

PROCEEDINGS OF COMMON COUNCIL.

REGULAR SESSION—FEBRUARY 6, 1882.

The Common Council of the City of Indianapolis met in the Council Chamber, Monday evening, February 6th, A. D. 1882, at seven o'clock, in regular session.

PRESENT—Hon. Daniel W. Grubbs, Mayor, and *ex officio* President of the Common Council, in the Chair, and Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Dowling, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, Weaver, and Yoke—25.

ABSENT—None.

The Proceedings of the Common Council for the regular session, held January 16th, 1882; for the special session held January 20th, 1882, and for the adjourned session held January 23d, 1882, having been printed, and placed on the desks of the Councilmen, said Journals were approved as published.

COMMUNICATIONS, ETC., FROM THE MAYOR.

His Honor, the Mayor, presented the following report; which was received:

Indianapolis, Ind, Feb. 6th, 1882..

To the Common Council and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—I report collections for the month of January, 1882, as follows:

Policemens' witness fees..	\$157 05
Mayor's fees.....	130 60
Fines.....	3 30
Total	\$290 95

Which amount I have this day paid to the City Treasurer, and have deposited his receipt therefor with the City Clerk.

D. W. GRUBBS, Mayor.

His Honor, the Mayor, presented the following communication; which was received:

Indianapolis, Feb. 6, 1882.

To the Mayor, Common Council and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—In obedience to instructions from the Board of Aldermen, the undersigned have prepared, and herewith present to the Council, an ordinance requiring all persons selling liquors in the city of Indianapolis, under license from the Board of Commissioners, issued under existing laws, to pay a license fee to said city. We have attempted to prepare the same in accordance with the motion of said Board, and to conform to existing laws.

Respectfully,

D. W. GRUBBS, Mayor.

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney.

The following entitled ordinance, presented with the foregoing communication, was read the first time:

G. O. 11, 1882—An Ordinance requiring every person selling spiritous, vinous or malt liquors, in the city of Indianapolis, under a license from the Board of Commissioners of Marion county, Indiana, to also first procure a license so to do from said city; providing penalties for violations of this ordinance, and containing other provisions properly connected with the issuing of such licenses.

REPORTS, ETC., FROM CITY OFFICERS.

The City Civil Engineer submitted the following report; which was received, the contracts concurred in, and the bonds approved:

To the Mayor, Common Council, and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—I herewith report the following contracts and bonds:

Contract and bond of Aneshaensel & Strong, for erecting lamp-posts, lamps and fixtures complete to burn gas, except the service pipes, on Morris street, between Meridian street and Dakota street. Bond, \$200.00; surety, Adolph Scherrer.

Contract and bond of Aneshaensel & Strong, for erecting lamp-posts, lamps and fixtures complete to burn gas, except the service pipes, on California street, between Indiana avenue and First street. Bond, \$100.00; surety, Adolph Scherrer.

Respectfully submitted,

S. H. SHEARER, City Civil Engineer.

The City Clerk submitted the following report:

To the Mayor, Common Council and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—I herewith report the following entitled affidavits, now on file in my office, for the collection of street assessments by precept, to-wit:

Francis J. Blume vs. Walter B. Brown, for.....	\$12 00
Francis J. Blume vs. Julia B. Isgrigg, for.....	12 00
Francis J. Blume vs. Charles H. Hayden, for.....	12 00
Francis J. Blume vs. William and Isaac Veigel, for.....	12 00
Francis J. Blume vs. Frederick Donner, for.....	12 00
Francis J. Blume vs. Frederick Donner, for....	12 00
Francis J. Blume vs. Frederick Donner, for.....	12 00

Francis J. Blume vs. William W. Winslow, for.....	12 00
Francis J. Blume vs. William W. Winslow, for.....	12 00
Francis J. Blume vs. Benjamin M. Gregory, for.....	12 00
Fred. Gansberg vs Eliza J. and James E. Hinton, for.....	13 57
Henry C. Roney vs. Mary E. Beckett, for.....	13 50
Henry C. Roney vs. Thomas J. Breedlove, for.....	10 90

And recommend you order the precepts to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Jos. T. MAGNER, City Clerk.

On motion, the above report was concurred in, and the precepts ordered to issue by the following vote :

AYES, 16—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cowie, Coy, Fultz, Harrold, Knodel, Koller, Morrison, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Ward, and Yoke.

NAYS, 1—viz. Councilman Thalman.

The City Clerk submitted the following report; which was referred to the Finance Committee :

To the Mayor, Common Council and Board of Aldermen :

Gentlemen:—I herewith submit an itemized statement showing the amount of orders drawn on the city treasury during the month of January, 1882, viz :

Board of Health.....	\$ 469 33
Bridges.....	99 89
City Assessor's Department.....	128 25
City Civil Engineer's Department.....	127 70
City Dispensary.....	277 07
City Hall.....	607 13
City Hospital and Branch.....	1,195 52
Cisterns.....	466 82
Fire Department.....	5,402 77
Fountains.....	23 80
Garfield Park.....	2 75
Gas.....	5,298 73
Incidentals.....	64 50
Insurance.....	62 50
Judgments and costs.....	12 80
Market-Masters' Fees.....	149 85
Parks.....	114 55
Police.....	4,180 00
Printing.....	580 32
Salary.....	5,180 75
Station Houses.....	111 06
Street Improvements.....	4,048 43
Street Openings and Vacations.....	25 00
Street signs.....	594 30
Street Repairs.....	1,349 91
Taxes refunded.....	243 72
	<hr/>
	<u>\$ 30,817 45</u>

Respectfully submitted,

Jos. T. MAGNER, City Clerk.

The City Treasurer submitted the following report; which was referred to the Finance Committee:

Report of Isaac N. Pattison, City Treasurer, for the month of January, 1882.

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand as per last report, Jan. 1, 1882.....	\$130,331 85
From auction licenses.....	10 00
From dog licenses.....	3 00
From dray licenses.....	2 70
From Clinic tickets (City Hospital and branch).....	36 00
From coal licenses.....	6 00
From express licenses.....	7 20
From fines and fees.....	331 55
From hack licenses.....	6 00
From hucksters' licenses.....	6 00
From market rents.....	29 00
From market masters' fees.....	270 55
From peddlers' licenses.....	60 00
From promiscuous.....	18 15
From sale of old material, Fire Department.....	169 00
From Taxes current.....	5,241 55
From Taxes delinquent.....	5,292 22
	<u>\$141,820 77</u>

DISBURSEMENTS.

For Board of Health.....	\$ 469 33
For Bridges.....	99 89
For City Assessor's Department.....	128 25
For City Civil Engineer's Department.....	132 70
For City Dispensary.....	277 07
For City Hall.....	162 53
For City Hospital and Branch.....	1,193 16
For Cisterns.....	466 82
For Fire Department.....	3,007 87
For fountains.....	23 80
For gas.....	5,298 73
For Garfield Park.....	2 75
For incidentals.....	64 50
For Insurance.....	62 50
For judgments and costs.....	34 25
For Market-masters' fees.....	149 85
For parks.....	117 20
For Police.....	2,149 00
For printing.....	580 32
For salary.....	943 75
For Station Houses.....	118 81
For street improvements.....	4,049 93
For street openings and vacations.....	25 00
For street repairs.....	1,378 31
For street signs.....	594 30
For taxes refunded.....	450 25
Balance on hand February 1, 1882.....	119,839 90
	<u>\$141,820 77</u>

TOMLINSON ESTATE.

Balance on hand as per last report, January 1st, 1882	\$ 25,961 63
From rents.....	200 00
	<hr/>
	\$ 26,161 63
	<hr/>
Balance on hand, February 1, 1882.....	\$26,161 63
	<hr/>

Respectfully submitted,

I. N. PATTISON, City Treasurer.

To JOSEPH T. MAGNER, City Clerk.

The City Clerk, in behalf of Wm. Hadley, rental agent, submitted the following report; which was referred to the Committee on Public Property:

Indianapolis, Feb. 6th, 1882.

To His Honor, the Mayor, Members of the Common Council, and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—I herewith report collections for the month of December, 1881, and January, 1882, with treasurer's receipt therefor:

Mary Dyer, No. 113, north Illinois street, for Dec and Jan.....	\$ 50 00
Hannah Overman, No 115, north Illinois st., for Dec. and Jan....	50 00
W. H. Mahone, No. 117, north Illinois st., for Oct. and Nov.....	50 00
Sarah Pickard, No. 23, west Ohio st., for Nov. and Dec.....	70 00
E. H. Pritchard, No. 27, west Ohio st., for Dec. and Jan.....	50 00
Paul Sherman, No. 21, Indiana avenue..	30 00
Katie Crosby, (on Waterman ground lease),.....	15 00

\$315 00

Less bill J. H. Compton, for repairs..... 2 78

\$312 22

Less 3½ per cent commission..... 10 92

\$301 30

Respectfully submitted,

• WILLIAM HADLEY, Agent.

The City Attorney and City Civil Engineer submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

Indianapolis, Jan. 23, 1882.

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—The undersigned, City Attorney and City Civil Engineer, to whom was referred the communication of J. L. Spaulding, with instructions to report what means should be adopted for the enforcement of the assessment or estimate against the property referred to therein, beg leave to report that they have carefully investigated the matter referred to them.

The case is a peculiar one. The facts are these: An ordinance was passed, providing for the improvement of the sidewalk on the north side of Maryland street, from West street to Helen street. Helen street only runs to the south side of Maryland street. A thirty foot alley a little beyond Helen street, runs into Maryland street, and in the preparation of the ordinance, was mistaken for a continuation of Helen street north. Edward King owns the ground adjoining the alley in front of which a portion of the improvement was made. He refuses to pay because he thinks he is not legally liable. All the others have paid.

It is clear that the ordinance directing this sidewalk to be built, is void, for uncertainty. It is equally clear, therefore, that Mr King cannot be compelled to pay, under the ordinance, and that there is no lien against his land. It has been suggested that a new ordinance be passed, ordering this particular part of the work done. This would avail nothing to the contractor, in our opinion. The ordinance does not create the lien, but the work done under the ordinance. The work has already been done, and therefore no lien could be created by a new ordinance.

We are of the opinion that the contractor is without legal remedy, and that unless the city sees fit to pay him for this part of the work, he must lose the amount.

Respectfully submitted,

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney.

S. H. SHEARER, City Civil Engineer.

The City Attorney submitted the following report, and the following proposition for compromise; which were referred to the Judiciary Committee and City Attorney:

Indianapolis, Jan. 23, 1882.

To the Mayor, Common Council, and Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—Aegidius Naltner now proposes to receive the sum of \$450.00 in addition to the sums already appropriated, in full settlement of all claims and demands against the city on account of his garbage contract. The \$450.00 claimed is for the month of December. He has given me a written agreement to that effect, signed by himself and two of his bondsmen, with a request that I present the same to your honorable bodies, which I do with this communication. I am informed that the third bondsman is now deceased.

Respectfully submitted,

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney.

To the Honorable Mayor, Board of Aldermen, and Common Council of the City of Indianapolis:

We, the undersigned, hereby release the city of Indianapolis of all claims and rights of every nature whatever, growing out of the contract of Aegidius Naltner with the city of Indianapolis for the removal of slops, garbage, ashes, etc., from the lots of said city. Provided, however, that the said city of Indianapolis pay to said Aegidius Naltner the sum of four hundred and fifty dollars, the amount due for the month ending December 31st, 1881, under said contract.

AEGIDIUS NALTNER,
AUSTIN H. BROWN,
JACKSON LANDERS.

The City Attorney submitted the following opinion; which was received:

To

the Mayor and Common Council:

Indianapolis, Jan. 23d, 1882.

Gentlemen:—There was turned over to me by my predecessor, your request for the City Attorney to report "whether the city has a right to levy a sewer tax over the present ninety cent limit" or not.

Understanding that the current of opinion among the members of this body and the Board of Aldermen, was in conflict with my first impression, I have reserved my opinion thereon till now, in order that I might more thoroughly investigate the question. After a careful investigation of the statutes and the law governing the construction to be given to laws such as are here involved, I am clearly of the opinion that the Council is not limited to the ninety cent levy including a sewer tax under the legislation of last winter, if she sees fit to levy such a sewer tax.

By section 3 of an act approved February 13, 1877, (Acts 1877, p. 15), Common Councils of cities having a voting population of over sixteen thousand, are prohibited from levying a tax for any one year exceeding the aggregate of ninety cents upon the hundred dollars of taxable property, etc. By this, the Legislature intended to and did prohibit the levying of a tax in excess of ninety cents on the one hundred dollars for general purposes, which, at the time, included expenditures for the construction and maintenance of sewers.

But on the 15th day of April, 1881, the Legislature passed two acts in relation to the construction and maintenance of sewers, one special and the other general. (See Acts 1881, pp. 106, 107 and 108). By these acts the city is authorized to construct a special sewer named in the first, and to construct and maintain sewers generally as provided in the second. If the Legislature did not mean, by this latter act, to provide a special revenue over and above the ninety cent levy then authorized, it could have meant nothing at all, for in that ninety cent levy, the Council could have included any amount it saw fit for sewer purposes, and no other legislation was necessary. Courts will not treat statutes as meaningless, if a purpose can be found for their enactment. The legislative *intent* is always sought for. That is the rule by which to construe statutes. It is clear, I think, that the Legislature intended to provide means for the city to pay her part of the cost of the special sewer named in the first act referred to, if she should resolve to construct the same; and that this idea, together with the further idea that the city might desire to construct other sewers, none of which, it must have been clear to their minds, if advised of the facts, could be done without a larger levy than ninety cents, led to the passage of the last act referred to. Impliedly the power is given by these two acts to raise, by taxation, the necessary funds to pay for the work thus authorized. The limitation contained in the act of 1877, does not, in my opinion, apply to any tax that may be levied for the purposes specified in the two acts of 1881, above cited.

I regard the question here passed upon as settled by the recent case of the United States *vs.* New Orleans, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, and reported in 98 U. S. Reports, p. 381.

Respectfully submitted,

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney.

The City Attorney submitted the following report; which was received:

Indianapolis, Jan. 3d, 1882.

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—I have examined G. O. No. 68, 1881, introduced by Mr. Morrison, being an ordinance to prevent injury by fire, as directed by your honorable body, and believing its provisions could not be enforced in its present form, I have exercised the discretion given to me and prepared a new ordinance on the same subject in lieu of it which I hand to His Honor, the Mayor, for introduction, and return herewith the original to the Clerk.

The charter seems to contemplate that the Board of Public Improvements shall have supervision of all matters relating to buildings, and I have therefore provided in the ordinance now submitted, that said Board shall pass upon all the matters therein contemplated. There is no language in the charter *directly* empowering the Board of Public Improvements even, however, to require fire escapes to be provided, but such a power falls *so nearly* within both the letter and spirit of the statute, that I believe the provisions of the ordinance herewith submitted can be enforced in proper cases:

I also report that I have prepared an ordinance making it a misdemeanor for any person to carelessly handle fire arms in the presence or sight of any other person; and also an ordinance requiring safety-gates to be erected and maintained at various railroad crossings, as heretofore directed by your honorable body—both of which I herewith hand to His Honor, the Mayor, for introduction.

Respectfully submitted,

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney.

The ordinance referred to by the foregoing report, was introduced by His Honor, the Mayor, at the adjourned session held January 23d, 1882. (See G. O. 9, 1882, page 1110, *ante.*)

The City Attorney submitted the following report, which was received:

Indianapolis, Feb. 6th, 1882.

To the Mayor, Common Council, and Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—I herewith submit a form of contract between the city and the Water Company, as directed. I have attempted to embody in it all the features expressed in the action of your honorable bodies, as certified to me by the Clerk. Although the action of the Board of Aldermen of January 23d, directing me to incorporate in said contract a certain clause concerning the purity of water to be furnished, has not been concurred in by the Council, I have considered it my duty to include said clause in the form submitted, and present the whole for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney.

The following entitled ordinance, presented with the above report, was read the first time:

G. O. 12, 1882—An Ordinance making and providing for the execution of a contract between the City of Indianapolis and The Indianapolis Water Company.

The following report from the City Attorney was read and received:

Indianapolis, Feb. 6th, 1882.

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—I have examined G. O. No. 1, 1882, concerning the running at large of cows and other animals therein named, referred to me at your last meeting. I have grave doubts as to whether it repeals any part of the ordinance now in force on the same subject, which was the primary purpose of its author. It provides in general terms for the repeal of all ordinances coming in conflict with it. It makes it unlawful for the owner of any cow, bull, steer, or heifer, to allow the same to run at large from 7 o'clock P. M. till 6 o'clock A. M. So does the one now in force, and during the day time also. The one under consideration does not render lawful what is now unlawful, viz., the running at large of cows in the day time, by any express terms, and therefore it is extremely doubtful whether the courts could or would hold that any feature of the old ordinance is repealed by this.

I have prepared an ordinance for the author of this one, which I think clearly expresses his original intentions on the subject, and which it is believed can not admit of two constructions.

I return the ordinance referred to me herewith to the Clerk.

Respectfully,

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney.

The following report from the City Attorney was read and received:

Indianapolis, Feb. 6, 1882.

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—You ask me to report "whether the Council and Board of Aldermen have any jurisdiction in regard to regulating the excessive charges proposed by railroad companies against our business men for switching purposes."

I think not. The Legislature has conferred no such powers upon the Council. Indeed, it is a mooted question as to whether the state has the power by legislative enactment to remedy such an evil as the one complained of. At all events, the Council has no such power at the present time.

Respectfully submitted,

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney.

The following report from the City Attorney and Judiciary Committee, was read and received :

Indianapolis, February 6, 1882.

To the Mayor, Common Council and Board of Aldermen :

Gentlemen:—By a motion of the Board of Aldermen, the City Attorney and Council Judiciary Committee are instructed to report whether the city has the power by ordinance to compel railroad companies, especially the Union Railway Company, to build viaducts over their tracks, for the safe passage of the public, etc.

The statute gives the Council power "to provide by ordinance for the security of citizens and others from the running of trains through any city, and to require railroad corporations to observe the same." See Sec. 53, clause 42, of city charter.

Section 4 of the ordinance granting the Union Railway Co. the right to lay additional tracks, etc., ordained February 28, 1873, provides, among other things, as follows :

"It shall be the duty of said Union Railway Company, and one which they shall be deemed to have assumed and accepted, by proceeding to lay the tracks above mentioned, to use all reasonable and proper precautions to prevent injury or harm to any one within said city, in operating their locomotives and cars upon any track of said company, or over which the said company shall exercise control. * * * It shall also be the duty of said Union Railway Company to make and construct secure, safe and proper crossings at all points where any track or tracks by it owned or controlled, shall cross or intersect any street or alley, and to keep and maintain the same at all times in good, proper and suitable repair. The said crossings to be by said company so constructed and maintained as that the same shall afford citizens and travelers safe, convenient and comfortable passage across said track or tracks."

In most instances, the ordinances granting other railroad companies the right to occupy the streets, have similar provisions to those just quoted. So that the railroad companies not only knew that the law of the State gave the Council power to require them to maintain crossings for the security of the citizens, when they asked permission to lay their tracks along the streets, but they expressly agreed to do so. None of them, however, agreed to construct and maintain *viaducts*, except impliedly. If a reasonably safe protection can be afforded by some less expensive method than by constructing a viaduct, then I do not think the company could be compelled by ordinance or otherwise, to build such an improvement. In other words, the Council cannot arbitrarily pass an ordinance and require a railroad company to construct a viaduct at a particular crossing. It thus resolves itself largely into a question of fact for a court or jury, as to whether that particular kind of a crossing is necessary for the safe passage and security of citizens, or not. Thus, if the Council should pass an ordinance commanding the Union Railway Co. to build a viaduct over its tracks at a given point, and it should refuse to do so, the proper remedy left for the city would be to proceed by mandate to compel it to do so; and the question for the court or jury would then be: Is it necessary for the protection of life, and to afford citizens and travelers safe, convenient and comfortable passage across the tracks of the company at the point in controversy, that a viaduct should be put there? If the evidence should show that it is, then the company would be required to construct it; otherwise, not. Less expensive improvements such as safety gates, would probably answer the purpose in many cases, and would be all that the courts would require maintained; but in cases such as you suggest, viz: on streets "where travel is continually obstructed," if there are such, I have no doubt of the power and ability of the city to require viaducts to be constructed.

Instead of proceeding by mandate, the city could pass an ordinance requiring viaducts built, and have the proper notices served, and if the companies should decline to proceed with the work, the city could do the work and charge the cost to the company; but in cases of this kind, the safer course for the city to pursue,

would be by mandate. In this way, if beaten on the facts, she would lose only the cost of the proceeding; whereas, if she first does the work, she would lose the entire cost of the work.

Respectfully submitted,

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney.

James A. Pritchard,
John W. Fultz,
N. Yoke,
Judiciary Committee.

The following report from the City Attorney was read and received:

Indianapolis, February 6, 1882.

To the Mayor, Common Council, and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—Since the last meeting of the Council, the case of Henry W. Fenneman vs. Mary A. Logan, and others, The City being a nominal defendant, has been disposed of by the Superior Court, the decree entered protecting the rights of the city as far as could be done.

The case was this: Mrs. Logan had given Fenneman a mortgage on a lot in the outskirts of the city. She afterwards platted this and other lots into an addition, taking a few feet off of this lot for a street. This she could not do, of course, to the prejudice of Fenneman; and his mortgage debt remaining unpaid, he foreclosed his mortgage, making the city a party. The city has in no way accepted the dedication of the street attempted to be made by Mrs. Logan, and has expended nothing on it in improvements, and it only exists on paper. The court, however, ordered all of the lot, except these few feet, first sold to pay the plaintiff's claim, which is all the city could ask. I understand the street will be allowed to remain as platted.

The case of John T. Redmond against the city, has also been decided by the General Term of the Superior Court, reversing the judgment of the Special Term, which was in favor of the plaintiff, for \$101.00, and costs.

It will be remembered that this was an action to recover a \$50.00 bounty, with eighteen years interest thereon. Under a resolution of the Common Council, passed December 14, 1863, appropriating \$25,000 for the payment of bounties to all volunteers to fill up the city's quota under the President's call of October, 1863. The six years statute of limitations was pleaded against the plaintiff's claim in special term, but the court held it bad, and gave judgment against the city for the full amount of the bounty offered, and eighteen years interest. An appeal was taken by my predecessor, to the General Term, the case briefed, and otherwise put in shape for decision, but at his request the ruling of the court was withheld to await the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of The County vs. Shipley, which involved the same question. This case was decided last month by the Supreme Court, reversing the judgment of the Circuit Court, and holding the plea of the six years statute of limitations good; thus settling all these old bounty claims against the county and city in their favor. The General Term reversed the judgment of the Special Term on the authority of this decision.

Respectfully submitted,

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney

The Superintendent of the City Dispensary submitted the following report; which was received:

To the Common Council and Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—The following reports of the City Dispensary for the month of January, 1882, are respectfully submitted:

Number of Patients treated at Dispensary	132
Number of Medical cases at Dispensary	60
Number of Surgical cases at Dispensary	57
Number of Disease of Nervous System	3
Number of Disease of Eye and Ear	7

Number of Diseases of the Throat.....	0
Number of Out-door Patients treated.....	117
Number at Station House.....	2
Number at News Boys' Home.....	0
Number of Patients sent to Hospital.....	0
Total number of Patients treated during month.....	968
Total number of Visits made during month.....	328
Total number of Prescriptions filled during month.....	841
Number of Births during month.....	2
Number of Deaths during month.....	2

EXPENDITURES FOR MONTH.

C. A. Ritter, Superintendent.....	\$70 00
H. O. Pantzer, Assistant.....	41 66
F. M. Ferree, Assistant.....	41 66
C. H. Bacon, druggist.....	30 00
Stewart & Barry, drugs.....	73 03
W. N. Allen & Co., vaccine.....	12 00
Johnston & Bennett, repairing coal hods.....	50
Albert Schiffling, furnishing key.....	50
Watson Coal and Mining Co., coal.....	10 15
J. J. Garver, vaccine.....	6 00
Total expenditures for month.....	\$285 50

J. J. GARVER, M. D., Superintendent.

The Superintendent of the City Hospital and Branch, submitted the following report; which was received:

To the Common Council and Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis :

Gentlemen:—The following reports of the City Hospital and Branch, for the month of January, 1882, are respectfully submitted:

	First Week.	Second Week.	Third Week.	Fourth Week.	Three Days.	Monthly Totals.
Number of paid Officers and Employes in Hospital.....	12					
Number of paid Officers and Employes in Branch.....	1					
Number of beds in Hospital.....	100					
Number of beds in Branch.....	10					
No. of adult patients in Hospital at beginning of week.....	67	62	52	47	54	67
No. of infant patients in Hospital at beginning of week.....	8	7	9	8	7	8
No. of adult patients received during week.....	7	6	10	12	1	36
No. of infant patients received or born during week.....	1	2	1	...	1	5
No. of adult patients discharged during week.....	11	16	10	3	3	43
No. of infant patients discharged during week.....	2	...	2	1	...	5
No. of adult patients who died during week.....	1	...	4	1	...	6
No. of infant patients who died during week.....	1	...	1
No. of patients in Branch at beginning of week.....	2	2	2	3	5	2
No. of patients in Branch at end of week.....	2	2	3	4	5	5
No. of adult patients in Hospital and Branch at end of week.....	64	54	50	58	56	56
No. of infant patients in Hospital and Branch at end of week.....	8	8
No. of pay-patients at beginning of week.....
No. of pay-patients at end of week.....
Aggregate number of days of patients in Hospital.....	517	443	402	413	183	1958
Aggregate number of days of patients in Branch.....	14	14	21	23	12	84
Aggregate number of days of subsistence furnished.....	425
Number of prescriptions filled.....	910
Total.....

Total expenditures for month	\$ 1264 54
Aggregate number of days subsistence furnished	2467
Average daily cost of each patient	61+cts.
Average daily cost for patients, officers, and employes.....	51+cts.

WILLIAM N. WISHARD, M. D., Superintendent.

Councilman Bryce moved to suspend the order of business for the purpose of considering the report of the Committee on Streets and Alleys, relative to the vacation of Allen, Leota and Laurel streets.

Which motion was adopted, and the order of business suspended.

Councilman Weaver, in behalf of the Committee on Streets and Alleys, submitted a report, which was referred back to the committee for further consultation, and to report later in the session.

REPORTS, ETC., FROM OFFICIAL BOARDS.

The Fire Board, through Councilman Thalman, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

To the Mayor, Common Council, and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—Your Fire Board, to whom was referred several motions in regard to procuring “gongs” for the Hose Reels and Engines, respectfully report, that we can have them attached to all that are not already supplied, at an expense of about \$150 00. We recommend the Chief Engineer be directed to buy the same and have them attached. A report from committee on insecure buildings was also referred to us, with power to act, recommending prompt action be taken to make secure No. 7 Engine House, we have contracted to have the work done for \$220 00.

Respectfully submitted,

Isaac Thalman,
Phil Reichwein,
N. Yoke,

Fire Board.

The Police Board, through Councilman Pearson, submitted the following report; which was received:

Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 6, 1882.

To the Common Council and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—In compliance with a motion passed by your bodies on the 23d day of January, 1882, we appointed twenty extra policemen to serve for the term of two weeks. The term of service of these men will expire to-night. As required by said motion we now report, as was reported by this board last spring, that the police force of this city is not as large as it should be. While the present force is very efficient, still the territory embraced in each beat is so large that it cannot be thoroughly patrolled by the number constituting the regular force. Believing that the best interests of the citizens demand an increase of the force, we therefore recommend such increase, not to exceed twenty additional patrolmen.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Pearson,
H. B. Stout,
Edgar Brundage,
Police Board.

The Board of Public Improvements and Street Commissioner, through Councilman Dean, submitted the following report; which was received:

To the Mayor, Common Council, and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—We herewith report expenditures of the Street Repairs Department for the month of January, 1882, together with total amount for the fiscal year to February 1st, 1882:

Pay-rolls.....	\$1,150 87
Blacksmithing.....	26 70
Gravel.....	41 60
Hardware.....	10 66
Lumber.....	120 08
Total expenditures for January, 1882	\$1,349 91
Total expenditures per last report.....	18,900 70
Total expenditures to February 1st, 1882.....	<u>\$20,250 61</u>

Respectfully submitted,

Edward H. Dean,
Wm. H. Morrison,
John R. Cowie,
Board of Public Improvements.

L. A. FULMER, Street Commissioner.

The Board of Health submitted the following report; which was received:

Report of Deaths in the City of Indianapolis, from the 15th day of January, 1882, to the 31st day of January, 1882, inclusive.

Under 1 year.....	14
1 to 2 years.....	3
2 to 5 ".....	5
5 to 10 ".....	2
10 to 15 ".....	2
15 to 20 ".....	6
20 to 25 ".....	10
25 to 30 ".....	4
30 to 40 ".....	6
40 to 50 ".....	4
50 to 60 ".....	3
60 to 70 ".....	2
70 to 80 ".....	1
80 to 90 ".....	2
90 to 100 ".....	1
100 and upwards.....	0
Unknown.....	0
Total.....	<u>65</u>

Respectfully,

J. A. SUTCLIFF, M. D., President.
E. S. ELDRR, M. D., Secretary,
M. T. RUNNELS,

Board of Health.

The Board of Health submitted the following report :

Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 6th, 1882.

To the Hon. Mayor and Members of the Common Council :

Gentlemen:—I desire to call your attention to some facts and matters relating to the occurrence of cases of small-pox in our city :

1st. There are no parties who are employed to remove small-pox patients to the Pest House, and the Board of Health has experienced a good deal of trouble in securing the removal of that class of patients.

2d. There are no parties employed to remove infected articles from houses where small-pox cases occur, nor to destroy the infected articles, disinfect rooms, and discharge such other measures as are demanded to protect the public against a spread of the disease.

3d. There is no physician designated to attend cases of small pox occurring throughout the city, and the fact that an attendance upon cases of small-pox debars a physician from other practice renders it difficult to procure medical attendance upon patients affected with the disease.

4th. There is no provision made for the payment of materials used in disinfection, nor for bedding, clothing, and other articles that are infected and should be destroyed.

I would respectfully recommend that some definite plan be ordered by your body which will relieve the Health office of much embarrassment, and I take the liberty to suggest that the Superintendent of the City Hospital be authorized to procure a wagon, and have some one in his employ take charge of the same, and attend to the removal of patients and destruction of infected articles, and the disinfection of houses. Such a method would place it under the control of competent authority.

Enclosed please find bill of expenses incurred by the Board so far, and a list of articles belonging to Henry Edwards, colored, which were destroyed.

Very truly yours,

E. S. ELDER, M. D.,
Secretary Board of Health.

Councilman Thalman moved that the above report be received, and that the Hospital Board be authorized to contract for conveying smallpox patients to the Pest House.

Which motion was adopted.

The following claims, submitted with the above report, were referred to the Committee on Accounts and Claims :

Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 6th, 1882.

THE CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS,

Dr.

To Charles G. Haag,

To removing and destroying the bedding and clothing from the house of Henry Edwards, and for one suit of clothing..... \$13 00

To removing and destroying the beds and bedding from the house of A. Baur, and one suit of clothes..... 15 00

\$28 00

C. G. HAAG.

I approve the above bill, and recommend its payment.

E. S. ELDER, M. D.,
Sec'y. of Board of Health.

Indianapolis, Ind., Feb 6th, 1882.

CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS,

To E. S. Elder, M. D., Sec'y. of Board of Health,

Dr.

To disinfecting material used in Henry Edwards' house.....	\$1 00
To cash paid for using same.....	1 00
To materials used in disinfecting A. Baur's house.....	1 00

\$3 00

E. S. ELDER, M. D.

Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 6th, 1882.

CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS,

To Henry Edwards,

Dr.

For goods destroyed, as per invoice of Board of Health, total.....	\$35 00
--	---------

HENRY EDWARDS.

I respectfully recommend that the above be paid, as the articles were worth more than the money asked.

E. S. ELDER, M. D.,
Sec'y. of Board of Health.

REPORTS, ETC., FROM STANDING COMMITTEES.

Councilman Weaver, in behalf of the Committee on Streets and Alleys, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Streets and Alleys, together with a special committee of three, to whom was referred the petition of John S. Spann et al, for vacation of certain streets and alleys in Allen, Root & English's addition, to enable the C., I., St. L. & C. R. R. Co. to erect their shops in said portion of the city, have examined said locality, and recommend said vacation be made, and that the accompanying resolution herewith submitted be adopted.

Respectfully submitted,

Edgar Brundage,	George Weaver,
Wm. H. Morrison,	B. W. Cole,
N. Yoke,	Simeon Coy,
Special Committee.	Committee on Streets and Alleys.

Your committee also submit the following dispatch as part of their report:

Cincinnati, O., Feb. 6, 1882.

To J. W. Sherwood, Indianapolis:

If Grant street is vacated by the city, we will commence building our shops inside of six months, and finish them within two years. Shops to be for all the road.
M. E. INGALLS.

The following resolution, presented with the above report, was read:

Resolved, That the matter of vacating certain streets and alleys within the boundaries herein mentioned, viz.: Commencing at the intersection of the north line of the first alley north of Deloss street, running east and west along the north line of a part of Allen, Root and English's addition, and old donation line; thence along the old donation line in a northerly direction 525 feet, more or less, to the main track of the C., I., St. L. & C. R. R. Co.; thence along said main track, in an easterly direction, to the center of Allen street; thence westerly along the center of Allen street, to the center of Laurel street; thence in a southerly direction, along the center of Laurel street, to the north line of the alley first above mentioned; thence along the north line of said alley in a westerly direction 1690 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning—being all of that portion of the above described

lands east of Grant street, in Allen, Root and English's addition, being Leota street, Allen street, and all the alleys within said boundries, and so much of Laurel or Spruce street as lies between its intersection with the alley heretofore described and the main tracks of said railway company, together with the petition and plat presented in such case; be referred to the City Commissioners, with instructions to assess benefits and damages to any person or persons thereby benefited or damaged; the said Commissioners are hereby instructed to return as a part of their report, all petitions and notices, and if any property owner immediately on the line of said streets or alleys, who is directly interested therein, shall object to such vacation of said streets and alleys, to make such fact a part of their report; and the City Clerk is hereby directed to issue the proper notices to the Commissioners.

And it was adopted by the following vote:

AYES, 25—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Dowling, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, Weaver and Yoke.

NAYS—None.

The Committee on Bridges, through Councilman Cowie, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Bridges, to whom was referred the bridge over Williard street, would recommend that a bridge be built over Pogue's Run on said Williard street, as a necessary convenience for both citizens and manufactories in that neighborhood.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Cowie,
B. W. Cole,
John W. Fultz,
Committee on Bridges.

The Committee on Finance, through Councilman Pearson, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

Indianapolis, Feb. 6, 1882.

To the Members of the City Council, and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—The Finance Committee would respectfully report that they have examined the books of the City Clerk and City Treasurer for the month of December, 1881, and find them correct according to their reports presented to this body, and recommend the same be adopted.

John R. Pearson,
Isaac Thalman,
E. H. Koller,
Committee on Finance.

The Committee on Finance, through Councilman Pearson, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

To the Mayor, Common Council, and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—Your Finance Committee, to whom was referred the matter concerning the building of the sewer leading from the Reformatory, respectfully report that we have carefully considered the matter, and would recommend against the passage of the ordinance, for the following reasons: The sewer is estimated to cost about \$90,000; of this, the state proposes to pay \$40,00, leaving the city's portion some \$50,000—we are of the opinion that the bulk of the cost should be paid by the state, as it is for her sole benefit that the necessity of the sewer exists. We

would further recommend that the Judiciary Committee and City Attorney be directed to have a bill prepared and presented to the next legislature for passage, which shall provide that the state shall build the sewer at her expense, from the Reformatory to Washington street, at the crossing of Pine. In that case the city would have to build from New Jersey to Pine, at a probable cost of \$25,000. This we would consider a very liberal offer on the part of the city, as it would give the state the benefit of over \$100,000 worth of sewer, (the Washington street and Kentucky avenue sewers,) which must necessarily be kept in repair and good sanitary condition by the city, at a considerable annual expense, from which the state would be entirely relieved.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Pearson,
Isaac Thalman,
E. H. Koller,
B. Ward,
Finance Committee.

The Judiciary Committee, through Councilman Pritchard, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

Indianapolis, Feb. 6th, 1882.

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—Your Judiciary Committee, to whom was referred a communication from City Attorney showing that Mr. Scott, tenant at Garfield Park, claims to have a cause of action against the city growing out of the contract, but proposes, as a settlement of all matters, to surrender immediate possession, release all claims against the city, pay accrued cost in possession case, and turn over to city a certain road-scraper, if city will release a personal judgment against him for rent due, amounting to \$216.00. The City Attorney asks for instruction.

Your committee recommend that the City Attorney be directed to order constable holding execution and writ of possession, to make the judgment and costs on his execution, and put the city in possession of Garfield Park on his writ of possession.

Respectfully submitted,

Jas. A. Pritchard,
John W. Fultz,
N. Yoke,
Judiciary Committee.

The Judiciary Committee, through Councilman Pritchard, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

Indianapolis, February 6th, 1882.

To the Common Council and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—Your Judiciary Committee, together with the City Attorney, to whom was referred sundry papers, report thereon as follows:

The first is the petition of M. B. Rudesill, wherein he says that at the time he made the contract for the transfer to the city of lot 7 Routh's subdivision of square 21 Johnson's heirs addition, (being the lot upon which No. 9 Engine House is erected,) it was agreed that the city should remit the taxes for the year 1880, amounting to \$10.16. He has paid the amount, and asks it to be refunded.

Petitioner does not state who made such an agreement with him, and it is not provided for in his deed. If there was such a contract, his deed should have been made subject to taxes of 1880. This was not done. We recommend the prayer of the petition be not granted.

The second is a petition of F. McWhinney, showing that on the 18th of October, 1879, he purchased at private sale of City Treasurer, lot 4, Ray's subdivision of outlot 159, in city, and paid into the city treasury the sum of \$151.25.

He says the sale was not sufficient to transfer, and did not transfer the lien to him, which the city had thereon for taxes, and did not vest any interest in, lien on, or title to, said lot in petitioner. This he says is the decision of Judge Howe, in cause No. 27,472. And he therefore asks that the money, with interest, be refunded to him. Judge Howe held in the case referred to, that the law did not permit the City Treasurer to sell at private sale, the property of the citizen, for taxes due and delinquent thereon. In fact, that there could not be a private sale for taxes made by City Treasurer, and any attempt to do so was void, and would not, and could not, transfer to a so-called purchaser the lien of the city. The petitioner is presumed to know the law. If he sees proper to voluntarily pay the taxes of any one, he cannot recover the money so paid from the city. Your committee recommend the prayer of petition be not granted.

The third is the petition of Catharine Ruschhaupt and Chauncy L. Turner, showing that they are the owners of lot 17, and 20 feet off the north side of lot 18 and lot 20, and 10 feet off the south side of lot 17, in Haugh & Churchman's subdivision of lot 3, St. Clair's addition to city. They further represent that there is what appears to be a street assessment lien for benefits for opening Second street, amounting to \$420.00. They ask that the record of this lien be satisfied.

The city at one time, in cause No. 11,745 Superior Court, instituted suit to collect some of these assessments on opening Second street. It was found that the assessment was void, and the suit was dismissed at city's costs. In the case known as the Yandes case, Judge Byron K. Elliott held that these assessments on Second street were void, for the reason that the petition to open the street was not referred to a committee before it was referred to the City-Commissioners. This judgment was affirmed in General Term of Superior Court. Your committee therefore recommend that the prayer of petition be granted.

The fourth is the petition of Henry Emerich, duly sworn to, showing that he is the guardian of one George Dreschel, a minor. That said estate consists wholly of money, and that he returned said money for taxation, along with his own personal list. He further says, that the money of the minor was assessed in name of minor, and against him as guardian, and that this was done without his knowledge. Consequently he has paid taxes twice on the money of his ward, and he asks that the sum of \$19.00, the tax on ward's money be refunded.

The original lists show that he returned on his individual list \$2,000.00 personal property, and he says that in this is the personal property of his ward. For same year, Daily & Pickerell, as his attorneys, returned \$1,506.62 as personal property against him as guardian of George Dreschel, and petitioner says, in his sworn petition, that this was done without his knowledge.

The City Assessor informed your committee that from his knowledge of the facts, he would correct duplicate so as to have agreed with petition. We think he has paid twice on money of his ward, and therefore believe that \$19.00 should be refunded. Your committee recommends that the sum of \$19.00 be refunded to petitioner.

The fifth is the petition of F. A. Mitchell, Trustee, showing that on duplicate No. 13,065, and receipt No. 3,994a he paid \$9.00 more than correct amount of taxes due. The City Treasurer informed your committee that facts stated in petition are true. Your committee therefore recommend that the sum of \$9.00 be refunded to petitioner.

Respectfully submitted,

Jas. A. Pritchard,
John W. Fultz,
N. Yoke,

Committee on Judiciary.

C. S. DENNY, City Attorney.

The Committee on Public Property, through Councilman Cowie, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

To the Mayor, and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Public Property, to whom was referred the communication of the "Indianapolis Floral Association" with a proposition to

furnish bed plants for the Public Parks of the city, would recommend that an expenditure of \$300 be expended on the following parks: \$100.00 on Military Park, \$100.00 on University Park, and \$100.00 on Circle Park.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Cowie,
Wm. H. Morrison,
John W. Fultz,
Committee on Public Property.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES.

Councilman Dowling, in behalf of a certain special committee, submitted the following report; which was received, and the committee discharged:

To the Mayor and Common Council of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—Your Special Committee, to whom was referred the matter of the erection of safety gates on several streets crossing the Union Railway Company, by the said company, would report having performed their duty, and after consultation with the president of the board of managers of the Union Railway Co., are perfectly satisfied that said Union Railway Co. intend to comply with all the requirements of this Council as soon as they possibly can.

Jas. T. Dowling,
B. W. Cole,
Peter F. Bryce.
Special Committee.

Councilman Bryce, in behalf of a certain special committee, submitted the following report; which was concurred in, and the committee discharged:

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—The undersigned, your committee, to whom was referred the matter of the disannexation of certain territory west of Fall Creek, would respectfully report that they do not think it advisable to disannex said territory at this time, and therefore recommend that the resolution do not pass.

Peter F. Bryce,
B. Ward,
John W. Fultz,
Special Committee.

Councilman Caylor moved that the report of a certain special committee, relative to the Watson Coal and Mining Co.—which was laid on the table at a previous meeting—be taken from the table, and that said report be referred back to the committee.

Which motion was adopted, and the report referred back to the committee.

MESSAGES AND PAPERS FROM THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN.

The following message was read, and the matter as set forth therein, was referred to the City Market Commissioners:

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—At a regular session of the Board of Aldermen, held Monday evening, January 23d, 1882, said body adopted the following motion:

"That the City Civil Engineer report plans for the erection of a Market House on the south half of Square 44, which shall not exceed in cost the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars; and that when such is accepted by the Common Council and this Board, such Market House shall be paid for from the Tomlinson Fund now in the city treasury."

I herewith submit the foregoing for your consideration and action thereon.

For the Board of Aldermen:

GEO. T. BREUNIG, Clerk.

The following message was read; and, on motion, the Common Council adhered to their former action:

To the Mayor and Members of the Common Council:

Gentlemen:—The Board of Aldermen, in regular session, held in the Aldermanic Chamber, Monday evening, January 9th, 1882, struck out of Ap. O 1, 1882, the amount of \$500.00, allowed J. H. Webster, Chief Fire Engineer, to be used for incidental expenses of the Fire Department, and adopted the following motion:

"That the amount allowed J. H. Webster, to be used for incidental expenses of the Fire Department, and expended under the direction of the Fire Board, be stricken out of the ordinance, and that the claim be so amended, that the Committee on Fire Department act jointly with the Fire Board."

I submit the same for your consideration.

For the Board of Aldermen:

GEO. T. BREUNIG, Clerk.

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCES.

This being the regular appropriation night, the following entitled Appropriation Ordinances were placed on their final passage without a suspension of the rules.

By the Fire Board, through Councilman Thalman, the following entitled ordinance was introduced and read the first and second times:

Ap. O. 6, 1882—An Ordinance appropriating money for the payment of sundry claims against the City of Indianapolis, on account of the Fire Department.

Councilman Reichwein offered the following as an amendment to the above ordinance; which was adopted, and the ordinance so amended.

That \$300 be inserted for use of Chief Fire Engineer for purchasing supplies.

The ordinance as amended, was ordered engrossed, read the third time, (amount appropriated, \$955.83,) and passed by the following vote:

AYES, 23—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Stout, Thalman, Ward, and Yoke.

NAYS—None.

By the Hospital Board, through Councilman Bryce, the following entitled ordinance was introduced, and read the first and second times:

Ap. O. 7, 1882—An Ordinance appropriating money for the payment of sundry claims against the City of Indianapolis, on account of the City Hospital and Branch

Councilman Morrison offered the following as an amendment to the above ordinance :

That the sum of two hundred dollars be, and is hereby, appropriated to Dr. W. N. Wishard, for treatment of small pox patients for the years 1881 and 1882.

Councilman Pearson moved that the above amendment be referred to Judiciary Committee and Hospital Board.

Which motion was adopted.

The ordinance was then ordered engrossed, read the third time (amount appropriated, \$1,264.64,) and passed by the following vote :

AYES, 23—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, and Yoke.

NAYS—None.

By the Police Board, through Councilman Pearson, the following entitled ordinance was introduced, read the first and second times, ordered engrossed, and read the third time :

Ap. O. 8, 1882—An Ordinance appropriating money for the payment of sundry claims against the City of Indianapolis, on account of Station-Houses. [Amount appropriated, \$168.84.]

And it was passed by the following vote :

AYES, 23—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, and Yoke.

NAYS—None.

By the Committee on Accounts and Claims, through Councilman Brundage, the following entitled ordinance was introduced, read the first and second times, ordered engrossed, and read the third time :

Ap. O. 9, 1882—An Ordinance appropriating money for the payment of sundry claims against the City of Indianapolis. [Amount appropriated, \$13,483.04.]

And it was passed by the following vote :

AYES, 23—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, and Yoke.

NAYS—None.

By the Committee on Printing, through Councilman Bedford, the following entitled ordinance was introduced, read the first and second times, ordered engrossed, and read the third time :

Ap. O. 10, 1882—An Ordinance appropriating money for the payment of sundry claims against the City of Indianapolis, on account of Printing, Stationery and Advertising. [Amount appropriated, \$1,407.70]

And it was passed by the following vote:

AYES, 23—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, and Yoke.

NAYS—None.

By Councilman Pearson:

The following entitled ordinance was introduced, read the first and second times, ordered engrossed, and read the third time:

Ap. O. 11, 1882—An Ordinance appropriating the sum of Five Hundred and Sixty Dollars (\$560) for the pay of special policemen of the city of Indianapolis.

And it was passed by the following vote:

AYES, 23—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, and Yoke.

NAYS—None.

By consent, Councilman Caylor, in behalf of a certain special committee, submitted the following report; which was received:

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—The committee to whom was referred the matter of ascertaining whether or not "The Watson Coal and Mining Company have their coal carts registered as coal dealers," beg leave to report they find that no such company have registered any coal carts with the City Clerk, as required by city ordinance.

Allen Caylor,
B. W. Cole,
Frederick Hartmann.
Special Committee.

INTRODUCTION OF GENERAL AND SPECIAL ORDINANCES.

Under this order of business, the following entitled ordinances were introduced, and severally read the first time.

By Councilman Brundage:

S. O. 6, 1882—An Ordinance to provide for grading, curbing and bowldering the gutters of Fletcher avenue, from Dillon street to Linden street.

The above entitled ordinance was accompanied by the following petition:

To the Mayor, Common Council and Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—The undersigned, owners of real estate fronting on Fletcher avenue between Dillon and Linden streets, respectfully petition for the passage of an ordinance providing for curbing with stone and bowldering the gutters on said street.

A. O. Despo, 35 ft; W. J. P. Clary, 30 ft; Wm. Roney, 30 ft; Louise Panse, 30 ft; A. Cost, 30 ft; I. Thistlethwaite, 30 ft; R. K. Tucker, 30 ft.

By Councilman Brundage :

- S. O. 7, 1882—An Ordinance to provide for grading and paving with brick, the east sidewalk of Dillon street, from English avenue to Prospect street.
- S. O. 8, 1882—An Ordinance to provide for grading and graveling Linden street and sidewalks, from Orange street to Pleasant Run.
- S. O. 9, 1882—An Ordinance to provide for grading and graveling Minnesota street and sidewalks, from Madison avenue to East street.

By Councilman Dean :

- G. O. 13, 1882—An Ordinance requiring a flagman to be stationed at the intersection of the Jeffersonville, Madison & Indianapolis Railroad Company's tracks with Madison avenue, between Lincoln and Minnesota streets.

By Councilman Egger :

- G. O. 14, 1882—An Ordinance to restrain cows and heifers from running at large, from sunset in the evening to sunrise in the morning, and preventing such animals, when breachy, from running at large at any time in the city of Indianapolis; providing penalties, establishing pounds and rules for the government thereof; appropriating money in aid thereof, and repealing conflicting ordinances.

By Councilman Morrison :

- G. O. 15, 1882—An Ordinance granting William Pfafflin permission to erect an iron balcony over the sidewalk of Indiana avenue, in front of Lot No. 12, in Square No. 28, in the city of Indianapolis.

Councilman Morrison moved a suspension of the rules for the purpose of placing the above ordinance on its final passage.

Which motion was adopted, and the rules suspended by the following vote :

AYES, 23—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, and Yoke.

NAYS—None.

G. O. 15, 1882, was then read the second time, ordered engrossed, read the third time, and passed by the following vote :

AYES, 23—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, and Yoke.

NAYS—None.

Councilman Pritchard moved a suspension of the rules for the purpose of placing G. O. 12, 1882, on its final passage.

Which motion was adopted, and the rules suspended by the following vote :

AYES, 23—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, and Yoke.

NAYS—None.

The following entitled ordinance was then read the second time :

G. O 12, 1882—An Ordinance making and providing for the execution of a contract between the City of Indianapolis and The Indianapolis Water Co.

Councilman Pritchard offered the following amendment to the above ordinance; which failed of adoption :

Amend by striking out all of line 2, after the word "that," and all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, and all of line 8 to and including the word "health," on page eight.

Councilman Morrison offered the following motion :

That the contract be referred back to the City Attorney, with instructions to so arrange said contract that the city be not compelled to take any of the seventy-six plugs not now in use, only one in each 1000 feet of mains laid by said Water Works Company; also to so fix said contract in such a manner that the city can re-locate any of the drinking fountains now in use.

On motion by Councilman Thalman, the above motion was laid on the table by the following vote :

AYES, 19—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Cole, Coy, Dean, Dowling, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, Weaver, and Yoke.

NAYS, 6—viz. Councilmen Bryce, Caylor, Cowie, Egger, Mauer, and Morrison.

On motion by Councilman Pritchard, the *previous question* was ordered by unanimous vote.

The question then being on the engrossment of the ordinance, the ordinance was ordered engrossed, read the third time, and passed by the following vote :

AYES, 24—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Coy, Dean, Dowling, Egger, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, Weaver, and Yoke.

NAYS, 1—viz. Councilman Morrison.

By Councilman Koller :

S. O. 10, 1882—An Ordinance to provide for grading and graveling Highland street, between Washington and Ohio streets.

The above entitled ordinance was accompanied by the following petition :

Indianapolis, February 4th, 1882.

To the Honorable Mayor, Common Council and Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis :

Gentlemen—The undersigned respectfully petition your honorable bodies to repair Highland street from Washington street to Ohio; also, the curbings, crossings and pavements between said points, and your petitioners will ever pray.

Frederick Ostermeyer, 232½ feet; A. F. Ostermeyer,
80 feet; H. W. Piel, 80 feet; J. W. Cooper, 45 feet;
Fred Knefler, 333 feet.

By Councilman Koller:

S. O. 11, 1882—An Ordinance to provide for paving with brick, and curbing with stone, the sidewalks of Highland street, between Washington and Ohio streets.

By Councilman Stout:

S. O. 12, 1882—An Ordinance to provide for grading and paving with brick, the west sidewalk of College avenue, from Twelfth street to Clyde street.

By Councilman Yoke:

S. O. 13, 1882—An Ordinance to provide for grading and graveling the first alley south of Fletcher avenue, between Pine and Grove streets.

The above entitled ordinance was accompanied by the following petition:

To the Mayor, Common Council, and Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—The undersigned, owners of real estate fronting on the first alley south of Fletcher avenue, between Pine and Grove streets, respectfully petition for the passage of an ordinance providing for the grading and graveling of said alley.

Sarah J. Dell, 20 feet; E. Hadley, 30 feet; I. King, 30
E. J. Morris, 40 feet; N. Yoke, 30 feet.

By Councilman Yoke:

S. O. 14, 1882—An Ordinance to provide for grading and bowldering the north gutter, and grading and paving with brick, and curbing with stone, the north sidewalk of Elm street, between Grove and Noble streets.

The above entitled ordinance was accompanied by the following petition:

Indianapolis, February 3d, 1882.

To the Mayor, Common Council and Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—The undersigned, owners of real estate fronting on east side of Elm street, between Grove and Noble streets, respectfully petition for the passage of an ordinance providing for curbing and bowldering the gutter and paving with brick the sidewalk to the width of eight feet.

Lat. Poundstone, 40 feet; Geo. Hitz, 40 feet; Engel Krentler, 40 feet; Mrs. C. E. Aker, 40 feet; George Goth, 40 feet; A. D. Lombard, trustee 7th Presbyterian church, Jacob Beltz, trustee 7th Presbyterian church, Wm. H. Wishard, trustee 7th Presbyterian church, 80 feet; Jacob Fubor, 40 feet; Mrs. Fuerchtenicht, 40 feet; Lewis Aker, 20 feet.

By consent, Councilman Weaver, in behalf of a Committee on Insecure Buildings, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Insecure Buildings, make the following report for your consideration and action thereon:

On examination of the building known as Gilmore's Zoological Garden, situated on the west side of Mississippi street, near the corner of Washington street, we find the galleries are supported by 2 by 6 inch joist, resting on a girder made out of one 2 by 6 inch joist edgewise, and one the same size spiked to it, the flat side to the other. Some of them are 12 feet, and some 14 feet spans, which are too weak for any ordinary audience. Beneath these galleries are two stoves which heat the building. The stove pipes from them pass through the gallery floors, and should any accident occur to them, the building—being a frame structure—would soon be in flames; and should any person be disabled, or a panic ensue, the loss of life would be much greater, as those beneath the galleries would be imprisoned, as fire would be the natural result of such a calamity.

We would recommend that this matter be referred to the Chief Fire Engineer, and that he be instructed to make examination of said building.

Respectfully submitted,

George Weaver,
H. B. Stout,
Frederick Hartmann,
Special Committee on Insecure Buildings.

Councilman Weaver, in behalf of the same committee, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

Indianapolis, February 6th, 1882.

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Insecure Buildings, beg leave to submit the following report:

We have examined the buildings known as the old Oriental Hotel, on south Illinois street, on the north side of the alley running east and west between Georgia and Louisiana streets, and find them in a dangerous condition. The southeast corner, which is four stories high, is supported by a brick pier one foot ten inches long, by thirteen inches thick, which is crumbling beneath its weight. The walls above it are bulged to the south fully four inches, and are six inches at least out of perpendicular. They are badly cracked for the entire height, and are only nine inches thick above the first story. Having to support four floors of joist, we consider it unsafe, and would recommend the Chief Fire Engineer be instructed to notify the owners that the walls herein mentioned are unsafe, and that they be given a reasonable length of time to make it secure, to the entire satisfaction of the City Council and Board of Aldermen.

Your committee also examined the rear walls of the Sherman Hotel, situated on Louisiana street between Meridian and Illinois streets, and found that the northeast corner had settled in the foundations so as to crack the walls for the entire height of four stories, and fully two inches wide, so as to break the corner, separating it from the main building the entire height, throwing it out of perpendicular fully four inches, so as to make it unsafe.

Therefore, we recommend that the Chief Fire Engineer also be instructed to notify the owners to make the building secure as soon as possible, and to the entire satisfaction of the City Council and Board of Aldermen.

We report that the building on west Washington street has been made secure.

Respectfully submitted,

George Weaver,
H. B. Stout,
Frederick Hartmann,
Special Committee on Insecure Buildings.

By consent, Councilman Bedford, in behalf of the Committee on Public Health, submitted the following report; which was concurred in:

To the Mayor and Common Council:

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Public Health, to whom was referred the matter of some vacant lots on east Ohio street, east of Arsenal avenue, which are below the level of the surrounding grounds, would report that we have examined the same, and would recommend that the City Marshal notify the owners of said lots to fill them up.

Respectfully submitted,

C. T. Bedford.
Phil. Reichwein,
Sim Coy.
Committee on Public Health.

INTRODUCTION OF MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS.

Councilman Bryce, in behalf of the Hospital Board, submitted the following report:

Indianapolis, February 6th, 1881.

To His Honor, the Mayor, and Common Council, and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:—The undersigned would respectfully represent that at a meeting of the Hospital Board, held Dec. 12th, 1881, the following resolutions were passed:

“WHEREAS, The time of service of the Hospital Board, and of the Superintendent, will hereafter commence on January 1, instead of June 1; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the offices of the President and Secretary of the Board, and all the positions on the consulting and clinical staff, be declared vacant, on and after December 31, 1881.

Resolved, That the election of President and Secretary of the Board, and the appointment of the consulting and clinical staff, shall hereafter occur at the first meeting of the Board in the month of January of each year.

Resolved, That the above resolutions take effect January 1, 1882.”

And in pursuance of the above, at a meeting of the Hospital Board, held January 31st, 1882, a staff was appointed, and Peter F. Bryce was elected President, and Henry Mauer, Secretary.

Respectfully,

Peter F. Bryce,
H. J. Mauer.

The first part of this report, viz: So much as relates to the meeting of the Hospital Board on December 12th, 1881, in which the resolutions above referred to were passed, I concur, as that was a *regularly* called meeting of the Board—all being notified, and all being present. But so much as relates to the said meeting held Jan. 31st, 1882, I wish to enter my protest, as it was not a regularly called meeting of the Board, as I was not notified of said meeting; and inasmuch as the Council passed a resolution instructing the chairman of each committee to notify each and every member of every meeting, I would therefore offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the action of a part of the Hospital Board, on January 31st, 1882, above referred to, be declared null and void.

Very respectfully,

C. T. BEDFORD.

Councilman Pritchard moved to refer the foregoing report back to the Hospital Board, with the request that another meeting be called, and the matter done over again.

Which motion was adopted.

Councilman Caylor offered the following resolution :

WHEREAS, It is currently reported that Drew & Wasson, under the name of the Watson Coal and Mining Company, are furnishing coal to the city; Therefore,

Resolved, That a special committee of three be appointed to investigate the entire matter, and report at the next regular meeting of Council.

Which was adopted by the following vote:

AYES, 13—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Dowling, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, Pritchard, Stout, Ward, and Weaver.

NAYS, 12—viz. Councilmen Brundage, Coy, Dean, Egger, Knodel, Koller, Maurer, Morrison, Pearson, Reichwein, Thalman, and Yoke.

Councilmen Caylor, Brundage and Coy, were appointed by the Chair to act as the members of such committee.

Councilman Coy offered the following motion; which was adopted:

That the City Marshal be, and he is hereby, directed to notify the C., C. & I. Railway Co. to bowlder that part of the east side of Alabama street immediately north of their freight depot, at Virginia avenue and Alabama street, there being no sidewalk for the distance of about forty feet where drays are in the habit of crossing to reach said freight depot; and that, unless said improvement is at once made, an ordinance will be passed requiring said sidewalk bowldered.

Councilman Dowling offered the following motions; which were adopted:

That the City Marshal be, and is hereby, requested and directed to notify the Vandalia Railroad Co., Vincennes Railroad Co., Indianapolis, Bloomington & Western Railroad Co., and Kingan Railway Co. to lay between their different tracks broken stone, in such a condition and in such a manner as shall make a good and first class road-way, at the point where the tracks of the foregoing railroads cross and intersect Kentucky avenue and Missouri street.

That the Committee on Bridges and the City Civil Engineer be, and are hereby, directed to investigate the locality of the proposed Williard street bridge, and at the next meeting of this Council, bring in an estimated cost of a bridge sufficient to accommodate the manufactories and citizens located on said Williard street.

Councilman Egger offered the following motion; which was adopted:

That the Union Railway Company, and the P., C. & St. L. Railway Company be, and they are hereby, requested to have a Brush electric light placed at the east end of the freight depot, at the crossing of Virginia avenue and Alabama street, for the safety of persons crossing their tracks at said point in the night time; and that the City Marshal be instructed to serve a copy of the above request on each of said companies immediately.

Councilman Egger offered the following motion; which was referred to the Board of Public Improvements:

That a stone crossing be placed from the south sidewalk of Coburn street to Prospect street, under the direction of the Street Commissioner

Councilman Harrold offered the following motion; which was adopted:

That the City Marshal be and is hereby instructed to notify the I. B. & W. Railway Co. to boulder their part of sidewalk on west side of West street, leading into their freight house from West street.

Councilman Knodel presented the following petition; which was referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys:

To the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—The undersigned states to your honorable body, that he and Wm. Seiders are owners and tenants in common of James Frank and Wm. H. Seiders' subdivision of lot number three, in Herman Heinrichs (Schroer's) subdivision of 27 acres in section 13, township 15, range 3 east, as per plat in Plat Book No. 6, page 21, in the office of the Recorder of Marion county, Indiana; that the said Frank and Seiders' subdivision is a piece of land containing three acres, which are used as garden lands; that the same is now divided into 25 lots, and Webb street and two alleys running parallel with Webb street, one north, the other south of it, are running through said subdivision; but neither the lots nor the street nor the alleys are used as such, and have no usefulness as such.

Your petitioners, therefore, requests the vacation of said subdivision, as well as of the lots, alleys, and Webb street in the same; and your petitioner further says, that no other persons than your petitioner and the said Wm. H. Seiders own any property adjoining said Webb street and said alleys.

BERNHARD BACKMAN,
By Philip Rappaport, his Att'y.

Councilman Knodel offered the following motion; which was adopted:

That the City Civil Engineer be directed to re-advertise for proposals for the erection of two lamp posts on Merrill street, between Delaware and Pennsylvania streets.

Councilman Dowling was excused for the remainder of this session.

Councilman Fultz offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, This Council has had another illustration of the manner in which snap judgment is taken in the meetings of committees and official boards, by not notifying all of the members when they hold meetings, therefore

Resolved, That this Council will not entertain any report from committees or official boards where the members have not all been notified of the fact that a meeting was to be held.

Councilman Bryce moved to lay the above resolution on the table.

Which motion to lay on the table was adopted by the following vote:

AYES, 18—viz. Councilmen Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Cowie, Dean, Egger, Knodel, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Reichwein, Stout, Thalman, Ward, Weaver, and Yoke.

NAYS, 6—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Coy, Fultz, Harrold, Hartmann, and Koller.

It being now nearly eleven o'clock, Councilman Pearson moved that the time be extended.

Which motion was adopted, and the time extended by the following vote :

AYES, 19—viz. Councilmen Bedford, Brundage, Bryce, Caylor, Cole, Dean, Egger, Fultz, Hartmann, Knodel, Koller, Mauer, Morrison, Pearson, Pritchard, Stout, Thalman, Ward, and Ycke.

NAYS, 5—viz. Councilmen Cowie, Coy, Harrold, Reichwein, and Weaver.

Councilman Mauer presented the following petition; which was referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys and City Civil Engineer:

Indianapolis, Jan. 3d, 1882.

To the Mayor, Board of Aldermen, and Common Council of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—The undersigned, owners of the real estate fronting on west New York street, between Blake street and Agnes street, respectfully petition for the passage of an ordinance providing for the removal of certain obstructions of the sidewalk on the north side of said street, viz, certain tenement houses owned by parties non-resident of this city, as well as certain steps in front of said houses.

And your petitioners will ever pray, etc.

F. L. Weisnheimer, 60 feet, Martin Matt, 40 feet;
W. H. Thompson, 30 feet; P. O. Keefee, 30 feet;
Wm. Hild, 120 feet.

Councilman Mauer offered the following motion; which was referred to the Board of Public Improvements:

That the Street Commissioner be, and is hereby, directed to place a double row of stone crossings on each side of New York street, at the intersection of all the streets and alleys between Bright and Agnes streets.

Councilman Morrison presented the following report; which was referred to the Committee on Public Charities:

To the Honorable, the Mayor, Common Council, and

Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—Enclosed please find reports of the Treasurers of the Boards of Trustees and Managers of the "Home for Friendless Women," for the year 1881.

Respectfully submitted,

N. A. Hyde,
Thos. H. Sharpe,
Chas. N. Todd,

Indianapolis, Jan. 21st, 1882.

Executive Committee of Board of Trustees.

Report of the Treasurer of the Board of Managers of The Indianapolis Home for Friendless Women, from Dec. 31st, 1880, to Dec. 31st, 1881.

DR. TO RESOURCES OF THE HOME

To balance Jan. 1st, 1881	\$109 68
Received from Wm. S. Hubbard, Treasurer of the Board of Trustees of the Home, interest on the Peck fund.....	309 00
Received from Wm. S. Hubbard, Treasurer of the Board of Trustees of the Home, city fines.....	706 00
Received from Wm. S. Hubbard, Treasurer, membership fees.....	22 00

Old iron sold at the Home.....	29 25
Two returned checks.....	11 00
Donations from friends during the year, and on Donation Day.....	167 00
Work fund of the Home.....	526 86

CR. BY EXPENDITURES FOR THE HOME.

	\$1,880 79
By Matron's salary.....	\$360 00
By fuel.....	210 00
By dry goods for house use, and clothing for inmates.....	59 52
By repairs and re-furnishing the Home.....	106 10
By stationery.....	5 70
By drugs and medicines.....	20 70
By chain and weaving 103 yards of rag carpet.....	22 48
By current expenses of the Home.....	1,065 88
By balance Dec. 31st, 1881.....	30 41
	\$1,880 79

255 women and children have been received and sheltered at the Home during the year.

21 of this number have been protected, and cared for in their hour of need.

137 were transient women and children, needing help, counsel, and shelter, and then provided for as best we could.

61 had employment found for them in good families.

12 left to look for work and did not return.

2 babes died—one sent to the Orphans' Home.

One woman sent to the Asylum for the Insane.

2 women sent to the County Asylum.

18 remain in the Home.

The Indianapolis Home for Friendless Women was organized by some of our leading, philanthropic citizens in February, 1867. Some of them have gone to their reward, but their works do follow them. Others still live and rejoice to see the Home accomplishing that for which it was intended. During the 14 years it has been in existence we have positive evidence that from 20 to 25 young girls have been rescued yearly. Restored to parents and friends, or living happily in homes of their own. Count the number up, and ask, what is the Home doing? Then count, if you can, the protection, sympathy, and help extended to transient women and children, widows, orphans, deserted wives and children—homeless ones suffering from causes too numerous to mention. This year alone 137, each of the preceding, 14 generally more, seldom less. Add the two together and say whether the friends of the Home have not great cause to thank God for his blessing on their work and take courage for the future.

Ours is not a work to be spread before a gossip-loving public. There are too many home circles that would be invaded, wives, mothers, daughters, sisters, who were names given would go with aching hearts and names disgraced, with no power to help themselves. The wheat and the tares must remain together until the separating time comes. And what good would it accomplish by being told? If man would only deal with man as woman deals with woman, there would be a much more pure state of society.

We have to guard against the charge of a premium on vice, by making it too easy for the seducer to have his victim and his innocent offspring provided for.

Lately the papers have often told the story of "one more unfortunate." Shame and remorse drives them to suicide, and the cry of a sacrificed life goes up to Him who has said, "vengeance is mine, I will repay." Its a fearful thing to answer for a lost soul. Death does not end it.

We commence our 15th year with renewed confidence in our kind friends, who have so often come to our help in our time of need, and trust in Him who has blessed the work of our hands hitherto.

On behalf of the Board of Managers:

L. F. HYDE, Sec'y.
M. M. TODD, Treas.

Report of the Treasurer of Board of Trustees of the Home.

Credit by amount received from fines to the City Treasurer by the Mayor,	\$846 00
Dr. to amount paid for 3 years insurance on the Home.....	\$140 00
" amount paid to Board of Managers for the Home.....	706 00
	\$846 00

Respectfully submitted,

WM. S. HUBBARD, Treasurer,
Board of Managers of the Home.

Decem er 31st, 1881.

Mrs. Judge Newman, Pres't; Mrs. J. L. Ketchum, Vice Pres't; Mrs. L. F. Hyde, Sec'y; Mr. M. M. Todd Treas'r; Mrs. J. M. Rey, Mrs. Dr. Burgess, Mrs. T. H. Sharpe, Mrs. J. H. Vaen, Mrs. C. Baker, Mrs. Judge Gresham, Mrs. A. E. Ronche, Mrs. J. Byrket, Mr. Dr. Carey, Mrs. G. D. Emory, Mrs. E. Eckert, Mrs. T. P. Haughey, Mrs. Dr. Newcomer, Mrs. Hetty Adams, Mrs. Hannah Hadley, Mrs. Jane Trueblood, Mrs. W. B. Burford, Mrs. Chas. Moores, Mrs. J. H. Orr, Mrs. E. C. Atkins, Mrs. J. S. Morrison, Mrs. Abram. Hendriels, Mrs. Henry B. Sherman.

Councilman Pearson offered the following motion; which, on motion by Councilman Ward, was laid on the table :

That the chairman of the special committee appointed to investigate the contract made by the city with Drew & Wasson, be instructed to wait on the firm for his information, instead of clerks or drivers of said firm.

Councilman Pearson offered the following motion; which was adopted :

That C. C. Hines be granted the privilege of laying a sewer connection of vitrified stone-ware sewer pipe, from his premises, on the corner of Tennessee street and the first alley north of St. Clair street, in and along said alley to and connecting with the Illinois street sewer, *at his own expense*. Said work to be done under the supervision of the City Civil Engineer.

Councilman Reichwein offered the following motion; which was adopted:

That the City Attorney be instructed to prepare an ordinance for compelling city prisoners to do street work under the direction of the Street Commissioner.

Councilman Thalman presented the following petition and motion; which was adopted, and the prayer of the petitioner granted:

To His Honor, the Mayor, and Common Council of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—Christopher Hilgenberg, your petitioner, is the owner in fee-simple of lot No. 7 in square fifty seven (57), in the City of Indianapolis; also the owner of the improvements thereon, being street No. 15 north Pennsylvania street in said city. Your petitioner asks for a permit to excavate the sidewalk on said lot for the purpose of constructing a coal vault, said vault to be fifteen (15) feet wide and twenty (20) feet long, and seven (7) feet high; to be built with two 9-inch brick arches, each arch to be eight and one-half feet at the base in the clear. Said arches when completed to be covered with five-inch flag stones, said arches also to have a stone battering against the street, said wall to be 20 inches at the base and tapering up to 12 inches at the top. And also finish the excavation of the cellar

and replace with thirteen-inch brick walls where they are needed. Brick and stone laid in good lime mortar will be the materials used in the construction of said work.

C. HILGENBERG.

Moved that prayer of the petitioner be granted, provided that a good, safe plank walk is built around the place while the work is progressing, and that the work be done under the direction of the City Civil Engineer.

Councilman Thalman presented the following petition; which was referred to the Judiciary Committee:

To the Mayor, City Council, and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen.—I was over assessed on the following real estate for 1880. Please have the proper correction made, and the overcharge returned to me, and oblige

Yours, truly,

JNO. H. CAFFER.

\$450.00 over assessed on valuation of 1880, on Lot 431, Out-lot 98 \$4 81

M. F. CONNETT, City Assessor.

Councilman Thalman offered the following motions; which were adopted:

That the City Attorney report to this Council whether or not we have authority to pass an ordinance regulating the number of cars, in freight trains, to run through the city; also, to regulate the time a train may blockade the crossing of streets.

That, in order to ascertain the cost of protecting the west bank of White river, in Indianola, the City Civil Engineer be directed to advertise for proposals for rip-raping the same with stone, or rolling mill cinders, the bids to be so much per lineal foot of the embankment, and for any number of feet that may be required. (should the city entertain the proposition to have the work done).

Councilman Thalman presented the following communication; which was referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys:

Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 1st, 1882.

To the Mayor, City Council, and Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen.—I will give sufficient land to make a forty foot street along the west bank of White River (where the street has recently washed away), for the sum of one thousand dollars.

A. WILLIAM MINKNER.

Councilman Ward presented the following remonstrance; which was received, and filed with the ordinance S. O. 3, 1882:

To the Honorable Common Council and Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen.—The undersigned, citizens of the city of Indianapolis, and owners of real estate bordering upon Meridian street, between New York street and St. Clair street in said city, respectfully represent and show to your honorable bodies that the wooden block pavement heretofore put upon said part of said street, was not only a very expensive, but, comparatively, a very worthless improvement. We therefore respectfully, but earnestly, object to and remonstrate against any more wooden blocks of red cedar or any other kind of wood, being placed thereon. And, as said street, from Washington street to New York street, has been, for the last twenty years or more, improved with stone bowlders, and constantly used without cost to the city, and but little, if any, to the property owners along the same for

repairs, and is now in good repair for travel, we respectfully petition your honorable bodies to cause said part of said street between New York and St. Clair streets to be improved and paved with like stone bowlders.

Jas. C. Ferguson, 80 feet; S. L. Hall, 142½ feet; Amelia B. Mansur, Amelia B. Mansur, guardian, 205 feet; Mary A. Parry; V. T. Malott, 67.6 feet; Robt. B. Duncan, 82.6 feet; Edward Schurmann; M. E. Jordan, 61 feet; G. M. Ballard, 53½ feet; H. W. Ballard, 33¾ feet; A. M. Dukemineer, 33¾ feet; M. B. Copeland, 59½ feet; J. M. Maxwell, 65 feet; F. M. Churchman, 40 feet; John C. Wright, 40.10 feet; George Crozier, 22½ feet.

Councilman Yoke offered the following motions; which were adopted:

That the City Marshal be directed to report to this Council if pounds have been located for impounding cows, as provided by ordinance; and if not, why not.

That the Board of Public Improvements is hereby authorized to re-open the Stone Yard.

On motion, S. O. 5, 1882, an ordinance for the improvement of Central avenue, was stricken from the files.

Councilman Ward was excused for the remainder of this session.

On motion by Councilman Thalman, the Common Council then adjourned.

DANIEL W. GRUBBS, Mayor,

President of the Common Council.

Attest: JOS. T. MAGNER, City Clerk.

PROCEEDINGS OF BOARD OF ALDERMEN.

SPECIAL SESSION—FEBRUARY 6, 1882.

The Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis, met in the Aldermanic Chamber, Monday evening, February 6th, A. D. 1882, at eight o'clock, in special session, pursuant to the following call:

Indianapolis, Feb. 6th, 1882.

To the Members of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Indianapolis:

Gentlemen:—You are hereby requested to meet in special session this evening, at eight o'clock, for the purpose of considering the report of the committee on the proposed vacation of Lota, et al. streets.

By order of the President of the Board of Aldermen:

GEO. T. BREUNIG, Clerk.

PRESENT—Hon. James T. Layman, President of the Board of Aldermen, in the Chair, and Aldermen DeRuiter, Hamilton, Mussmann, Newman, Rorison, Seibert, and Tucker.

ABSENT—Aldermen Drew, and Wood.

The following message was read and received:

To the President and Members of the Board of Aldermen:

Gentlemen:— I herewith transmit to your honorable body certain papers, which were favorably passed upon by the Common Council, at its regular session, held this evening, February 6th, 1882, for your action upon the same.

For the Common Council:

JOS. T. MAGNER, City Clerk.

The following report from the Committee on Streets and Alleys was read, and the favorable action of the Common Council thereon (see page 1145, *ante*) was concurred in:

To the Mayor and Common Council:

25 *Gentlemen:*—Your Committee on Streets and Alleys, together with a special committee of three, to whom was referred the petition of John S. Spann, et al., for vacation of certain streets and alleys in Allen, Root & English's addition, to enable the C. I., St. L. & C. R., R. Co. to erect their shops in said portion of the city, have examined said locality, and recommend said vacation be made, and that the accompanying resolution herewith submitted be adopted.

Respectfully submitted,

Edgar Brundage,
Wm. H. Morrison,
N. Yoke,
Special Committee.

George Weaver,
B. W. Cole,
Simeon Coy,
Committee on Streets and Alleys.

Your committee also submit the following dispatch as part of their report:

[1165]

Cincinnati, O., Feb. 6, 1882.

To J. W. SHERWOOD, Indianapolis:

If Grant street is vacated by the city, we will commence building our shops inside of six months, and finish them within two years. Shops to be for all the road.

M. E. INGALLS.

The following resolution (adopted by the Common Council—see page 1146. *ante*) was read:

Resolved, That the matter of vacating certain streets and alleys within the boundaries herein mentioned, viz: Commencing at the intersection of the north line of the first alley north of Deloss street, running east and west along the north line of a part of Allen, Root & English's addition, and old donation line; thence along the old donation line in a northerly direction 525 feet, more or less, to the main track of the C., L., St. L. & C. R. R. Co.; thence along said main track, in an easterly direction, to the center of Allen street; thence westerly along the center of Allen street, to the center of Laurel street; thence in a southerly direction, along the center of Laurel street, to the north line of the alley first above mentioned; thence along the north line of said alley in a westerly direction 1690 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning—being all that portion of the above described lands east of Grant street, in Allen, Root & English's addition, being Leota street, Allen street, and all the alleys within said boundaries, and so much of Laurel or Spruce street as lies between its intersection with the alley heretofore described and the main tracks of said railroad company, together with the petition and plat presented in such case; be referred to the City Commissioners, with instructions to assess benefits and damages to any person or persons thereby benefited or damages; the said Commissioners are hereby instructed to return as a part of their report, all petitions and notices; and if any property owner immediately on the line of said streets or alleys, who is directly interested therein, shall object to such vacation of said streets and alleys, to make such fact a part of their report; and the City Clerk is hereby directed to issue the proper notices to the Commissioners.

And it was concurrently adopted by the following vote:

AYES, 8—viz. Aldermen DeRuiter, Hamilton, Mussmann, Newman, Rorison, Seibert, Tucker, and President Layman.

NAYS—None.

The Board of Aldermen having transacted such business for which it was convened, on motion, was declared adjourned.

JAMES T. LAYMAN, President

Attest: GEO. T. BREUNIG, Clerk.