 37 favoring the change, to three voting in favor of the old system.”

On Tuesday, July 17, 1894, the following unopposed ticket of Riverside Borough officers was elected without opposition: Mayor John G. Webb; Councilmen: Albert Z. Bogert, Nathaniel Board Zabriskie, James D. Christie, Nicholas R. Voorhis, Frederick H. Crum, D. Anderson Zabriskie; Assessor, John R. Voorhis; Collector, James D. Holdrum; and Commissioners of Appeals, Henry Spatz, Conrad Freidman, Henry Lozier. At their first council meeting, \$400 was approved for road purposes and \$500 for Borough purposes. In September, ordinances creating a Board of Health and prohibiting animals and geese from running at large in the roads was introduced at the Borough Council. The Borough Committee also purchased four boatloads of crushed

stone for use on the public highways. At their October meeting, the majority of the Council voted down the ordinance prohibiting cattle, horses and geese to run at large, thinking the penalties too severe, but approved the Board of Health.

Considerable dissatisfaction was being expressed in the Cherry Hill section of Riverside Borough over the township school law since “the taxpayers do not enjoy paying a school tax in both the old and new boundaries.” The schoolhouse, built in 1890, was within the Fairmount section of New Barbadoes Township.

### **Fairmount (Hackensack)**

In September 1894, the residents of Fairmount planned an application to the Legislature for an extension of the Hackensack Improvement Commission limits to the New Barbadoes Township line, thus including them in what would become the City of Hackensack.

On February 14, 1895, *The Hackensack Republican* reported that Riverside Borough, having no schoolhouse in the Cherry Hill section, initiated discussion on annexing the Fairmount section of New Barbadoes township (which lay outside of the Hackensack Commission limits), thereby securing the school at Cherry Hill (designated No. 4 in New Barbadoes). If annexation failed, the Borough would have to erect another school of its own. The residents of Fairmount, however, immediately sought union with the Hackensack Improvement Commission, hoping to “open the way for macadam, sewers, lights, and all other improvements necessary to enhance the value of property located so convenient to a large town and possessing such fine natural advantages. Accordingly, thirty-nine Fairmount residents and property owners presented a petition to the Hackensack Improvement Commission on February 8, 1895, seeking annexation. Milton Demarest, council to the Commission, was instructed to prepare an act for presentation to the Legislature, embodying the purposes of the petitioners. Senator Winton introduced the bill authorizing the annexation of Fairmount to Hackensack on Monday, February 11, 1895. Fairmount was annexed to Hackensack by the Legislature on March 6, 1895, adding sixty-four voters to the town.

## Westwood

In late April, citizens of Westwood filed a petition with Judge Van Valen seeking a referendum on the formation of a borough, which was also scheduled for May 8. On April 26th, *The Hackensack Republican* noted that the boroughites of Westwood had “carried their scheme through very quietly with the reported purpose of heading off Hillsdale and avoiding opposition that often follows agitation.” Consequently, Hillsdale became “restless under the prestige gained by Westwood, and it is expected that some of its residents will apply to the legislature for a city charter.” According to report of *The Bergen Democrat* on April 27, 1894:

“This project [in Westwood] has been agitated for several years, meetings held and the subject discussed, but no definite action taken. There has been a feeling of dissatisfaction for a long period and people want to break loose from the township. As they paid a large proportion of the taxes levied, they wanted the management and use of their own funds.”

The first borough election of officers in Westwood on May 29, 1894, produced no excitement as but one slate of candidates, known as the Citizens Ticket, was on the ballot. In fact, *The Hackensack Republican* described the election as “the most quiet, orderly expression of public sentiment by ballot held here since blizzard day, 1888 (when nobody could get out to vote).” According to the local correspondent on the *Republican*, the Westwood election apparently differed from the usual fare:

There were no loafers around with whisky bottles protruding from their pockets; no running of floaters into the stable yard to load them with aqua fortis; no bullying and bruising.

The new borough officers were pretty evenly divided between the two parties. With 158 voters in the Borough of Westwood, Isaac D. Bogert, Republican, received 101 votes and became its first Mayor. The vote produced the following outcome: for Mayor, Isaac Bogert; for Councilmen, Walter G. Wray, George E. Youmans, George W. Collignon, John C. Kent, William W. Voorhis, James H. Ackerson; for Assessor, Lewis M. Planck; for Collector, John A. Eckerson; for Commis-

sioners of Appeals, David C. Blauvelt, William H. Post, Levi Bull; money for borough purposes, \$500; road purposes, \$100; dog tax, 50¢, each additional dog, \$1.

## Park Ridge

By April 26th, the *Republican* could report that Park Ridge was “also quivering upon the verge of fame,” explaining:

Nothing since the great original mellow drama has so stirred Park Ridge as has the portentous proposition to give its hills, dales, dells and dingles, its weird wildwood, its Red Rangers of the Pascack, its Spikaboorn Glen where bogies, elves and fairies revel in flitting moonbeams, the Angel Dancers, its everything, yes, to give its everything, even the school house in the hollow, the glory of government as a municipality.

On April 13th, papers were filed for an election on the question of incorporation for the borough of Park Ridge. Forty-five property owners, representing a valuation of \$67,500 out of a total valuation in the proposed borough limits of \$180,000, signed the petition. Park Ridge voters were “stirred by prospect of borough government, thus taking out of Washington township a pretty big slice of territory.” This attempt “revealed considerable opposition on account of the boundaries.” Montvale was part of the school district but was excluded from the proposed borough. Accordingly, it was thought that advocates would have to fight hard to succeed on a referendum scheduled for May 14, 1894, because “old settlers object to a borough and will marshal their forces, while Justice Smith is marshaling the boroughites.” It was further said that Justice Smith “would not refuse the title of mayor.” William B. Smith of Park Ridge, formerly a Colonel of the First Regiment of North Carolina in the Confederate Army, was a book publisher associated with A. S. Barnes & Company. He settled in Bergen County in 1882 and was later engaged in the insurance and real estate business. Park Ridge was later described as “a camp where Punkin-Duster and Commuter brandish weapons at each other, jangling dreadful armor with all the din of horrid conflict.”

On Monday, May 14, 1894, voters at Forresters Hall in

Park Ridge chose borough incorporation by a vote of 95 to 49. The first election of borough officers was set for June 5th.

On June 14, *The Hackensack Republican* reported that the Punkin-Dusters and Commuters of Park Ridge were having a “hot time” as the old and new elements continued to struggle for supremacy. The new comers, called Commuters, had always been worsted in the battles at the polls until March, “when with the aid of the women, they carried the school election against the old-time natives, or Punkin-Dusters.” Having tasted victory, the Commuters started a borough movement, winning two to one:

Then came the grand contention; the pitched battle; the death grip, to determine who should control the borough government. Dr. Henry C. Neer was nominated for mayor by the Punkin-Dusters, opposed by James H. Wield, the bobbin manufacturer, for the Commuters. Meetings secret and public followed in daily succession, with personal controversies acrimonious and all but openly belligerent.

On election day at Banister Hall, all the devices known to sharp political workers were employed to influence the outcome; some men were challenged because their names did not appear on the registry list. It was claimed that the Punkin-Dusters hired additional temporary farm hands to increase their strength and “almost every Punkin-Duster and every Commuter believed that his opponent was bribing the virtuous voters of Park Ridge.” J. B. H. Storms of *The Local* issued a special edition of his paper in interest of the Commuters and the same party freely distributed a circular. The Punkin-Dusters, led by old Tammany Gil Ackerman and Patriarchal Postmaster Warner “plodded along as though treading the furrow — turning neither to right or left, but looking straight ahead and moving with unrelenting steadiness.” Democratic boss Ed Sarson of Eastwood was called in for consultations. Justice Smith’s Citizens Party (or Commuters) Ticket, headed by G. James H. Wield for Mayor, only doubled their vigilance and determination to win. The result was described as a stand-off and the closeness of the final vote did not soothe tempers: James Wield won by one vote (75 to 74). The People’s Borough Party (or

Punkin-Dusters), headed by Dr. Henry Crippen Neer for Mayor, only elected candidates for assessor (John J. Brickell) and one councilman (Francis W, but considered it a victory of sorts, since as anti-boroughites, they had overcome the big majority against them for incorporation. The successful candidates from the Citizens Party included: for Councilmen, James A. Head, John J. Storms, Jacob H. Hall, Theodore G. Volger, J. Leach; for Collector, Isaac D. Herring; for Commissioners of Appeals, John D. Jersey, William Ackerman and John Leach. The Punkin-Dusters, regarding the outcome as something of a victory, celebrated with “fireworks and fire water.” Failing to make a clean sweep, the Commuter leaders decided upon contesting the outcome.

In Park Ridge, the People’s Borough Party, having elected Doctor Neer for Mayor, now believed “there was a conspiracy a foot by the opposition party to overthrow the will of the people as expressed in the late election and swear in James Wield, defeated candidate for Mayor...” To pre-empt any such coup, Doctor Neer and Theodore G. Volger, a newly elected Councilman, took their oath of office on Monday, June 18, 1894.

The election of Henry C. Neer as Mayor, Francis Wheaton for Councilman and John J. Brickell for Assessor in Park Ridge was invalidated by State Supreme Court Judge Jonathan Dixon on Monday, July 9, 1894, when he learned that votes had been collected in a hat rather than in a ballot box, thus violating the Ballot Reform Act. He set August 7th as the date for a new election.

The new election in Park Ridge, scheduled by Judge Dixon, “equaled in bitterness the original election in June.” That entire election would have been invalidated, except that a protest was not made within the statutory limit of twenty days. Both parties nominated their former candidates. Contrary to Judge Dixon’s order, the Borough Clerk did not advertise the election in three local newspapers, choosing only *The Bergen Democrat* and the *Leader*. When the polls opened, Messrs. Leach, Postmaster Warner (People’s Party), Justice Smith, Theodore G. Volger (People’s Party) and his business partner, Mr. Mittag, hotel-keeper Gil Ackerman and other prominent citizens appeared and the trouble began. Mr. Leach challenged a voter who was born in the county and who had resided here all his life. Messrs.

Forbes and Reddich retaliated by charging John Burt, Jr., a lawyer with offices in New York who had allegedly departed Park Ridge, for illegal voting. Burt was arrested and taken before Justice Bell who released him upon bail. Reverend Charles Helliswell had to go to Madison, New Jersey, for his papers before the Election Board allowed him to vote. Dr. Eugene Jehl, the candidate for Councilman, was challenged but permitted to vote without producing his papers. Thus the strife continued all day. The results of the vote were: Mr. Wield (Citizens) defeated Dr. Neer, 77 to 74; Dr. Jehl (Citizens) defeated Francis Wheaton for Councilman, 78 to 73; Robert A. Sibbald (Citizens) defeated John J. Brickell for Assessor, 77 to 74. Of course, it was believed that the losers would contest the outcome.

Discontented landowners in Park Ridge wanted to secede from that borough by a change of its boundaries, but the prevailing wisdom held that the Park Ridge referendum had been legal and therefore the unhappy parties would either have to abide by its consequences or move away.

On January 17, 1895, *The Hackensack Republican* described Park Ridge as “a camp where Punkin-Duster and Commuter brandish weapons at each other, jangling dreadful armor with all the din of horrid conflict.” Justice Smith, boss of the Citizens Party that pushed G. James H. Wield for Mayor, determined to expel Old Man Warner of the People’s Party (also known as “Priam of the Punkin-Dusters”) from the postmastership of Park Ridge, charging him with “offensive partisanship in acting as an election officer and as challenger for the Punkin-Dusters; also, with being incompetent, discourteous and neglecting his duty.” Assessor Robert Sibbald was recommended for the office in affidavits to Washington. The People’s Party nominated Theodore G. Volger, for the position, and his business partner, Mr. Mittag, being the Democratic executive committeeman, they expected to win. Mittag & Volger manufactured typewriter supplies at Park Ridge. Warner claimed that Sibbald wanted the office (which paid about \$550) for his father-in-law.

## Montvale

Citizens of Montvale soon realized that, in creating the Borough of Park Ridge, they had been cut off from their school district and left without a schoolhouse. “A mild form” of borough fever was now active in Montvale, a section omitted in the formation of Park Ridge. Agitators here drew the lines to include a portion of neighboring Orvil Township and thus entitle them to a Freeholder. On August 10, 1894, *The Bergen Democrat* responded to the Montvalians strategy, saying: “By all means, let us have some more ‘freeholders’ and when the Board has attained all its proportions the people will be ready for passage of a law that will wipe out the present system.”

On August 13, 1894, Judge James Van Valen granted an order for organizing the Borough of Montvale, to be bounded south by Park Ridge, north by the New York State line, east by Harrington Township. It included a section of Orvil Township on the west, thus entitling it to representation by a new Freeholder. The election was set for August 30th at the public house of John A. L. Blauvelt. There was “reportedly ‘little or no opposition’ and it was thought the vote would be ‘about all one way.’” realizing that they had been “out-generalled by the Montvalians,” the citizens of Park Ridge suddenly felt “lonely in consequence” of the fact that they had not been foresighted enough to include some portion of a neighboring township within their corporate limits and thus gain Freeholder representation for themselves.

Mayor Wield of Park Ridge assumed the duties of his office and the Park Ridge Borough Council initiated steps to annex a portion of Montvale on August 10th, and accordingly passed a resolution calling for an election on the question to be held September 13th. Unfortunately, the timely acceptance of Montvale’s petition by Judge James Van Valen and the order for its borough referendum to be held August 30th precluded this stratagem. Ironically, Justice Smith of Park Ridge objected to this movement for an independent government in Montvale, but to no avail.

## Maywood

On February 5, 1894, a crowded meeting of about 80 citizens at the Spring Valley school house voted to ac-



cept several lots offered by Gustav Peetz on Maywood Avenue and to move the school of District No. 28 (known as the Spring Valley School) to that location. C. E. Breckenridge, Mayor of Maywood, presided. Edgar D. Howland led the opposition to the move, arguing, "The proposed location was far from the centre of population, on one side of the district, and would compel some of the children to travel a great distance." District No. 28 was divided into three sections; the pupils being located about as follows: Spring Valley, 13; Rochelle Park, 12; Maywood, 28. Mr. Breckenridge, despite having no children of school age, stated his willingness "to pay his share toward securing for the district a modern school with modern accommodations." Mr. H. P. Mehlin noted the lease for the school lot expired in May 1894 and that it was therefore timely to accept Mr. Peetz's offer. After a prolonged and heated discussion, the first two votes of the trustees were tied but on the third ballot, they approved moving the schoolhouse to Maywood Avenue by a majority of one vote.

The residents of Spring Valley refused to outcome of the recent meeting and to "consider the matter settled in favor of building a new school house at Maywood for \$6,000." Instead, a committee composed of representatives from the contending sections of Spring Valley and Maywood, sent a resolution to county superintendent Terhune "recommending that the action by which it was agreed to raise \$6,000 to build a new school house be reconsidered and the bonds declared void; also that the district be divided." Mr. Peetz, however, had been selling lots with the understanding that the new school would be located on Maywood Avenue according to agreement, and he was indignant at the latest turn of events, and the Republican's reporter thought, under the circumstances, "it was possible that legal complications may arise." Soon thereafter, Maywood voters in School District No. 28 assembled at their schoolhouse to act upon the county superintendent's positive response regarding division of the district. Owing to a rapid increase in population, these voters were anxious to build a modern school house in their own neighborhood and a committee suggested placing the boundary line in the center of the road leading from Fairmount to Spring Valley.

According to The Bergen Index of June 9, 1894, Maywood was "also troubled over the school matter, and an application for borough election is expected from that place." The people of Maywood consequently petitioned for a borough of their own to include all that portion of Midland Township bounded east by New Barbadoes, south by the Lodi line, west by the Saddle River and north by the Paramus road, thus encompassing that portion of Maywood lately built up by development (notably by Gustav Peetz). The Midland Township Committee had already contracted for further macadamizing of highways in the vicinity of Cherry Hill, but learning of Maywood's intention to incorporate as a borough, the Committee cancelled the contracts given to F. J. Marley. The stone for the work already lay at Cherry Hill Depot.

On Friday, June 29, 1894, Maywood voters held their special election at the Maywood Clubhouse where borough promoters won with ease; it was said that the new township school law "prompted this election."

## Tenaflly

A referendum held Tuesday, January 23, 1894, successfully concluded a campaign by borough advocates to have Tenaflly secede from Palisade Township. The election was reportedly "an exciting one" and those for and against the question worked hard to persuade voters of the best course to take. When all was said and done, 272 out of 290 eligible voters went to the polls, favoring the change in government by vote of 137 to 130 (five ballots being rejected). On February 3rd, Tenaflly's borough petitioners gathered in the lodge room of Tenaflly Hall to cast an informal vote for the new borough's mayor and council. Nominating H. B. Palmer as their unanimous choice for the mayoralty. On Tuesday, February 6, 1894, the entire Citizens Ticket was elected to office in Tenaflly and H. B. Palmer became its first mayor. The final returns showed, out of 241 votes cast, Palmer received 237; J. H. Browning, 230; J. H. Buckley, 235; G. W. De Mott, 169; F. Colver, 147; P. Richter, 147; S. Ciore, 165. On the opposition ticket, A. H. Westervelt received 75; H. A. Walcott, 96; D. H. Gildersleeve,

87; and L. C. Barthelemy, 91. Messrs. Palmer, Browning and Buckley were listed on both tickets, explaining their high vote totals.

## Boiling Springs becomes East Rutherford

Tenaflly's example was not lost on other disgruntled communities. In 1889, the New Jersey Legislature had cut off the territory between the Erie railroad on the south and old Hoboken road from the newly created Borough of Rutherford to form Boiling Springs Township. The expenditure of road moneys was also a source of discord among different sections of a township. In early December 1893, sixteen residents of Boiling Springs Township issued a call for a public meeting to consider whether it was in their interest to "cut loose from Carlton Hill" by pressing for a change in the form of local government. These separatists believed that "Carlton Hill receives 1/2 road appropriations whilst it paid 1/3."

On February 2, 1894, citizens of Boiling Springs Township assembled at their schoolhouse to hear a special Committee of Ten recommend borough government for the entire township. The people of Boiling Springs township desired to incorporate their entire territory into a borough, but the Carlton Hill section had a number of objectors who asked to have a decisive vote on the question postponed by two weeks; a request granted by borough advocates. Carlton Hill possessed a school, a post office and other advantages of its own and the opposition was backed by Passaic, lying west of the river, which wanted to control the trade of the hill district. Consequently, a counter offer proposed formation of a borough to include Carlton Hill, Passaic Park and Wallington on the riverfront in Bergen County. Others suggested that Carlton Hill form a borough by itself. Yet another citizens' meeting to advance the cause of borough government was held at Boiling Springs on February 9, 1894.

The inhabitants of Boiling Springs Township decided to hold their referendum on borough government on March 6, 1894. The proposed new borough, to be called East Rutherford, was to extend from the Hackensack River to the Passaic River, north to the tracks of the Erie Railroad, being bounded by Rutherford, Carlstadt

and Passaic. Mr. Van Riper, however, believed the proposed borough fell short of the four square miles required by the law. Furthermore, opponents objected to certain signatories on the petition who, they claimed, were not property owners. Judge Van Valen granted a hearing on March 7th and required affidavits on the contested signatures and borough limits.

On March 28, 1894, the question of incorporation as a borough was finally submitted to the citizens of Boiling Spring Township. It was said that residents were "anxious to attain the dignity of a borough and stand on an equal footing with Rutherford." After the boroughites won, 240 to 37, "serenaders marched through town headed with drums and fish horns and the night was made hideous." But the spirit of unanimity and celebration soon vanished. Hoping to eliminate politics from borough affairs, a Committee of Fourteen was chosen to nominate a bipartisan Citizens Ticket. During its primary, Theodore J. Hoster, Democrat, defeated William McKenzie, Republican, for Mayoral nomination by a vote of 102 to 80. Chagrined at the loss, East Rutherford Republicans then nominated their own ticket and Democrats quickly followed their example. At the ensuing election in which 361 ballots were cast, Democrat Theodore G. Hoster claimed victory over McKenzie by a vote of 166 to 162. Twenty-seven ballots, however, were reportedly unaccounted for and a recount was demanded. Accusations of treachery came from all sides.

On Saturday, May 19th, the mayoralty contest in East Rutherford was settled by a special hearing before Judge Jonathan Dixon, Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, presiding over the Bergen County Circuit, held a summary investigation of the election and ruled that a recount showed Republican candidate McKenzie to have been elected Mayor by a majority of nine votes. Theodore Wood, the only Democrat on the Council, was elected by one vote.

## Cresskill

A week later, on February 9, 1894, The Bergen Democrat reported that "Cresskill is beginning to sound the note of revolt against Peetzburgh domination, and the village will probably follow the example of Tenaflly and

leave the Dutch ‘to flock by itself.’ ” Peetzburgh, a section of present-day New Milford, was a suburban tract largely developed by Gustav Peetz and settled by Germans.

Egbert Tallman, James H. Ferdon, A. C. Demarest, D. Atwood, J. P. B. Westervelt, A. T. Ferdon, H. V. Westervelt, J. F. Haring, John Demarest, Edmond Deapon, Sarah E. Ferdon, Catherine E. Westervelt, D. H. Voorhis, Elisabeth H. Worth, William S. Opdyke and Martha E. Lewis, sixteen property owners representing \$26,250 valuation, applied for an order to hold an election to determine whether the borough of Cresskill should be formed. In response, Judge Van Valen ordered the election for May 8 with George F. Allen as clerk, William A. Tallman and Christie Westervelt, inspectors.

Cresskill departed Palisade Township on May 8, 1894. Almost immediately, the “more progressive residents” of Closter expressed their interest in “a form of government which will build up the place.” The borough election was held at Odd Fellows Hall, Westwood, on May eighth.

On Tuesday, June 5, 1894, the first election of borough officers for Cresskill was held at the office of Demarest & Allaire. It resulted as follows: James H. Ferdon, for Mayor; W. A. Tallman, H. V. Westervelt, W. H. Westervelt, Eugene D. Voorhis, B. J. Westervelt and John Ferdon, for Councilmen; A. C. Demarest, for Assessor; Egbert Tallman, for Collector; A. C. Worth, F. W. Schaaf, and J. B. P. Westervelt, for Commissioners of Appeals; appropriation for roads, \$1,500; appropriation for borough purposes, \$500.

## Ridgewood

The boundaries of School District No. 61, Ridgewood, were considerably enlarged in March 1894 by addition of territory from the Midland Park and Ridgewood Grove Districts. In about a year’s time, the Grove District was to be entirely abolished as Ridgewood absorbed that portion lying within the township line while the remaining portion lying in Saddle River Township was to be placed within the Fairlawn School District.

In its issue of September 6, 1894, *The Hackensack Republican* reported the movement to create a borough of Undercliff and East Ridgewood out of parts of Ridgewood, Orvil and Washington townships had been “temporarily baulked” and that consequently two additional Freeholders had died aborning. If the scheme had succeeded, then Ridgewood Township would have been reduced to Ridgewood village and old Bob Lewis’s Spikertown. In response, some of Ridgewood’s citizens determined “to check the crazy borough rush” by calling a meeting for September 4, 1894, to promote incorporation under the Village Act. The necessary papers were completed by lawyer William M. Johnson of Hackensack and submitted to Judge Van Valen on September Fifth. It was felt that the residents would “be found almost or quite unanimous in favor of this movement” to incorporate as a village rather than a borough “as not less than 130 taxpayers, representing \$380,000 of valuation in the village territory” had signed the petition. The total valuation was about one million dollars and the law required taxpayers representing only one-fifth of that amount to sign the petition. Village incorporation would “save the populous portion of the original township from dismemberment by absorption in woodchuck boroughs.” The Republican felt that the loss of their Freeholder would amount to nothing since “it is pretty safe to believe that the creation of freeholders under the baby borough act will be changed next winter.”

The election at Ridgewood Village on Thursday, November 15, 1894, polled 277 votes for village incorporation and 62 against; consequently, the Republican correspondent remarked, “To all intents and purposes Ridgewood township is obliterated.”

## Carlstadt

In April 1894, the Legislature debated an Act permitting the consolidation of two villages by popular referendum. Consequently, a possible consolidation of Carlstadt and New Carlstadt was discussed. Perhaps reacting to the same legislative proposal, the people of Oradell renewed their effort for borough government “as soon as certain laws have been passed.”

Summoned by their school trustees and the village

board of Carlstadt, about one hundred and thirty residents attended a public meeting on Friday, June 1, 1894, to consider the question of incorporation. Theodore Bloscher was elected chairman and Albert Depert, secretary. Speaking in German, Peter Albertine, a school trustee, talked about the probable effect of the new school law upon the Carlstadt district. Speaking to the English element, Professor John Oehler referred to the proposed consolidation of all the school districts in each township and the centralization of their respective indebtedness and obligations. Existing trustees would vacate their offices on July first and then a board of nine trustees would be elected for the joint management of all the township schools. Now Professor Oehler began the litany that drove "Home Rule":

Possibly the outside trustees might object to and decide against German being taught in the Carlstadt schools. Perhaps it may be objected that Carlstadt paid the principal more than the other principals received. Mediocrity would take the place of excellence. To unite in a joint scheme where other schools were deep in debt would be a financial disaster to Carlstadt.

In closing, Professor Oehler asked, "if anyone could offer a stronger objection than they had in the alternative submitting to the obnoxious school law." By forming a borough, "they separated their school district from the remainder of the township and secured the expenditure of local taxation at home. He suggested the limits of the proposed borough be defined by the Carlstadt village lines. He protested that: "This was not a selfish movement but a question of expediency." To avoid technical difficulties, an attorney would need to be hired. When once incorporated, further territory could be annexed when desired. Mr. Hoffman countered with the suggestion that the fire district should define the borough limits. A ballot was then taken to ascertain the sentiments of the crowd; with a total vote of 76, there was only one vote against the proposed change in government. The acting village board, joined by P. Albertine, Herman Foch and John Oehler, composed a special committee to take the necessary steps toward incorporation. Theodore Hoster, ex-mayor of East Rutherford, assisted the committee, having had experience in a similar movement at Boiling Springs. Mayor Luther Shafer was engaged as counsel.

On Wednesday morning, June 27, 1894, polls opened at the Carlstadt schoolhouses; despite publication and distribution of a circular by opponents of the question, 173 voted in favor of incorporation while only 29 were opposed. John Oehler, Carlstadt's champion of boroughism, was so absorbed by his cause on Election Day that he reportedly startled a waiter in a local restaurant when he ordered "a plate of borough."

The question of annexing Windsor to the Borough of Carlstadt was narrowly approved at the polls on September 4, 1894. It was necessary in this case that the people of the borough and those of the territory to be annexed to vote in separate ballot boxes. The vote of Windsor approved annexation, 13 to 11; Carlstadt voters approved the question 77 against 1. The action placed the electric railway car shops and powerhouse within the Borough's limits and consequently deprived the township of a valuable tract for tax assessment.

The residents of the New Village of Carlstadt, having voted to annex their territory to the Carlstadt and form one government, applied to the Carlstadt Borough Council on December 20, 1894 for admission. An election needed to be scheduled in both places to determine the question.

## Leonia

On April 5, 1894, the Republican counted Fort Lee and Leonia among the communities seeking incorporation. A borough election in the last week of April to decide borough incorporation for Coytesville was defeated, 69 to 58. Apparently, there was "much excitement over the matter and charges were made that illegal voters were run in from the [Susquehanna] tunnel."

On July 3, 1894, The Bergen Index noted that the Leonia Improvement Society had authorized a committee to hire "a good speaker opposed to boroughism." Though the citizens of Leonia were reportedly well satisfied with the status quo, still they would tolerate the incorporation of a new borough rather than submit to an alteration of the boundaries of School District #6 in

## Ridgefield Township.

By October 1894, it was thought that the borough movement at Leonia had “fallen through” since the exploratory committee “could not agree on boundaries.” On November 21, 1894, the voters of Leonia, by vote of 64 to 9, expressed disapproval of the incorporation movement. Palisades Park (probably the section now Cliffside Park), adjoining Leonia, was planning its own election on borough incorporation in the near future.

The first borough officers in Leonia were: for Mayor, Cornelius Christie; for Councilmen, Cornelius T. Terhune, Edward Grinslade, J. Vreeland Moore, David G. Beeching; William P. McGraw, and R. J. G. Wood; for Assessor, Cornelius D. Schor; for Commissioners of Appeals, Eugene A. Cortelyou, Stephen M. Gladon and Jasper Westervelt.

## Woodcliff

On May 25th, a local reporter for *The Bergen Democrat* observed that “Woodcliff is left out of the borough limits [of Park Ridge] and, we understand, the people are glad of it.” On July 31, 1894 borough fever struck Woodcliff as about thirty residents met and appointed a committee to decide upon the boundaries of yet another new borough. Their intention was to take in part of Orvil Township, thereby securing a freeholder. Messrs. Stanton and Westervelt were the prime movers behind the Woodcliff initiative.

Judge James M. Van Valen, Presiding Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, ordered a referendum for August 28, 1894, to decide incorporation of the Borough of Woodcliff, encompassing 3.75 square miles, to be held at the former hotel of Peter J. Wortendyke on Old Pascack Road. There was little opposition to seceding from Washington Township and voters approved establishment of a borough, 46 to 16. It was generally conceded that Walter B. Stanton would be the first Mayor of Woodcliff. Mr. Ackerman, a resident of the new borough, vacated his seat as Washington Township Committeeman, leaving but one Township Committeeman and a Clerk to do the Township’s business. Naturally, the government of the remnant of Washing-

ton Township came to a standstill.

The uncontested election at Woodcliff on September 25, 1894, produced the following borough officers: for Freeholder, Garret N. Ackerman; for Mayor, S. Burbage Reed; for Councilmen, F. P. Van Riper, C. A. Felter; J. Ackerman, Martin J. Myers, Frederick F. Wortendyke, Walter Stanton; for Assessor, John F. Wortendyke; for Collector, William English; for Commissioners of Appeals, Peter R. Wortendyke, Abram J. Allen, Abram J. Ackerman. Winners of the Montvale election on September 27th were: for Mayor, Jacob Ter Knile; for Freeholder, Garret F. Hering; for Collector, John J. Demarest; for Assessor, James D. Riper; for Councilmen, William L. Weller, John Male, John A. Johnson, Samuel Barrie, Auguste Avenengo and George Smith; for Commissioners of Appeals, Jerome B. Silsby, Jacob J. Hopper and John J. Jones.

## Eastwood

*The Hackensack Republican* was quick to note, in its issue of May 31, 1894, that “the propose creation of a borough of Eastwood out of a specified section in this vicinity has aroused a sharp sentiment of opposition, and there is some bitterness of feeling.” The Republican correspondent observed:

There is an idea abroad that the township lines have been run in zig-zag circuitousness to take in and exclude voters for partisan purposes: in other words, merely to meet the wishes of the Democratic clique that is hungry for office and sees no other method of gratifying its desires.

The *Bergen Index* also thought that Eastwood’s boundaries were pick-and-choose, stealing a schoolhouse here, but excluding political opponents whenever possible:

A very peculiar feature of the Eastwood contest is the survey on which the dividing line for the new borough has been drawn. One has been taken to include the Midvale school house in the borough limits, but turns and angles, like an Ionian key, cut out the residences of colored people, so that only white people occupy the proposed borough. This boundary

was defined by Edward Sarson, the Democratic boss. John J. Bogert, a Republican, who has negro tenants, to get even with the opposite party, has made arrangements to move the “nigger” tenement to another corner of his lot. This will enable his tenants to be voters. A large tenement will also be built by Farmer Bogert, as a color line protest against the Democrats.

Posted notices announcing the borough referendum in Eastwood were torn down. A change in the proposed boundary lines was made in the third week of May, so as to include a part of Harrington Township. Consequently, if the question carried, the new Borough of Eastwood would be allowed a Freeholder (as was Delford, which also included portions of two townships). The first election of officials for the borough of Eastwood, held Tuesday, June 26, 1894, resulted in the selection of an all-Democratic ticket, headed by Mayor Garret H. Herring.

On June 8, 1894, The Bergen Democrat published the following partisan report on the disputed referendum at Eastwood:

**HOT CONTEST AT BOROUGH ELECTION — WAS INTIMIDATION RESORTED TO!** Following in the wake of Westwood, part of Eastwood determined by vote of 56 to 23 to incorporate under the amended borough law, which, taking part of Harrington Township, gives Eastwood a representative on the Board of Freeholders. The election did not pass quietly; it is strongly a Democratic section, and the Republicans in it, numbering but 12, made a desperate fight; even parties outside the borough took a hand in the fray. John Heck [of Westwood] made himself especially officious, and carried his opposition beyond the bounds of safety, if affidavits be true, and they are corroborated by responsible citizens. Heck appeared at the polls early Tuesday morning [June 5, 1894] and was exceedingly loud in opposition, though a non-resident. He was arrested and put under bond in the sum of \$600 and W. W. Banta became his surety.

The Bergen Index said that the vote went for creating Bergen County’s ninth borough “with a majority of 19 out of a total vote of 95.” This newspaper was more exact in its description of Heck’s fury. John Heck of Eastwood,

an active worker in Methodist societies, was suffering “from his over-zealousness and the indiscreet means he used to oppose the borough formation, in Tuesday’s election, at Eastwood.” The circuitous and highly political boundary of the new borough “excluded the house of John Heck and also several other staunch Republicans.” Incensed and bitter, “it is said that he threatened three hotelkeepers with a revocation of their licenses if they dared to vote for incorporation.” He threatened to press charges for alleged violations of the liquor laws if they voted or worked at the polls for incorporation. On complaint of Blauvelt Post, he was arrested and brought before Justice W. B. Smith of Park Ridge.

Since the Democrats were in the ascendancy at Eastwood, it was undoubted that a Democratic Freeholder would be elected from that place. The Republicans had worked hard to secure a majority of the Board of Chosen Freeholders, electing a Republican, Jacob Van Buskirk, from the new Borough of Delford. The Democrat from Eastwood would balance the Republican from Delford “so that when the Freeholders meet in July they will be stronger by two votes, but the party standing will be the same.” Such considerations certainly figured in Eastwood’s strange and timely birth. Furthermore, it was a “sore grievance of the townships” that the boroughs, “out of all proportionate representation, will have control of the Democratic county conventions.” By careful calculation, Democratic Party workers understood that Washington township with three boroughs would send twelve delegates whereas Hackensack with more voters than the entire township of Washington, would send only five delegates. Thus control of the party was unfairly gathered into the hands of the rural Democratic boss, Edward Sarson. Democrats unhappy with this distortion presently suggested that each township or borough be entitled to send a delegate for every hundred voters. Such an equitable plan had already been adopted and placed into satisfactory operation by the Republicans.

## Shadyside

On June 4, 1894, the borough movement in Shadyside was “ploughed under by a majority of 32 [votes]...”

## Englewood

Of timely significance, the State Supreme Court decided the Englewood Road Board Case (William O. Allison vs. Clinton H. Blake), ruling in June 1894 that women were debarred from voting in the state of New Jersey. In April 1893, a road board election was held in District No. 1, Englewood, and Clinton H. Blake was declared the winner by a majority of sixteen votes, twenty of his supporters being women, who were supposed to have the right to vote at such an election if they were property owners. Mr. Allison contended that women had no right to vote and rested his case upon this claim, although there were questions regarding illegal male voters and a declaration by Mr. Allison that twenty non-resident freeholders were not allowed to vote for him while seventeen non-resident freeholders were allowed to vote for Mr. Blake. The Supreme Court declared Blake's election illegal because women had no right to vote under the constitution of the State of New Jersey.

## Kensington, Schraalenburgh, Dumont

Schraalenburgh wanted to become a borough, an act that would require including a part of Bergen Fields. Consequently, the latter community "hustled itself" and secured its own incorporation by vote on June 25th. Consequently, the remaining Schraalenburghers were asked to vote at Andrew Stroh's meat market in Schraalenburgh on Friday, June 29, 1894, for or against incorporation of the proposed Borough of Kensington ("thus obliterating another good old native name."), taking in parts of the Townships of Harrington and Palisades. The proposed Borough of Kensington included what is now Dumont, but extending westward to the Hackensack River, taking in the Peetzburch and River Edge (formerly Old Bridge) sections of what is now New Milford, south to Henley Avenue.

Friday, June 29, 1894, was the day of decision in Maywood, Riverside and Kensington. In the first reversal to borough mania, however, the proposed Borough of Kensington was stillborn, losing 65 ayes to 73 nays.

On July 6, 1894, ex-Senator Cornelius S. Cooper re-

newed an application for a new borough, but this time he dropped the name of Kensington and accepted the old name of Schraalenburgh. He also had the boundaries of the proposed borough changed, leaving out certain "kickers." Judge Van Valen declined to grant the petition, however, "on the ground of the indefiniteness of the boundary lines."

The election for officers for the new Borough of Schraalenburgh on August 28, 1894, had the following results: Mayor, Dumont Clarke; Councilmen, Garret I. Demarest, John W. Voorhees, Robert C. Dixon, Charles B. Schuyler, William H. Fleet and Newton A. Fuller; Freeholder, Richard D. Van Buskirk; Assessor, David D. Blauvelt; Commissioners of Appeals, Charles H. Fisher, William H. Bell, Julius H. Simpson; Collector, Peter E. Moore; Police Justice, Gilbert I. Germond. The Honorable Cornelius S. Cooper, who ran for Councilman, and Samuel H. Vanderbeck, who ran for Freeholder, were defeated by Democratic voters.

## Bergenfield

On June 8, 1894, residents of Bergenfields, praying for incorporation as a borough filed a petition with Judge Van Valen. An overwhelming majority (83 to 1) approved borough government for Bergenfield on Monday, June 25, 1894.

On Tuesday, July 17, 1894, William P. Tyler was elected Bergenfield's first mayor and Clarence E. Breckenridge was elected Maywood's first mayor. Neither faced any opposition on the ballot.

## Hasbrouck Heights

According to The Bergen Index of June 9, 1894, Hasbrouck Heights was "in the taking stage of the movement" and action was expected to follow. As the new Township School Law was scheduled to go into effect on July 1, 1894, borough advocates were hard at work in Hasbrouck Heights where, according to report in The Bergen Democrat on June 22, 1894:

"The new school law is at the bottom of it: some hold that this law obliges the township generally to assume

the bonded indebtedness now existing upon districts, notably in the villages of Lodi and Little Ferry, while the home school house has little if any debt at all. The argument is gaining ground.”

On Tuesday, June 26, 1894, nearly all the voters of Hasbrouck Heights gathered in Pioneer Hall, in response to a call issued by some of the leading citizens of the town “to discuss the advisability of cutting adrift from the wicked outside world which according to their geographical knowledge includes Lodi and Little Ferry.” The Hackensack Republican thought, “the farmers were particularly hostile to the borough movement, claiming they were the heaviest taxpayers and had not been consulted in reference to issuing the call.” The hall was full by 8:45 P. M. when Henry Lemmermann was elected chairman. He noted that Hasbrouck Heights paid 40% of the taxes raised in Lodi Township, but only 27% of the amount was returned to the town in benefits. He further intimated that “at the present rate of increase in the valuation, the town in the very near future will pay 75 per cent of the taxes in the township, and in order that Hasbrouck Heights shall derive all the benefits of the taxes he advised a change of government.” By request, Mayor Shafer of Rutherford explained the details relating to the advantages of borough government and the powers of local officials. He then compared taxation under the township and borough modes of government. Farmer Henry Gross asked him if it was obligatory for boroughs to establish police and fire departments, to which question Mayor Shafer replied in the negative. Freeholder Van Bussum advised the citizens “to look before they leaped, and started a heated discussion upon the new school law.” Upon a motion made by George H. Ramsden, an informal vote was taken to ascertain the views of those attending which resulted in a two-thirds majority in favor of borough incorporation (46 to 23). In consequence a committee consisting of John Van Bussum, John L. Deane, E. M. Anson, William Fisher, E. E. Brannin, John H. Berdan and Henry Lemmermann was appointed to draft a map and fix the boundary and report at a future meeting.

In Hasbrouck Heights, boroughites proposed to include a portion of Bergen Township with their section of Lodi Township and thus gain another Freeholder. Public meetings on the borough question at Hasbrouck

Heights had been “characterized by bitter personalities” who fought over proposals for the boundaries. In reaction, sentiment against incorporation was growing.

The borough referendum at Hasbrouck Heights on July 31, 1894, was described as “a high old time” that “excited the entire town.” According to The Bergen Democrat, “a Presidential canvass could not have more thoroughly arouse the citizens of Hasbrouck Heights, especially its voting population.” Meetings held prior to the vote “were not of the enthusiastic nature, for the people seemed pretty evenly divided and the discussions were animated; feeling has run high, and it showed itself, too, on election day.” Both side seemed confident of their success and the debate continued throughout the day of decision. Here as elsewhere, “the discourse went so far as to become bitterly personal, and charges and countercharges flew through the air.” As soon as the polls opened, J. L. C. Graves, John Van Bussum and Mr. Briggs hotly disputed the validity of the ballot tickets since “two classes of tickets were supplied — for the borough and against it.” The one ballot was printed on heavy white paper while the other was printed on very thin white paper and this variation in the weight of the paper made the ticket “plainly recognizable on the outside, the blame for which is perhaps justly placed on the printer.” According to some objectors, the apparent difference in the ballots violated the Ballot Reform Law:

“True, the voter had the right to change the ballot, but if he wrote on the miserably poor ticket, it would be plainly recognizable to the election officers.”

To add fuel to the fire, a circular was distributed around Hasbrouck Heights on Election Day, alluding to the question of “Home Rule” and expressing “the belief that its people know what its needs are better than Lodi and Little Ferry.” When the polls finally closed at 7:00 p. m., Pioneer hall was crowded with citizens anxious to hear the results. The final vote, announced “amid wild applause,” stood: 72 votes for the borough and 60 against it. Immediately the losers decided to contest the outcome on the ground that it violated the Ballot Reform Act and Supreme Court Judge Jonathan Dixon’s recent rulings.



Hasbrouck Heights braced itself for “another exciting canvass, this time for the election of the first borough officials.” Opponents of incorporation had decided against contesting the outcome of the referendum “although it is claimed that there are abundant grounds for setting it aside.” The first primary took place at Pioneer Hall on August 10th and the following Independent ticket was nominated: for Mayor, Henry Lemmermann; Councilmen, W. S. Lawrence, William J. Alexander, William A. Fisher, Samuel B. Frier, Frank S. Flagg and John Deveau; Commissioners of Appeals, F. Wilhelm, A. Chastney and John Dean; Collector, Henry Reipe; Assessor, John E. Musselmann; Freeholder, Edwin E. Brannin. Mr. Lemmermann, nominated without opposition, had “expended considerable of his private fortune in laying out new avenues and macadamizing them, aside from the erection of numerous residences.” On the following Tuesday, however, opponents were out in force at Pioneer Hall, casting fifty-eight votes for a Citizens Ticket in a primary of their own. John H. Garrison, employed at the Nassau Bank of New York, was unanimously chosen for the Mayoral spot on the ticket. Nominations for Councilmen included: George W. Selleck, S. B. Ferdon, Will D. Crist, R. F. Taggart, J. W. Charlton and Andrew M. McCabe. Nominations to the remainder of the ticket were: Collector, James A. Bell; Assessor, John Van Bussum; Freeholder Elmer E. Williams; Commissioners of Appeals, John H. Berdan, Edgar I. Gott and Henry Kiel.

The Board of Registration for the Borough of Hasbrouck Heights counted 163 voters. The election on September 11, 1894, for borough officers promised to be a “hot one” between the Independent Ticket, headed by Henry Lemmerman, and the Citizens Ticket, headed by John H. Garrison. The progress of Hasbrouck Heights was largely attributed to Mr. Lemmermann’s energy and liberal investment. His opponent in the mayoral contest was Mr. Garrison, an “elderly gentlemen, thoroughly qualified, but comparatively a new comer.” John Van Bussum and his opponent for the Assessor’s job, John Musselman, once political allies and experienced hacks in Lodi township affairs, were now “anxious for each other’s scalp.” When the vote was counted, the Citizens Ticket won handily and the list of voters’ choices comprised: for Mayor, John H. Garrison; for Councilmen, George W. Selleck, S. B. Ferdon, Will D. Crist, R.

F. Taggart, J. W. Charlton, A. M. McCabe; for Assessor, John Van Bussum; for Collector, James S. Bell; for Freeholder E. E. Williams; for Commissioners of Appeals, John H. Berlin, Edgar L. Gott and Henry Kiel.

## Little Ferry

To the south, the people of Little Ferry now stated their desire for a borough and, according to *The Bergen Democrat*, “there seems to be no end of the craze in Bergen County.” The citizens of Little Ferry wanted to include the brickyards east of Sand Hill, running down to the Hackensack River and then to Bellman’s Creek, to a point near the Moonachie road. Proponents argued, “that Little Ferry would have control of taxes raised in this section, where as heretofore Carlstadt has taken the bulk of the funds raised.”

On Friday, June 29, 1894, about sixty citizens of Little Ferry met at the schoolhouse “to settle matters in regard to having a borough all their own.” John Miesegoes provoked hearty laughter when, speaking of the boundary lines, he warned the gathering: “Don’t take in all that brickyard property; why, in ten years the land on the hill will be worth double the brickyard property; I know it, I’ve got it all figured out. Just remember that.” There was great enthusiasm for forming a borough but some controversy followed as to who would pay a lawyer \$75 for securing the proper legal papers. This matter was resolved when leading proponents of boroughism reached into their pockets for contributions.

Near the end of July, Lemuel Lozier undertook to make the necessary survey for the proposed borough of Little Ferry with the understanding that he should follow the boundaries of the school district; he completed his work by August 1. The Little Ferry petition had nearly enough signatures and the people of Moonachie were reportedly anxious to join.

On August 23, 1894, the Republican noted that Little Ferry had its map and its application for an order of election would soon be handed to Judge Van Valen. When the new borough was formed, there would be nothing left of Lodi Township but Lodi village and the Risers. Since Lodi was talking borough, Lodi Township

would finally be reduced to the Risers and the editor concluded that “the swamp angels will have nobody to fight but themselves.”

The election for incorporation of the Borough of Little Ferry, encompassing 1.62 square miles taken from the townships of Lodi and New Barbadoes, was scheduled for Tuesday, September 18, 1894, at Louis Bausbeck’s (formerly Charles Marshall’s) Hotel.

Democrats from the Borough of Little Ferry nominated the following slate of officers: for Freeholder, John D. Miesegeas; for Mayor, P. Mehrhof; for Assessor, Abram woods; for Collector, George Soll; for Councilmen, August Eckel, Jacob Vought, Fred Hartwick, August Erdman, John Eckel and Samuel Hanover; for Commissioners of Appeals, C. Glisman, Peter Mehrhof, and Fred Huber. Little Ferry Republicans nominated Postmaster James Pickens for Mayor, John D. Miesegeas for Freeholder, and Irving Pickens for Collector.

## Wood-Ridge

According to *The Bergen Democrat* of June 19, 1894, borough fever had also struck Woodridge, “but the intention is not to form an independent government.” Citizens of Woodridge apparently hoped “to annex jointly with New Carlstadt and become part of the borough just created which would make it one of the largest in the county.”

On October 26, 1894, borough sentiment in Woodridge was reportedly increasing. On Wednesday, December 5, 1894, a portion of Bergen Township became the Borough of Woodridge by a vote of 56 to 40. The contest was a hot one in which non-residents took an active part and wagons brought voters to the polls. At a previous election, the boroughites had been defeated by a majority of eight votes; consequently the borough lines were changed and another election order brought success.

Two slates of candidates were placed on the ballot for the first borough election at Woodridge, scheduled for January 8, 1895. One slate had Joseph Smith for Mayor; Joseph Young for Assessor; E. H. Pirovanni for Collector; Fray Fritsch, Albert Gramlich, E. M. Blanchard,

Henry Brinckerhoff, Mullenay and Ostroskie for Councilmen. The opposing slate comprised David I. Anderson for Mayor; Mr. Emler for Assessor; Martin Klees for Collector; John Adeling, E. M. Krone, Ed Pirovanni, H. Edwards, Randolph and Brodt for Councilmen. About February 1, 1895, adherents of a workingmen’s ticket in Woodridge nominated Mr. Emler for Mayor, John Adeling and Chris Krone for Councilmen.

## Peetzburgh and Palisade Township (New Milford)

The Board of Education representing all that was left of Palisade Township organized at Peetzburgh (now New Milford) on July 28th with John H. Zabriskie of River Edge, president, and Herman C. Seeman, District Clerk. The correspondent for Peetzburgh reported that agitation for a borough had been renewed “and it begins to look as though Peetzburgh will in the near future become a municipality.” Its population would almost be equal to that of Delford.

With the formation of Schraalenburgh Borough, all that remained of Palisade Township were Peetzburgh, New Bridge and a portion of River Edge. On August 17, 1894, the Peetzburgh correspondent for *The Bergen Democrat* noted that agitation for a borough had been renewed and “it begins to look as though Peetzburgh will in the near future become a municipality.” The population of the town was “almost equal to that of the Borough of Delford.”

## Ridgefield Park

An election was held on Monday, June 6, 1892 to determine whether Ridgefield Park should be incorporated as a Village. Some of the largest property owners opposed incorporation, fearing increased taxation, but its advocates held that its adoption would “secure home rule and be a benefit to the people.” Out of 141 votes, 81 approved incorporation while 60 did not. The village limits corresponded with the Ridgefield Park School district.

On August 1, 1894, the people of Ridgefield Park gath-

ered at a public meeting to consider the advisability of changing from an incorporated village to a borough. The local reporter for *The Bergen Democrat* believed that “the new school has much to do with the agitation for a change.”

On September 28, 1894, taxpayers came out in force to an exciting meeting at Town Hall in Ridgefield Park; so much so that the Hall was inadequate to accommodate the crowd. The majority seemed to favor continuance of the present village government, but boroughites engaged them in hot debate and the meeting finally broke up without reaching any conclusion.

Despite strong opposition, however, the borough question at Ridgefield Park was “not quite dead” and citizens favoring the change held private meetings to further the effort.

## Midland Park

The residents of Midland Park had been “quietly at work for the formation of a borough.” They proposed to take a slice from Ridgewood township and thereby gain a Freeholder.

## Hillsdale

Discovering with the secession of Park Ridge and Montvale that only their town and neighboring Etna remained of Washington Township, residents of Hillsdale now decided to “join the procession” and form their own borough government. The dismemberment of the old township had occurred within the space of only three months.

On September 4, 1894, L. R. Van Wagener presided over a meeting at the Manor House in Hillsdale where borough incorporation was discussed and the necessary steps initiated. Messrs. Van Wagener, Bell, Hering, Kinmouth and Van Wagener were appointed to a Committee of Five to confer with local residents and report their findings. It was thought that Hillsdale taxpayers

were “strongly in favor” of a change in government.

In September, the borough movement in Hillsdale still reportedly met “with unanimity of feeling on the part of the people generally.” On November 2, 1894, the Hillsdale correspondent for the *Democrat* thought that the borough movement appeared “to be dead sent at any rate.”

## Etna (Emerson)

A petition seeking incorporation of a Borough of Etna (later Emerson) was circulating in the second week of September. On September 28, 1894, the Etna correspondent for *The Bergen Democrat* speculated, “Consideration of the borough question will resume next month, provided the legislature does not knock out the entire borough system.” Two weeks later, however, the same reporter thought that the borough question at Etna lay “dormant.”

## Midland Park

On August 17, 1894, *The Bergen Democrat* noted that borough talk was “still to the front” in Midland Park with every indication of success, although a petition had circulated that objected “to calling the borough Midland Park.” *The Hackensack Republican* reported the completion of steps necessary for formation of the Borough of Midland Park, with the observation that: “in population it is a more suitable movement than almost any borough enterprise entered into this year.” It supposedly was not another political scheme “merely to avoid the working of roads” since its boundaries, where marked by highways, ran to the center of the road. The vote in favor of incorporation was expected to carry by a large majority.

It was thought that opposition to the borough question in Midland Park would “appear where least expected, and it would be well for leaders of the movement to make a thorough canvass.”

Incorporation of the Borough of Midland Park was approved 112 to 30 on September 4, 1894. The following slate of borough officers for Midland Park were nom-

inated at Columbia Hall on Tuesday, September 11, 1894: for Mayor, William Morrow; for Collector, E. M. Keck; for Assessor, John J. Terhune; for Freeholder, J. R. Carlough; for Commissioners of Appeals, G. A. Harley, J. B. Brokaw and William White; for Councilmen, H. T. Lawrence, John Klopman, Marcus Young, Joe Smith, C. N. Tillotson and G. Klopman. A week later, however, an Independent Ticket for Midland Park was nominated to oppose the regular Ticket.

The Citizens Ticket recently nominated at Midland Park, reportedly “consisted principally of Highlanders.” A week before the election there, an Independent Ticket appeared and “as certain success was predicted, electioneering was not generally done.” The election on October 8, 1894, resulted in victory for the so-called “Holland ticket” whose candidates were elected by majorities of 65 to 100 votes. The first borough officers elected in Midland Park were: for Mayor, William Morrow; for Collector, E. M. Keck; for Assessor, John J. Terhune; for Freeholder, J. R. Carlough; for Constable, C. Van Nimwegan; for Commissioners of Appeals, J. Brokaw, G. Harley and W. White; for Councilmen, H. T. Lawrence, John Klopman, Marcus Young, Tunis Smith, G. Klopman and C. N. Tillotson. On October 9, 1894, the Independent Ticket was elected at Glen Rock: for Mayor, R. T. Snyder; for Councilmen, D. V. Marinus, G. T. Hopper, A. De Baun, Henry Demarest, J. A. Ackerman, A. Marinus and J. J. Terhune; for Freeholder Andrew V. D. Snyder; for Assessor, J. A. Marinus; for Collector, J. B. Vanderbeck; Commissioners of Appeals, Edward Baker, H. D. Alyea and N. D. Hopper.

## Bogota

Borough agitation was also “in active operation” at Bogota, although “an original proposition to come across the river and take in part of Hackensack so as to secure a freeholder has been abandoned, but the second idea, to run Ridgely Park within the lines, will be agitated.” It was thought, “the Parkites may not relish being absorbed, but that doesn’t count.” Abram Godwin Munn and his grandson, Rogers Godwin Munn, were the principal agitators at Bogota.

In the first week of October 1894, the citizens of Bogota

applied for borough incorporation. They originally intended to annex part of New Barbadoes Township and thus secure a Freeholder, but “that has been omitted.” As matters stood, there were only 250 men, women and children in the proposed limits of the Borough of Bogota.

The election for borough incorporation at Bogota was held at the Bogota Water & Light Company on November 14, 1894. The first Borough officers for Bogota, elected January fifteenth, were: for Mayor, F. W. Crane; for Councilmen, Peter Bogert, Jr., A. G. Munn, A. J. Brinkerhoff, P. F. Hopper, E. B. Duvall and Henry McDougall; for Commissioners of Appeals, Peter Roberts, Menzo Davis, James C. Mensir; for Assessor, P. C. Terhune; for Collector, Albert Z. Bogert.

## Glen Rock

A meeting was held August 23, 1894, at the Grove schoolhouse, Ridgewood, “to make a preliminary move for forming the borough of South Ridgewood.” According to the Republican, the Hohokus Creek would become the east line of this “woodchuck municipality,” which would extend west to Rock Avenue, north to Grove Street, and south into Saddle River Township, taking in Fairlawn and Cherry lane. The name was soon changed, however, to Glen Rock.

A primary held at Snyder’s greenhouse on September 11, 1894, nominated the following slate of borough officials: for Mayor, A. V. D. Snyder; for Freeholder, Henry Demarest; for Councilmen, Garret Hopper, David Marinus, Alfred De Baun, Richard Snyder, John Ackerman, John Terhune; for Assessor, J. A. Marinus; for Collector, John Vanderbeck; for Commissioners of Appeals, Edward Barton, Henry Alyea and Nicholas Hopper.

Judge Van Valen ordered an election to decide incorporation of the Borough of Glen Rock, comprising 3.25 square miles, to be held at the greenhouses of Andrew V. D. Snyder, near Ridgewood, on Wednesday, September 12, 1894.

## River Vale

Rivervale was reportedly “talking borough” during the first week of September.

## Old Tappan

According to the Hillsdale reporter for The Bergen Democrat on September 14, 1894: G. H. Hering has completed a map of the proposed borough of Tappan.” Election for incorporation of the Borough of Old Tappan was held at the Old Tappan School House (formerly School District No. 19) on Tuesday, October 16, 1894.

## Allendale

On October 12, 1894, The Bergen Democrat concluded that borough fever had struck Allendale and “will probably result fatally.” The borough vote at Allendale was held in Archers Hall on November 18, 1894.

## Ramsey

In October 1894, the borough question was being “favorably agitated” in Ramsey.

## Upper Saddle River

On November 8, the Republican surmised that the new Borough of Upper Saddle River would be “strongly Democratic” as only sixteen Republicans could be found within its limits. On December 20, 1894, the Republican announced postponement of the borough election in Upper Saddle River “on account of informality in the proceedings.”

## Saddle River

The election to carve Saddle River out of Orvil Township was held at Saddle River Hall on November 19, 1894. On December 18, 1894, thirty ones votes were cast at Saddle River in an uncontested election with the following results: for Mayor, Dr. O’Blenis; for Assessor, A. H. Ackerman; for Collector, W. H. Packer; for Councilmen, G. G. Ackerman, W. W. Packer, A. Z. Winter, J. G. Esley, F. Blackledge and Fred Demarest; for Commissioners of Appeals, J. Woodruff, U. Savore and M.

M. Smith.

## Moonachie

On November 16, 1894, the Democrat declared that the amount of garden truck raised in the Moonachie section of Little Ferry was truly “astonishing.” By their industry, settlers had cleared many acres of wood and brush land, placing it in a high state of cultivation. While the majority of owners were poor people, they had purchased their lots at a low price and then trebled its value by their hard work. The local reporter thought: “What is needed are better roads under a new form of government.”

## Undercliff (Edgewater)

In Ridgefield Township, a movement to form the Borough of Undercliff (became Edgewater in 1899) was making headway, despite the fact that a railroad station and post office along the Erie Railroad, situated between Ridgewood and Hohokus, was already known as Undercliff. On December 5, 1894, the election for a borough government to be known as Undercliff was held at Edgewater, resulting in a majority of 65 in favor of incorporation. This new borough comprised the district under the Palisades from the southerly line of the Dupont property at Edgewater to the northerly line of the lands of the Fort Lee Park & Steamboat Company.

## Lodi

Property owners in Lodi applied for a change in government and an election on borough incorporation was set for December 21, 1894. On that date, the people of Lodi voted at McGrath’s Hall in the village of Lodi, to form a borough: out of 181 votes cast, 163 favored incorporation and 10 opposed it.

## Wallington

With a vote scheduled to form the borough of Lodi, Wallington was “likely to follow suit.”

## Cliffside

Application for a post office at Cliffside, Ridgefield township, was filed in December 1894. On Tuesday, January 15, 1895, Cliffside Park (Palisade Park) voted to become a borough, the project being carried 81 to 13. The new hotel of Walter Berdan of Guttenberg on Palisade Avenue was just then approaching completion.

## Teaneck

According to the Democrat of December 28, 1894, the people of Teaneck had made application for borough incorporation; the Phelps estate would comprise a large part of the proposed borough if the project succeeded.

On December 27, 1894, the Republican thought a considerable number of people would be surprised to learn that an application to hold an election for incorporating the Borough of Teaneck had been made to Judge Van Valen. The editor described the action as “wholly protective in its character, being forced upon the movers by the objectionable features of the ‘woodchuck’ borough craze.” The Phelps estate, comprising a large part of the territory embraced in the limits of the proposed borough, had contributed largely to public roadwork within its borders, to which cause the surrounding neighborhoods had persistently refused to contribute. These same selfish communities now intended to include “as much as possible of this estate and adjacent properties, which, though remote from such communities, is near enough for purposes of taxation.” In a case of self-preservation, therefore, Teaneck acted to prevent its own dismemberment. The proposed boundary limits began at the southwest corner of Englewood township at the Anderson street bridge, then ran north along the Hackensack River to a point 300 feet north at right angles from the center of West Englewood avenue; thence easterly parallel with said avenue and 300 feet therefrom, to the center of the Teaneck road, thence south to the center of West Englewood avenue, then east in a line in substantially the same course as the center of West Englewood Avenue to the center of Lafayette avenue, thence south along the center of said avenue to a point 300 feet north of Railroad avenue, thence west to the Northern Railroad, thence south along the railroad

to the dividing line between Englewood and Ridgefield townships, and following that line south and east to the place of beginning. With such boundaries, the Borough of Teaneck would be “much larger geographically” and possess “more population (over 300)” than several other new boroughs. The signers of the Teaneck petition, representing \$141,425 of the \$246,925 assessed valuation of property embraced in the proposed boundaries, included: Aymar Embury, Charles Kuntze, Charles A. Canavello, the Estate of William Walter Phelps by its executors and trustees, Frank S. DeRonde, John M. Robinson, Sheffield Phelps, A. C. Coe, John J. Phelps, Sophie C. Henderson and George Blanck.

The referendum on Teaneck’s borough movement was held January 14, 1895, at the office of William Bennett on Teaneck Road. Out of 53 votes cast, 46 favored the borough. Englewood village, anxious to preserve the integrity of the old township, certiorated that movement to the Supreme Court. *The Hackensack Republican* warned that “Englewood village cannot ‘hold up’ with physical force those who desire to escape her onerous taxation for centralization, but she can do the next thing possible, which is to give the lawyers an opportunity to earn fees.” Its editor felt that it would be better for the Legislature to “take such action that the anti-disintegrants will be satisfied to furl their banners and let their neighbors depart in peace.” The objections and legal complications held against the formation of Teaneck quickly evaporated, however, when promoters of “greater Englewood” looked at the matter “through different glasses” and “agreed to submit to the departure of Teaneck - not as a borough, but as a new township; they admit that the Teaneck section is a strictly rural community, the interests of the property owners being identical and not in accord with those of a thickly settled municipality such as Englewood...” The new Township of Teaneck embraced what was then known as Road Districts Nos. 4 and 5. The line began about 2,500 feet east of Teaneck Road and within 500 feet of Railroad Avenue; thence it ran east to within 200 feet of Overpeck Canal, thence south on that line to the Ridgefield township line or Cedar Lane Road, thence east to the middle of the Canal, thence south to the middle of the Hackensack and Fort Lee Turnpike, thence west to the westerly boundary of the DeGraw farm, thence north to the north line of George

C. Demarest's farm, thence west to the Hackensack River, thence north to the Palisade township line and east to the beginning point, encompassing about seven square miles. According to *The Hackensack Republican* of January 24, 1895, "the people along Teaneck road were desirous of being part of the new township rather than in the boroughs of Leonia and Bogota with which some of them are now connected, and they were gratified." Papers were quickly prepared and submitted to the Legislature. The editor of the Republican concluded that "this arrangement appears to be a very sensible one, and it will relieve Englewood of much territory that would have been a source of concern under the government it proposes to establish." Judge Phelps had expended large sums in building private roads through his Teaneck estate, which he opened to the public, and in macadamizing public roads. The Judge almost annually stimulated road improvement in Ridgefield and Englewood townships "by giving a sum equal to that voted by a road district by which means he had Cedar Lane changed from a condition of ruts or mire to a fine roadbed, at a cost of \$4,000 for less than one mile."

Assemblyman Zabriskie put the bill creating Teaneck Township through the Assembly on Monday, February 18, 1895; Senator Winton pushed it through the State Senate on Tuesday and Governor Wierds signed it into law at once. The first election of Teaneck officials was then scheduled for March 12.

## Englewood

According to the Republican of December 20, 1894, the people of Englewood did not favor incorporation. As they had fine macadamized roads, water, sewers, street lights, they had not as yet been carried away by the borough craze. A threatened dismemberment of their township by the formation of boroughs, however, "will probably compel them, against their wishes, to incorporate."

On January 10, 1895, *The Hackensack Republican* reported a meeting of citizens, held a few days since, at which Englewood decided to start the incorporation movement, appointing the following committee: William Bennett, Clinton H. Blake, E. B. Convers, Donald

Mackay (Dwight Place), Samuel M. Riker, R. H. Rochester and Joseph H. Tillotson. The citizens of Englewood were "greatly exercised over the fact that Teaneck had moved for incorporation, and writers have been trying to show that such a movement will be to the great disadvantage of the ridge, while at the same time it will be an advantage to Englewood to get rid of the territory. As a fact, however, the Englewood writers are proving very clearly that they do not want Teaneck to become a borough because they are anxious to have it form a part of the proposed town of Englewood. The same gentlemen are doing all they can to kill the proposed borough of Englewood Cliffs, in order that the territory embracing the Palisades may be saved to them. Both of these outlying sections are valuable for purposes of taxation. The Englewood Cliffs movement has been taken to the Supreme Court on certiorari." Englewood was to vote on incorporation on Tuesday, February 5, 1895.

## Englewood Cliffs

Owing to what *The Hackensack Republican* called "'Township Pride' — a desire to maintain, unbroken, the lines of the original, simon-pure old township —" the people of Englewood fought against a movement to form a borough out of that portion of Englewood township fronting the Hudson River, running west about a half mile from the edge of the Palisades, from the Ridgefield township line north to the Palisade township line. Incorporation of this borough, named Englewood Cliffs, was approved by residents, 34 to 1.

The Englewood Improvement Association persuaded residents of the village of Englewood to favor formation of a borough comprising the entire township and accordingly the Township Committee published notice of an election to be held February 5, 1895. To frustrate the "Cliff Dwellers," promoters of the township incorporation removed their borough proceedings the State Supreme Court on certiorari, a hearing being scheduled for February 5th. In response, citizens of Englewood Cliffs claimed that Englewood wanted to retain their section "only for purposes of taxation." They submitted figures showing that, despite paying many thousands of dollars in taxes for improvement, they received not a dollar's worth of benefits, whereas Englewood village acquired good streets, lights, water, sewers, police

and other public amenities. As a retaliatory measure, Englewood Cliff certioraried the Englewood borough movement to the Supreme Court.

The Englewood Township Committee gave notice of its proposed borough election to be held March 5, 1895.