

REGULAR MEETING.

COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

MONDAY, October 2, 1911.

The Common Council of the City of Indianapolis met in the Council Chamber, Monday evening, October 2, 1911, at 7:30 o'clock, in regular session, President John Blumberg in the chair.

Present: The Hon. John Blumberg, President of the Common Council, and 8 members, viz: Messrs. Johnson, McCarthy, Copeland, Rubens, Denny, Owen. Stilz and Troy.

Absent, none.

Mr. Copeland moved that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with. Carried.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS.
INDIANAPOLIS, IND., September 20, 1911.

To the President and Members of the Common Council:

GENTLEMEN: I return herewith with my approval the following ordinances:

General Ordinance No. 49, 1911, being an ordinance authorizing the alienation and conveyance of the following described real estate, situated in Marion County, State of Indiana, to-wit: Lot number thirteen (13), in the second section of Osgood's Forest Park Addition to the City of Indianapolis, Marion County, Indiana.

Appropriation Ordinance No. 58, 1911, being an ordinance appropriating the sum of \$500.00 to and for the use of the Department of Public Works and fixing a time when the same shall take effect.

Appropriation Ordinance No. 64, 1911, being an ordinance appropriating the sum of \$300.00 to and for the use of the Department of Public Safety and fixing a time when the same shall take effect.

Appropriation Ordinance No. 68, 1911, being an ordinance appropriating the sum of \$10,000.00 to and for the use of the Department of Public Works and fixing a time when the same shall take effect.

Appropriation Ordinance No. 74, 1911, being an ordinance appropriating the sum of \$7,000.00 to and for the use of the Department of Public Works and fixing a time when the same shall take effect.

I have the honor to remain,

Very truly yours,

S. L. SHANK,
Mayor City of Indianapolis.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS.
INDIANAPOLIS, IND., September 28, 1911.

To the President and Members of the Common Council:

GENTLEMEN: I return herewith without my approval Appropriation Ordinance No. 73, 1911.

Very truly yours,

S. L. SHANK,
Mayor City of Indianapolis.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS.
INDIANAPOLIS, IND., September 30, 1911.

To the President and Members of the Common Council:

I am sending you herewith the different reports made by the members of the Market Commission, with some suggestions of my own. I am sure that some of the present conditions at the East Market should be changed, and I believe such changes will tend to better the market and materially reduce the prices that people have to pay for produce there.

Under the law, the market is controlled by the Board of Safety, subject, of course, to the ordinances of the Council. If, therefore, the Council favors any of the recommendations I make, I respectfully suggest that a special committee of the Council confer with the Board of Safety concerning these changes, and together try and remedy the abuses by changes in the ordinances and the rules of the Board of Safety, if necessary.

First: I recommend that the wholesale and retail markets be entirely separated, and that the Council provide a place where produce can be

sold at wholesale, and that the present East Market be used by retailers only.

Second: I recommend that the powers of the Market Master be increased, if you find it necessary, or that a position be created to be filled by some competent person whose duty it shall be to familiarize himself with market conditions everywhere, keep posted on market prices, and keep in touch both by telegraph and telephone, with producers and producers' associations, so that if at any time there should be a shortage on the market of any particular article of food sold there, it could be brought to the market. I recommend that the ordinance be further changed so that the Market Master or such assistant shall have power to sell such produce if shipped to him, and retain a fair compensation for such work, at least sufficient to pay the expenses of so selling. I also recommend that the power be given to sell the produce of any farmer or gardener who can not come to the market, and that the Market Master be given the power to employ such assistants and clerks as he finds necessary and make a report to the Controller at such times as you deem necessary.

Third: I recommend that the original producer or producers, and the peddlers and commission men be separated, giving to each a certain portion of the streets now used for the market, but keep the two classes separated so that a consumer may readily know who he is dealing with. I recommend that the farmer and gardener who raises his own produce be given as nearly as possible the exclusive use of the east building on the market space; that each man be permitted to occupy only one street; that he be charged the sum of _____ cents for the use of such stand each market day. If one who has a stand engaged does not occupy it by seven o'clock on a market day, the Market Master should be permitted to give it to some other producer who has no stand, and that places be provided on the streets for any producer who can not find a vacant stand in the building. At the present time live poultry is sold in the east building. I recommend that a separate place on the East Market be established for dealers in poultry. I believe it would be better for the market to do so.

Fourth: Section 1729 of the Revision of 1904 provides that certain streets, naming them, shall be used as a public market for the sale of poultry, game, butter, eggs, fruits and vegetables in their natural state. I believe that this section should be amended so as to give the Market Master the power to separate the farmers and gardeners from the peddlers according to my third recommendation.

Fifth: Information has come to me that bartering in stands and stalls has been permitted. This should not be. Section 1746 of the Revision of 1904, provides that no city market lease shall be transferred, assigned or underlet, nor shall any other person than the lessee occupy or use the stall, stand or room so leased, or any portion thereof, and section 1783 provides a penalty for the violation of said section.

No one but the original lessee should be permitted to use the stands under any circumstances, and if anything more is needed, either by additional penalty or change in the ordinance, to prevent bartering in stands, this section ought to be amended, and it should be made clear that where a lessee gives up his stand, it should revert at once to the city.

Sixth: I recommend that the ordinances now existing be amended if it is legal to do so, so that a farmer or gardener who raises and sells his own stuff from house to house in the city, should be given the use of the streets and alleys, free of charge, for that purpose. I believe that a license, to be known as a farmers' license, should be issued by

the Controller upon the payment of a nominal sum, to any person applying for the same, who makes affidavit that the produce he is selling is of his own raising, and providing further for a penalty and a revocation of such license for any violation of the privileges.

I have studied the ordinances governing the market, and I believe with these changes, and with the hearty co-operation of the Board of Safety, and the Market Master, we will come back to the original idea of a public market and materially help reduce prices.

S. L. SHANK,
Mayor.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., September 1, 1911.

Hon. Samuel L. Shank, City Hall, Indianapolis, Ind.:

DEAR SIR: The Commission appointed by you to investigate the cost of living has directed most of its attention to the market. The consumer is more nearly related to the market place and to the conduct of the business of the market place than to that of any other place or supply. The grocer occupies his own ground either in ownership or through rental. The commission merchant also occupies private property, but the market place belongs in common to all of the people. The Commission has, therefore, deemed it wise to suggest to your honor and through you to proper authority a plan by which the people may secure to themselves the benefit of the market place to whom this place belongs. We recognize the fact that the city has grown to such proportions that no present means of supply should be disregarded or rendered less efficient. A largely increased population of the city makes it imperative that there should be the largest possible supply of products entering into daily consumption. The more nearly these products can be supplied through the producer, the farmer, and the gardener to the consumer, the less profit will be required from handling by middle men. Under present conditions the producer, the farmer and the gardener have not had sufficient encouragement, facility nor opportunity to meet the consumer.

With a view to a change of method without radically upsetting the efficiency of the present market in which middle men may be necessary, we recommend:

1. That there shall be no bartering in stands. If a standholder relinquishes his stand it shall revert and be re-let by the city. It should be made impossible for any individual to profit by the re-sale of any stand.
2. The ownership of several stands by one individual or firm should be discouraged.
3. The entire curb of Market street fronting the market place and on the west side of Alabama street to Washington street and on Alabama street fronting the east end of the market place and on Market street on the south side of Delaware to Alabama street should be set apart solely for producers, farmers, and gardeners selling directly to consumers, who shall occupy such space after they have made affidavit that they are producers, farmers or gardeners selling only such vegetables and other products wholly produced by themselves, such affidavit setting forth the consideration of the stand granted for such sale, and the grant to be void upon any other consideration.
4. We recommend that it be made unlawful with sufficient penalty by enactment of the Council or proper authority for any person other than a producer, farmer or gardener selling exclusively his own products

and exclusively to consumers to occupy any stand designated in the foregoing recommendation.

5. We recommend that the holder of these stands shall be assigned such places as they may select for as many days as the standholder may elect upon paying ten cents per day for each day he may desire; provided, however, that he shall occupy the stand not later than seven o'clock on the day or days upon which payment has been made. All stands in recommendation 3 shall be let without charge to such producers, farmers or gardeners upon their selection if not previously paid for or occupied by another.

6. We recommend that all farmers, gardeners and producers who are selling exclusively their own products shall upon affidavit be exempt from all forms of license such as vehicle license, peddler's license or any other charge by the city, except as provided in Article 5.

7. We recommend that the street car company be requested not to use the tracks in Market street between Delaware and Alabama streets on market days, and if possible that the line of track from Delaware to Alabama streets on Market street be removed.

8. We recommend that the city should not be required to furnish property on which business shall be conducted other than direct to the consumer. The time has come when the market place should be used as it was intended, getting back to first principles. As many producers as possible should be encouraged to take a stand inside the market house. Give him the best stand possible, with a view to the ultimate occupancy of the entire market place, by producers selling directly to consumers. Let him advertise his wares as his own production, with severe penalty for misrepresentation.

9. The market master should be impressed with the fact that the market is primarily for the benefit of the consumer, and not for revenue to the city. His success will be measured by his efforts to give the public the best and cheapest market, and not by the amount of money he can collect from the people through fees to be converted into the city treasury.

10. We recommend that all commodities be sold by weight in as far as practicable and enforce the penalty provided by law against all persons who sell by short or deceptive weight or measure.

The Commission has found many correlated problems which it did not feel itself competent to undertake and which it did not deem wise to include in its recommendations. Your Commission has great confidence in the ultimate power of public opinion, and would conclude this report with an appeal to the people to make effective the recommendations in as far as they may deem them wise, remembering that only an active and vigorous campaign will change present conditions and establish a permanent relief.

Respectfully submitted,

FELIX T. McWHIRTER,
Secretary.

Hon. Samuel L. Shank, City Hall:

DEAR SIR: The above resolutions were adopted section by section by the Commission, but received only two votes, to-wit: Vote of Hon. Cassius C. Hadley and of Felix T. McWhirter, for adoption as a whole. Hoping that the services of the Commission may be of value, I remain

Very truly,

FELIX T. McWHIRTER.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., September 1, 1911.

Hon. S. L. Shank, Mayor City of Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Ind.:

DEAR SIR: The Commission appointed by you to investigate the "High Cost of Living," as well as to inquire into the conditions under which the Indianapolis market is conducted and operated, has tried to perform its duties as quickly as possible, knowing that the public in general has been for some time past, and is now, clamoring that something be done to relieve the situation. Much information and data has been gathered by the Commission which no doubt will be of interest to you and of vast importance to the public.

The "high cost of living" is a question of national, as well as local importance. In fact, it is one of the big questions of the day, and to make sure that the cost of living is "high" your Commission, as a Commission and as individual members thereof, sought information from all sources and did not confine themselves to the city of Indianapolis and the State of Indiana alone, but went elsewhere and to other cities and States for prices on the actual and absolute necessities of life.

We find:

First. That the cost of living is not only high, but outrageously high.

Second. That the profits derived from foodstuffs are enormous.

Third. That the methods used and resorted to in order to hold up prices are intricate and complicated, requiring much more time than we have at our disposal to fathom.

For your benefit, and for the information of the consumer, we herewith submit statements from New York, N. Y., Des Moines, Iowa, South Bend, Indiana, and Indianapolis, Indiana, giving farmers' prices, market prices, grocers' prices and profits derived by the middlemen, commission merchants and a host of others who stand between the producers and consumers and are no more nor less than speculators in food.

INVESTIGATIONS MADE IN NEW YORK IN 1911.

<i>Product.</i>	<i>Prices Paid Farmer.</i>	<i>Cost to City Man.</i>	<i>Advance.</i>
Potatoes -----	35c peck.	\$1.50	300%
Tomatoes -----	\$2 for 24-lb. crate 8c lb.	25c lb.	300%
Apples -----	\$2 for 10-doz. box 20c per doz.	\$1 to \$1.50 per doz.	500 to 700%
Cabbage -----	2c each	10c each.	500%
Strawberries ---	10c qt.	\$1 per qt.	1000%
Asparagus -----	8c bunch.	30c to 40c.	400%
Milk -----	4c.	8c.	100%
Eggs -----	2c to 4c per egg.	In hotels 2 for 30c.	400 to 800%
Oats -----	1c per lb.	Cost of 7c to oat- meal 10c.	700 to 1000%
Wheat -----	\$1 per 60 lbs.	Bread 8 to 10c lb.	2000%
Pork -----	4 to 6c per lb.	20 to 30c.	500%

Meat at the rate sold in the restaurants, clubs and hotels in New York would bring over 2500% profit, whereas the live ox, from which the profit is derived, costs only from \$60.00 to \$70.00 direct from the farm.

INVESTIGATIONS MADE IN DES MOINES, IA., JULY 25, 1911.

<i>Product.</i>	<i>Market Prices.</i>	<i>Grocers' Prices.</i>	<i>Profit.</i>
Potatoes—bushel -----	\$1.50	\$2.40	60%
Cabbage—head -----	3 heads 10c	8c each	140%
Tomatoes—lb. -----	10c	15c	50%
Apples—bushel -----	\$1.00	\$1.40	40%
Cucumbers—dozen -----	25c	60c	140%
Corn—dozen -----	15c	20c	33½%
String beans—basket -----	10c	15c	50%

INVESTIGATIONS MADE IN SOUTH BEND, IND., SINCE THE AGITATION COMMENCED, AUGUST 14, 1911.

<i>Product.</i>	<i>Market Prices.</i>	<i>Grocers' Price.</i>	<i>Profit.</i>
Potatoes—peck -----	40c	50c	25%
Cabbage—head -----	3c	5c	66⅔%
Tomatoes—lb. -----	10c	12c	20%
Apples—peck -----	40c	40 to 50c	25%
Cucumbers—peck -----	20c	25c	25%
Wax beans—lb. -----	10c	12c	20%
Sweet corn—dozen -----	10c	12c	20%
Pears—basket -----	25c	35c	40%
Peaches—basket -----	25c	25 to 40c	40%
Grapes—basket -----	15c	20 to 25c	66⅔%
Cherries—quart -----	10c	12c	20%
Blackberries—quart -----	5c	10c	100%
Eggs—dozen -----	20c	24c	20%
Country butter—lb. -----	24c	28c	16⅔%
Spring chicken (live)—lb. -----	18c	25c	38 4-5%
Spring chicken (dressed)—lb. -----	20c	28c	40%

INVESTIGATIONS MADE IN INDIANAPOLIS, IND., AUGUST 15, 1911.

<i>Product.</i>	<i>Farmers and Gardeners' Price.</i>	<i>Grocers' Price.</i>	<i>Profit.</i>
Potatoes -----	\$3.50 per bbl. of 11 pks.	\$4.95	41%
Cabbage—head -----	5c	10c	100%
Tomatoes—bushel -----	50c	\$1.60	320%
Apples—peck -----	40c	40c	—
Cucumbers—hundred -----	35c	5c each	1328%
String beans—peck -----	20c	60c	200%
Sweet corn—dozen -----	10c	18c	80%
Grapes -----	20c—7 lbs. (3c lb.)	20c lb.	566%
Butter beans—quart -----	15c	30c	100%
Eggs—dozen -----	18c	22c	22%
Butter—lb. -----	25c	28c	12%
Chicken (live) -----	18c lb.	22½c	25%
Chicken (dressed) -----	24c lb.	27½c	14%

FROM THE REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

In a report recently published by the Department of Commerce and Labor, it is shown conclusively that the high cost of living has a real foundation and is in no ways mythical in its origin. The document summarizes investigations made by the Department of Commerce and Labor in two hundred and fifty-seven commodities during the year nineteen hundred and ten, which shows that prices were four per cent. higher than in nineteen hundred and nine, and one and six-tenths per cent. above the average of nineteen hundred and seven, which was the year of highest prices since eighteen hundred and ninety.

An interesting item in the bureau report shows that the wholesale price of farm products was seven and five-tenths per cent. higher in nineteen hundred and ten than in nineteen hundred and nine.

Wholesale prices in nineteen hundred and ten were nineteen and one-tenth per cent. higher than in nineteen hundred; forty-six and seven-tenths per cent. higher than in eighteen hundred and ninety-seven (which was the year of lowest prices between eighteen hundred and ninety and nineteen hundred and ten); sixteen and six-tenths per cent. higher than in eighteen hundred and ninety, and thirty-one and six-tenths per cent. higher than the average high prices between eighteen hundred and ninety and eighteen hundred and ninety-nine.

The highest prices in this decade were reached in October, nineteen hundred and seven, when a general decline began, which continued until August, nineteen hundred and eight. A rise then set in, and there were monthly increases without a break up to March, nineteen hundred and ten, when wholesale prices reached the highest point in twenty years.

They were then twenty-one and one-tenth per cent. higher than the average of nineteen hundred, forty-nine and two-tenths per cent. higher than the yearly average of eighteen hundred and ninety-seven, and thirty-three and eight-tenths per cent. higher than the average price of the ten years, between eighteen hundred and ninety and eighteen hundred and ninety-one.

Then followed a slight decline, and, from June to December, nineteen hundred and ten, prices remained nearly level. At the close of the calendar year nineteen hundred and ten, they were still thirty per cent. higher than the ten-year average between eighteen hundred and ninety and nineteen hundred, and forty-five and four-tenths per cent. higher than the record set by the high price year, eighteen hundred and ninety-seven. Of the two hundred and fifty-seven commodities considered in this investigation, one hundred and forty-eight showed an average increase, twenty-six showed no change, and eighty-three showed decreases.

Some extraordinary variations were recorded during nineteen hundred and ten. Potatoes increased three hundred per cent., eggs, ninety per cent.; coffee, sixty per cent., and mess beef, thirty-five per cent.

From these statements, it is plainly evident that the cost of living is "high." The producer, however, claims he makes only a bare living, merely an existence. The consumer claims he is paying too high a price for the necessities of life.

Who gets the profits, ranging from one hundred to one thousand per cent. is the question that interests the producer and the consumer. The answer is plain and definite—the middle man—whether he be peddler, huckster, grocer, curbstone commission broker or commission merchant.

On this subject Secretary Wilson of the Department of Agriculture said no later than July 31, 1911:

"One of the most pitiable things of modern times is the manner in which the poor of the large cities are being beaten down by the prices which prevail at this time. The prices are such that no man working for ordinary wages can meet them. They are beyond the pocket-book of the poor, and there is nothing that gives the poor any protection from them. This is true in nearly every city. The farmer does not get half the price the consumer pays. The farmer is not benefited by the high prices. The middleman, who steps in between the producer and the consumer, are the people who reap the benefit."

In order to reduce the cost of living, middlemen of all descriptions must be curtailed in their operations, or, in other words, the producer and consumer must be brought closer together.

In the city of Indianapolis and other cities, industrial discontent prevails and has prevailed for years. All on account of the fact that the wages received are not sufficient to meet the obligations incurred, or to be plainer still, the wage worker can not exist without going in debt on the wages he receives. The consequence is, he and his fellow workers demand an increase in wages. It may be granted by the employer or it may not. If it is granted, all well and good; if not, a strike occurs with all its hardships, trials and annoyances.

The employer is not to blame because the wage worker can not pay his debts, nor is the wage worker at fault. Rent, clothes, food, the actual and absolute necessities of life, have gone up by leaps and bounds, thereby compelling the wage worker to ask for an increase in pay. As soon as he gets it, up again goes the cost of living, the middleman reaping the benefits. The fact is, the wage worker is no better off now, as far as wages are concerned, than he was ten years ago, although wages have increased in the meantime, or to be plainer still, wages have not increased in the same ratio that the cost of living has.

One of our public men who has a reputation for being broad-minded and liberal in his views on all questions, said a little over two years ago:

"To increase the cost of living of the average family is not merely a question of a few cents more a day for the necessities of life, or a few cents a day less for wages. Far more is at stake—the health or sickness of little babies, the education or ignorance of children, the honesty or criminality of men, the working power of bread winners, the integrity of families, the provision for old age—in a word, the welfare and happiness, or the misery and degradation of the plain people are involved in the cost of living."

The Indianapolis press within the last few weeks has been heard from in no uncertain tones on the cost of living, one paper remarking that:

"There is hardly an interest in the city, no matter how great may seem its separation from the market, that is not affected by high price of food. We have come to the day when we are bound to recognize the fact that the body that is ill nurtured is ill fortified to withstand temptation, for the mind soon responds to the lower tones of the body. The market problem, of course, seems a formidable one, even to the man who has a comfortable income, but his interest is nothing like so vital as that of those who work for the weekly wage, whose every dollar counts. When we come to this man and his wife and his children, we see the sinister side of the combinations and conditions that extract an unfair price for food for him. And it must be confessed that it is in his welfare that we are most concerned. He has been hard pressed; he has been imposed upon. We want relief for him, primarily."

In order to relieve the situation in the Indianapolis market we recommend:

First—That grocers, bakers, restaurants and the like be excluded from the market altogether.

Second—That every day in the week except Sundays and legal holidays be market days, from June 1st to December 1st, inclusive.

Third—That the east end of the market, known as the shed—being the last addition to the market—be given to the use of farmers and gardeners solely on market days free.

Fourth—That the west side of Alabama Street, north side of Market Street and the east side of Delaware Street, surrounding the market, be given to the use of farmers and gardeners on market days at a rate of 25 cents each per space required.

Fifth—That peddlers, hucksters and middlemen be excluded altogether on market days from selling in that part of the market designated in Article 3, and the streets specified in Article 4.

Sixth—That gardeners and farmers display signs at all times while selling produce, designating whether wholesalers or retailers.

Seventh—That farmers and gardeners be required, under oath, to supply information to the market master, when required so to do, as to the location of their farm, nature of their crops, what proportion of said crop or crops they sell on the market, and any other information he may desire, under penalty of fine and expulsion from the privilege of using the market.

Eighth—That such legitimate farmers and gardeners using the market be exempt from vehicle license and any other such incumbrances that may now exist.

Ninth—That a Commission of three be appointed by the Mayor, to be known as the Market Commission, whose duty it shall be to supervise the interests of the market, hear all complaints made, no matter of what nature, investigate all charges, regulate rents and see that the public and the consumer are not taken advantage of by any one, whether by stall renters, farmers, gardeners or others.

Tenth—That all commodities be sold by weight as far as practical, and that the law be enforced against selling by false or deceptive weights or measures.

Eleventh—That employers of labor be requested and urged to make Friday of each week pay-day, so that the housewives of workers may be able to patronize the market early on Saturdays instead of late at night, as at the present time, when they have nothing to choose from but the "leavings" on hand with peddlers and middlemen.

Twelfth—That the street car company be requested not to use the tracks in Market street between Delaware and Alabama streets only in cases of emergency, or, better still, take the tracks up altogether.

If these recommendations are put into effect we feel that they will help solve the problem of the "high cost of living." But the problem for the whole of Indianapolis is broader than the scope of the market.

Only a small per cent. of our people ever buy anything at the market or ever will. So if lower prices are forced at the market, many people would not reap any advantage from them. Every family that buys at the market also buys at the grocery stores. It therefore follows that the more trade is given to the market, the less will be given to the stores, and it also follows that the less trade the stores have, the higher prices they will ask. So, after all, it is a debatable question whether the little saved at the market by its patrons is not lost to them at the grocery stores. We all agree that the producer and consumer must be brought closer together, and we must therefore realize

that the plan, method or system of bringing this about is the solution of the difficulty.

It is evident that the "high cost of living" is the result of the system of marketing the family necessities. We cannot describe this system better than the Secretary of Agriculture did when he said:

"The distribution of farm products from the farmers to the consumers is elaborately organized, considerably involved and complicated, and burdened with many costly features."

To get an understanding of this system of distribution the following illustration is offered:

There are about fifteen hundred retail grocery stores in Indianapolis and the approximate expense of conducting them is as follows:

Rent—\$50.00 per month -----	\$75,000.00
Labor—Average number of employes, four; average weekly wage, \$15.00, for 4 1-3 weeks in month-----	390,000.00
Horse and wagon keep, taxes, insurance, interest and incidentals, at \$100.00 per month-----	150,000.00

Total for one month-----	\$615,000.00
Total for twelve months-----	\$7,380,000.00

This is approximately what the consumers of Indianapolis pay each year for the last service in getting food from the grocery stores. It does not include handlers' profits or the cost of the commodities, which are all burdened by the tolls taken by country buyers and shippers, transportation companies, brokers, commission men, wholesalers, etc.

Our marketmaster reported over six hundred stands in the market and an average of two hundred wagons on the market daily, making a total, stands and wagons, of eight hundred. These stands and wagons represent an average of two people each, making a total of sixteen hundred people to be paid for serving the market patrons each day, at only a very moderate wage of \$2.00 each a day. This is an expense of \$3,200.00 each market day, \$9,600.00 for the three market days in the week, and \$499,200.00 in a year. This the patrons of the market must pay to maintain and retain the market as at present operated.

The great bane of the present system of marketing from producers to consumers is in the great number of people operating it. Is it therefore worth while to look elsewhere than to the system for the cause of the "high cost of living"? Any plan to remedy the trouble that falls short of straightening the road from the farm to the table and of freeing it from many of the present toll gates will be inadequate to solve the problem.

It is a problem that deserves the most serious consideration of all the people. We claim experiments should be made and plans tried until a practical and successful one is found. We therefore recommend that Consumers' Leagues or Associations be organized for the purpose of dealing with and buying direct from the producer all articles of food necessary for the table. The producers are as anxious to deal direct with the consumers as the consumers are to deal direct with the producers. Neither one nor the other wants to deal with the middleman. This is the solution of the difficulty, and when put into effect the "high cost of living" will be a thing of the past.

It has been officially stated by the Department of Agriculture that it costs 60 cents to deliver 40 cents' worth of farm products to the consumer, or, in other words, when the consumer pays one dollar the present marketing system takes 60 cents and the farmer gets 40. We believe, by the proposed new system, 40 cents' worth of farm products can be marketed, including transportation, for less than 25 cents. If

it can be done for that amount, then it will cost the consumer 65 cents, a saving of 35 per cent. over the old way.

It costs \$7,380,000.00 to maintain and operate the grocery stores of Indianapolis, and \$499,000.00 to pay the wages of people who sell on the public market (these figures do not include any profit), a total of \$7,879,000.00. We believe the Consumers' Leagues or Associations will save fully \$5,000,000.00 of this the first year, and a greater proportion as they get in running order.

By the establishment of Consumers' Leagues or Associations in Indianapolis, we believe enough can be saved in a few years to enable every thrifty family to own its own home.

Objections will be raised to this plan because it will disturb, to some extent, the present order of things. But the present system has simply become unbearable and it is getting worse every year. Better to have a peaceable readjustment than a bloody revolution. The masses of the people will endure much, but there is a limit to all things and a day of reckoning coming. That day is at hand.

Having thus expressed ourselves open and above board, without fear or favor, on this, one of the greatest questions of the day as we see it, we beg to remain,

Respectfully yours,

FRANK DUFFY,

Chairman,

J. A. EVERITT,

Members of the Commission.

REPORTS FROM CITY OFFICERS.

From City Controller:

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE,
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS.
INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 2, 1911.

To the President and Members of the Common Council:

GENTLEMEN: I submit herewith a communication from the Department of Public Safety, requesting me to recommend an appropriation of \$500.00 to a fund to be known as "Smoke Investigation."

I submit herewith an ordinance providing for the amount of the appropriation requested and recommend its passage.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRY R. WALLACE,

City Controller.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
OFFICE OF THE BOARD.
INDIANAPOLIS, IND., September 28, 1911.

Mr. Harry R. Wallace, City Controller:

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Board of Public Safety, held September 27, it was decided to request you to please ask the Common

Council to appropriate the sum of five hundred dollars (\$500.00) for the use of this department, under a fund to be known as "Smoke Investigation."

This is to be used in paying the expenses of three members of the committee appointed by this board, in visiting the cities of the East to investigate the smoke conditions and mode of handling same, with a view of bettering the conditions in this city.

Respectfully yours,

BOARD OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
WM. E. DAVIS, *President*.

From Board of Public Health and Charities:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND CHARITIES.
INDIANAPOLIS, IND., September 13, 1911.

To the President and Members of the Common Council, City:

GENTLEMEN: The Department of Public Health and Charities hereby submits the expenditures and balances of the City Hospital for the month of August, 1911:

	<i>Expenses.</i>	<i>Balances.</i>
Drugs -----	\$364 75	\$996 86
Dry goods -----	312 49	1,540 18
Electrical supplies -----	70 74	388 87
Engine room supplies -----	32 03	100 47
Furniture -----	211 75	1,046 78
Fuel -----	357 69	166 25
Flower Mission Hospital -----	375 69	1,393 72
Gas -----	46 68	398 64
Hardware -----	-----	169 48
Horseshoeing -----	13 50	121 25
Incidentals -----	88 13	170 91
Laundry supplies -----	46 72	352 52
Nurses' fund -----	674 51	3,773 26
Paints and painting -----	-----	11 82
Plumbing supplies -----	128 89	354 85
Provisions -----	2,142 59	10,284 39
Printing and stationery -----	10 00	442 79
Queensware -----	-----	448 39
Repairs to building -----	37 41	1,036 40
Salaries -----	2,722 11	11,440 70
Stable supplies -----	74 10	320 86
Surgical supplies -----	335 50	216 51
Telephones -----	-----	134 56
Tuberculosis fund—		
Hospital (clinic \$88.50) -----	199 90	1,263 73
Automobile -----	-----	125 00
Laboratory -----	18 65	1,461 35
Contagious disease fund (Board of Health) -----	206 74	-----

Total expense -----\$8,470 57

Total number of patients treated during the month of August, 1911—7,676. $\$8,470.57 \div 7,676$ patients= $\$1.10\frac{1}{2}$, average cost of one patient per day.

Yours very truly,
C. S. Woods,
Secretary Board of Health.

From Board of Public Health and Charities:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND CHARITIES.
INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 2, 1911.

To the President and Members of the Common Council:

GENTLEMEN: An officer of this Department visited the Sellers' Farm on September 30, and reports conditions satisfactory.

Yours very truly,

HARRY DUNN, *Clerk.*

REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES.

From the Committee on Finance:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 2, 1911.

To the President and Members of the Common Council:

GENTLEMEN: We, your Committee on Finance, to whom was referred Appropriation Ordinance No. 75, being "An ordinance defraying the current expenses of the city government of the City of Indianapolis, Ind., and for the use of the several executive departments thereof for the fiscal year beginning January 1, 1912, and ending December 31, 1912, including all outstanding claims and obligations and fixing the time when the same shall take effect," beg leave to report that we have had the same under consideration and would recommend that the same do pass.

Respectfully submitted,

FRED C. OWEN,
CHARLES F. COPELAND,
FRANK E. MCCARTHY.

Mr. Owen moved that the majority report of the committee be concurred in.

The roll was called and the motion of Mr. Owen lost by the following vote:

Ayes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Noes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 2, 1911.

MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned members of your Finance Committee, to which was referred Appropriation Ordinance No. 75, 1911, en-

titled "An ordinance appropriating moneys for the purpose of defraying current expenses of the city government of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, and for the use of the several executive departments thereof for the fiscal year beginning January 1, 1912, and ending December 31, 1912, including all outstanding claims and obligations, and fixing a time when the same shall take effect," beg leave to report that we have had said ordinance under consideration and would respectfully recommend that the same be amended as follows:

First. By striking out of item 12, under "Department of Finance," the words and figures "five thousand nine hundred forty dollars—\$5,940.00" and inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "five thousand two hundred twenty dollars—\$5,220.00."

Second. By striking out item 4 under "Department of Public Works," as follows: "4. For automobile maintenance and repair, the sum of one thousand dollars—\$1,000.00," and by renumbering the subsequent items under such heading accordingly.

Third. By striking out of item 14 (original numbering), under "Department of Public Works," the words and figures "six thousand dollars—\$6,000.00," and inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "five thousand dollars—\$5,000.00."

Fourth. By striking out of item 15 (original numbering), under heading "Department of Public Works," the words and figures "thirteen thousand dollars—\$13,000.00," and inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "nine thousand six hundred eighty dollars—\$9,680.00."

Fifth. By striking out of item 1 under heading "Board of Public Safety, Dog Pound," the words and figures "three thousand one hundred sixty dollars—\$3,160.00," and inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "two thousand four hundred forty dollars—\$2,440.00."

Sixth. By striking out of item 2, under heading "Board of Public Safety, Dog Pound," the following: "Two thousand dollars—\$2,000.00," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Seventeen hundred fifty dollars—\$1,750.00."

Seventh. By striking out of item 1, under heading "Department of Public Safety, Police Force," the words and figures "Three hundred seventy-five thousand, six hundred sixty-three dollars and seventy-five cents—\$375,663.75," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "Three hundred fifty-seven thousand, six hundred sixty-three dollars seventy-five cents—\$357,663.75."

Eighth. By striking out all of item 3, under heading "Department of Public Safety, Police Force," as follows: "3. For auto maintenance and repairs, the sum of two thousand five hundred dollars—\$2,500.00," and by renumbering the subsequent items under said heading accordingly.

Ninth. By striking out of item 11 (original numbering), under sub-heading "Police Force," the words and figures "One thousand dollars—\$1,000.00," and by inserting in lieu thereof "Five hundred dollars—\$500.00."

Tenth. By striking out of item 12 (original numbering), under sub-heading "Police Force," the words and figures "One thousand dollars—\$1,000.00," and inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "Seven hundred fifty dollars—\$750.00."

Eleventh. By striking out of item 14 (original numbering), under sub-heading "Police Force," the words and figures "Two thousand five hundred dollars—\$2,500.00," and inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "One thousand dollars—\$1,000.00."

Twelfth. By striking out of item 19 (original numbering), under sub-heading "Police Force," the words and figures "Five hundred dollars—\$500.00," and inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "Two hundred fifty dollars—\$250.00."

Thirteenth. By striking out of item 20 (original numbering), under sub-heading "Police Force," the words and figures "Two thousand five hundred dollars—\$2,500.00," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "One thousand five hundred dollars—\$1,500.00."

Fourteenth. By striking out of item 21 (original numbering), under sub-heading "Police Force," the words and figures "Two thousand seven hundred dollars—\$2,700.00," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "Two thousand two hundred dollars—\$2,200.00."

And we would respectfully recommend that when said ordinance is so amended that the same do pass.

Respectfully submitted,
GEORGE L. DENNY,
GEORGE B. RUBENS.

Mr. Denny moved that the minority report of the committee be concurred in.

Mr. Owen moved to lay the motion of Mr. Denny on the table.

The roll was called and the motion to lay on the table lost by the following vote:

Ayes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Noes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stiliz and Troy.

The roll was called on the motion of Mr. Denny to concur in minority report, which was carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stiliz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

From the Committee on Finance:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 2, 1911.

To the President and Members of the Common Council:

GENTLEMEN: We, your Committee on Finance, to whom was referred General Ordinance No. 55, 1911, being "An ordinance ordering and directing the levy of an annual tax and fixing the rate of levy or levies and taxation for the City of Indianapolis for the year 1912, and fixing a time when the same shall take effect," beg leave to report that we have had said ordinance under consideration and would recommend that

the same be amended by striking out of line 14 of said ordinance the word and figure "five (5)" and inserting in lieu thereof the word and figure "nine (9)," and when said ordinance is so amended we would recommend that the same do pass.

Respectfully submitted,
FRED C. OWEN,
CHARLES F. COPELAND,
FRANK E. MCCARTHY.

Mr. Owen moved that the majority report of the committee be concurred in.

The roll was called and the motion of Mr. Owen lost by the following vote:

Ayes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Noes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stiltz and Troy.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 2, 1911.

MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned members of your Finance Committee, to which was referred General Ordinance No. 55, 1911, entitled, "An ordinance ordering and directing the levy of an annual tax and fixing the rate of levy, or levies, and taxation for the City of Indianapolis for the year 1912, and fixing the time when the same shall take effect," beg leave to report we have had said ordinance under consideration and would respectfully recommend that the same be amended as follows:

First. By striking out the following words and figures in Section 1 (referring to the tax for general purposes) "seventy-four (74) cents," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "seventy-two (72) cents."

Second. By striking out of said Section 1 the words and figures "five (5) cents upon each one hundred dollars (\$100.00) on all such property for general park fund of said city," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Seven (7) cents upon each one hundred dollars (\$100.00) on all such property for general park fund of said city."

And we would recommend that when said ordinance is so amended that the same do pass.

GEORGE L. DENNY,
GEORGE B. RUBENS.

Mr. Denny moved that the minority report of the committee be concurred in.

Mr. Owen moved to lay the motion of Mr. Denny on the table.

The roll was called and the motion to lay on the table lost by the following vote:

Ayes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Noes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

The roll was called on the motion of Mr. Denny to concur in the minority report, which was carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

From the Committee on Public Service:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 2, 1911.

To the President and Members of the Common Council:

GENTLEMEN: We, your Committee on Public Service, to whom was referred General Ordinance No. 52, 1911, being "An ordinance approving and authorizing the sale of certain personal property by the Board of Public Works of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana," beg leave to report that we have had said ordinance under consideration and would recommend that said ordinance be amended by striking out of the inventory item 3, viz., "One one-and-one-half-story house, located on lot 18;" also striking out of the appraisement item 3, viz., "One one-and-one-half-story frame house, located on lot 18, \$200," and when said ordinance is so amended we would recommend that the same do pass.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM H. JOHNSON,
GEORGE B. RUBENS,
CHARLES F. COPELAND,
FRED C. OWEN,
FRANK E. MCCARTHY.

Mr. Johnson moved that the report of the committee be concurred in. Carried.

From the Committee on Elections:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 2, 1911.

To the President and Members of the Common Council:

MR. PRESIDENT: Your Committee on Elections, to which was referred

General Ordinance No. 67, 1910, entitled "An ordinance concerning the storage, care, repair and use of motor vehicles used by the City of Indianapolis, creating the office of City Mechanician, defining his duties, fixing his compensation, providing penalties for the violation thereof, and for publication," beg leave to report we have had said ordinance under consideration and would respectfully recommend that the said ordinance be amended as follows:

First. In Section 3, strike out the words "Seventy-five dollars—(\$75.00)" and insert in lieu thereof the words and figures "Eighty-five dollars—(\$85.00)."

Second. By adding at the end of Section 4 the following: "Provided, however, that should said City Mechanician be unable to perform any repairs needed upon any such motor vehicle, he shall make a statement in writing to that effect to the department under whose jurisdiction said vehicle is being used, and in that event said department shall order said needed work done by contract, according to law."

And we recommend that when said ordinance is so amended that the same do pass.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES E. TROY,
WILLIAM H. JOHNSON,
GEORGE L. DENNY,
GEORGE B. RUBENS,
CHARLES B. STILZ.

Mr. Troy moved that the report of the committee be concurred in. Carried.

INTRODUCTION OF APPROPRIATION ORDINANCES.

By City Controller:

Appropriation Ordinance No. 80—1911: An ordinance appropriating the sum of \$500.00 to and for the use of the Department of Public Safety and fixing a time when the same shall take effect.

SECTION 1. Be it ordained by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, That the sum of five hundred dollars (\$500.00) be, and is hereby, appropriated out of any moneys in the City Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to and for the use of the Department of Public Safety, the amount appropriated herein to be known as "Smoke Investigation Fund."

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Which was read a first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF GENERAL AND SPECIAL ORDINANCES.

By Mr. Stilz:

General Ordinance No. 66—1911: An ordinance amending "An ordinance amending Clause B of Section 2 of an ordinance entitled 'An ordinance concerning the compensation of all officers, heads of departments, clerks, assistants and employes of the City Hall of Indianapolis, Indiana, and repealing all ordinances in conflict therewith,' being General Ordinance No. 32—1907, approved May 16, 1907," being General Ordinance No. 2—1910, approved February 11, 1910.

SECTION 1. Be it ordained by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, That Section 2, Clause B, of an ordinance entitled "An ordinance amending Clause B of Section 2 of an ordinance entitled 'An ordinance concerning the compensation of all officers, heads of departments, clerks, assistants and employes of the City Hall of Indianapolis, Indiana, and repealing all ordinances in conflict therewith, being General Ordinance No. 32—1907, approved May 16, 1907,' being General Ordinance No. 2—1910, approved February 11, 1910," be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

SECTION 2, Clause B. The City Clerk shall receive a salary at the rate of three thousand (\$3,000.00) dollars per annum. The First Assistant City Clerk shall receive a salary at the rate of one thousand two hundred (\$1,200.00) dollars per annum. The Second Assistant City Clerk shall receive a salary at the rate of one thousand twenty (\$1,020.00) dollars per annum.

SECTION 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage.

Which was read a first time and referred to the Committee on Fees and Salaries.

By Mr. Rubens:

General Ordinance No. 67—1911: An ordinance licensing and regulating the construction and regulation of Moving Picture Theaters and Air Domes, and for the licensing of persons to operate moving picture machines and prescribing a penalty for the violation thereof.

SECTION 1. Be it ordained by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, That all rooms or buildings which have heretofore been erected for the use in the operation of, or which may hereafter be erected for or used in the operation of moving picture machines, shall be inspected and approved by the Inspector of Buildings of said city before the same shall be so used. Every room used for such purpose shall be on the ground floor of such building and shall front on

a public highway, and in no case shall there be a means of connection from said room to any other room or building, nor shall any other business be operated or conducted in such room except as hereinafter provided. All exterior walls shall be of some incombustible material. The entire floor of the auditorium, foyer and the exits to the street shall be constructed of fireproof material throughout; or, if joist construction is used in such floor, the space between such joists must be filled to the depth of at least four (4) inches with fireproof material. Every room used for such purpose shall have at least one (1) exit for every two hundred (200) seating capacity or fraction thereof, in addition to the front or main entrance, which exit shall open direct into a street, alley or courtyard, free from obstruction, with direct access therefrom and to a public highway in said city. The doorways to the main entrance to such room shall not be less than five (5) feet in width, and all additional doorways shall not be less than three (3) feet in width.

All doors must open outward, and shall not be locked while the room is open to the public. Each exit shall be clearly indicated on the inside thereof by illuminated red signs with the word "Exit" thereon in letters not less than six (6) inches in height. No aisle shall be less than three (3) feet in width. All seats shall be not less than thirty-one (31) inches from back to back and not less than eighteen (18) inches in width from center to center of the arms thereof, and shall be firmly secured to the floor. No camp chairs or stools shall be used in said room. There shall be placed in a box or compartment in which said moving picture machine is operated a three (3) gallon fire extinguisher, which shall be charged at least once in each year.

SECTION 2. An "air dome" is defined to be an enclosure made of wood or other materials, without a roof or covering, wherein exhibitions, entertainments or other forms of amusement are given. All air domes which have heretofore been erected, or which may hereafter be erected, shall be inspected and approved by the Inspector of Buildings of said city before the same shall be used. Every air dome shall have at least one (1) exit in addition to the front or main entrance, which exit shall open direct into a street, alley or courtyard, free from obstruction, with direct access therefrom and to a public highway in said city. The doorways to the main entrance to such air dome shall not be less than five (5) feet in width, and all additional doorways shall not be less than three (3) feet in width. All doors must open outward, and shall not be locked while the air dome is open to the public. Each exit shall be clearly indicated on the inside thereof by illuminated red signs with the word "Exit" thereon in letters not less than six (6) inches in height. All seats or benches in the auditorium of such air dome shall be securely fastened to the floor or ground. All exterior walls shall be constructed of some incombustible material, or, if made of wood, the same shall be covered with some incombustible material. In all air domes where a moving picture machine is used, there shall be placed in a box or compartment in which said moving picture machine is operated a three (3) gallon fire extinguisher, which shall be charged at all times. No air dome shall be operated within the fire limits, as fixed by the General Building Ordinance of the City of Indianapolis.

SECTION 3. Every person, firm or corporation desiring to operate or conduct any moving picture show or air dome under the provisions of this ordinance shall first secure a license so to do and make application to the Building Inspector for a permit so to do, and said Building Inspector, being satisfied with the fitness and safety of such room or building where such moving picture show or air dome is proposed to be held, as defined in Sections 1 and 2 of this ordinance, shall issue a

permit for said license, and upon the presentation of said permit to the City Controller and upon the payment of one hundred dollars (\$100.00), said Controller shall issue to said person, firm or corporation a license to operate or conduct such moving picture show or air dome for one (1) year from date of such license; Provided, however, that said license shall set forth the exact location on the street where such moving picture show or air dome is located, or proposed to be located, and no removal shall be made to any other location without first giving written notice to the Inspector of Buildings and City Controller of said city and complying with the provisions of Sections 1 and 2 of this ordinance; and provided further, that no person, firm or corporation shall operate more than one (1) place of amusement on any one license, but must secure a separate license for each place where such moving picture show or air dome is conducted; provided, also, that any license issued as herein set out may be transferred or assigned by giving a written notice to the City Controller. It is further provided that no license shall be issued under this ordinance for a period less than one (1) year, and said license shall not be issued until said fee of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) is paid in full.

SECTION 4. It is further provided that any moving picture theater or air dome licensed under the provisions of this ordinance shall be permitted to produce vaudeville acts where such acts are produced without the use of scenery, wings, curtains, footlights or stage lights or any combustible or inflammable properties. It shall be unlawful for the proprietor of such licensed moving picture theater or air dome to suffer or permit any patron thereof to stand in the aisles of such moving picture theater or air dome.

SECTION 5. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation or individual to use, maintain or operate any moving picture machine in such moving picture theater or air dome or any other place of public amusement unless the person so operating the same shall first submit to an examination before a Board of Examiners consisting of the Inspector of Buildings, the Electrical Inspector and the President of the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis touching his qualifications thereon and receiving a license so to do. All persons having submitted to such examination and having satisfied such Board of his qualifications, as aforesaid, shall, upon the payment of five dollars (\$5.00), to the Controller of said city, receive a license entitling and permitting him to operate such machine for a period of one (1) year. But no such license shall be issued to any person under the age of eighteen (18) years.

SECTION 6. Every moving picture machine so used for the purpose aforesaid must be enclosed in a fireproof booth or compartment, which booth or compartment shall be equipped with fire-proof magazines for the top and bottom rolls of such machine. Extra films must be kept in metallic boxes with tight-fitting covers and not more than four (4) films shall be allowed in such booth at any one time. All wiring apparatus for electricity in the use of such machines shall be constructed in conformity with the National Electric Code in existence at the time of the installation of such wiring.

SECTION 7. Any person, firm or corporation violating any of the provisions of this ordinance shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not less than twenty-five dollars (\$25.00) nor more than one hundred dollars (\$100.00), to which may be added imprisonment for a period not exceeding six (6) months.

SECTION 8. All ordinances and parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION 9. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and

after its passage and publication once each week for two consecutive weeks in "The Indianapolis Commercial," a daily newspaper of general circulation, printed and published in said city.

Which was read a first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. Rubens:

General Ordinance No. 68—1911: An ordinance for the protection of pedestrians; providing for the erection and maintenance of enclosed passageways about buildings and other structures to be erected and excavations to be made, abutting upon, or adjacent to public streets; regulating the maintenance of same; providing penalties for the violation thereof and fixing the time when the same shall take effect.

SECTION 1. Be it ordained by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, that it shall hereafter be unlawful for any person, firm, corporation or association to erect, or cause to be erected, any building, or other structure of any kind whatsoever, if such building or other structure shall extend to a height of more than thirty (30) feet above the ground, within the boundaries of the territory hereinafter described within the said City of Indianapolis, without first erecting a safe and convenient enclosed passageway for the use of pedestrians between the property line and the curb adjacent to such building or other structure.

SECTION 2. Such enclosed passageway shall be so constructed as to give a free and unobstructed passage for pedestrians, no less than ten feet in width and not less than eight feet in height; provided, however, that in no case shall such passageway be required to be of greater width than the established and existing sidewalk upon any street wherein such enclosed passageway shall be required; the sides and roof of the same shall be constructed of material of sufficient strength to afford full and complete protection to pedestrians, while passing through the same, from accidental injury by the falling thereon of materials used in the construction of said building or other structure; the roof covering such enclosed passageway shall be water-tight, and the inside walls and ceiling thereof shall be painted or calsomined throughout the entire length thereof; such enclosed passageway shall be equipped with suitable lights of sufficient number and power to illuminate the same at all times between the hours of 7:30 o'clock p. m. and 4 o'clock a. m.

SECTION 3. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, corporation or association to make, or cause to be made, any excavation preparatory to the erection of any building, or other structure, or for any other purpose whatsoever, if any such excavation shall be made nearer than within six feet of the street line in the territory within the City of Indianapolis hereinafter set forth without having first provided an enclosed passageway as herein provided in sections 1 and 2 of this ordinance.

SECTION 4. Such enclosed passageway shall at all times be maintained in a clean and sanitary condition, and shall, at all times, be kept free from rubbish and litter.

SECTION 5. The provisions of this ordinance shall apply to all persons, firms, corporations and associations who shall hereafter erect, or cause to be erected, any building or other structure, or make, or cause to be made, any excavation as hereinbefore described within that portion of the said City of Indianapolis embraced within the following boundaries, to-wit: Beginning at the intersection of the north line of Washington street and the west line of Noble street; thence north with the west line of Noble street to the south line of Market street; thence west with the south line of Market street to the east line of East street; thence north with the east line of East street to the north line of New York street; thence west with the north line of New York street to the west line of New Jersey street; thence north with the west line of New Jersey street to the east line of Massachusetts avenue; thence northeast with the east line of Massachusetts avenue to the south line of St. Clair street; thence west with the south line of St. Clair street to the west line of Massachusetts avenue; thence southwest with the west line of Massachusetts avenue to the north line of North street; thence west with the north line of North street to the west line of Missouri street; thence south with the west line of Missouri street to the north line of Ohio street; thence west with the north line of Ohio street to the west line of West street; thence south with the west line of West street to the north line of Washington street; thence west with the north line of Washington street to the east line of White river; thence crossing Washington street to the south line thereof; thence east with the south line of Washington street to the west line of West street; thence south with the west line of West street to the south line of South street; thence east with the south line of South street to the east line of East street; thence north with the east line of East street to the south line of Georgia street; thence east with the south line of Georgia street to the west line of Noble street; thence north with the west line of Noble street to the north line of Washington street, the place of beginning.

SECTION 6. This ordinance shall apply to all buildings or other structures erected or excavations made upon or in any property abutting upon or within the boundaries hereinabove set forth.

SECTION 7. Any person, firm, corporation or association violating any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined in any sum not less than twenty-five (25) dollars nor more than fifty (50) dollars, and each day such violation shall continue shall be deemed to be a separate offense.

SECTION 8. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and publication once each week for two consecutive weeks in the Indianapolis Commercial, a daily newspaper of general circulation, printed in the English language, and published in said City of Indianapolis.

Which was read a first time and referred to the Committee on Ordinances.

By Mr. Troy:

General Ordinance No. 69—1911: An ordinance to amend General Ordinance No. 83—1910, entitled "An ordinance fixing the salary and compensation of the employes of the City Hall, and fixing the time when the same shall take effect."

SECTION 1. Be it ordained by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, that Section 1 of General Ordinance No. 83—1910, entitled "An ordinance fixing the salary and compensation of the employes of the City Hall and fixing the time when the same shall take effect," be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

SECTION 1. The salary and compensation of the employes of the City Hall shall be, and the same are hereby fixed, as follows:

A. There shall be one Chief Engineer who shall receive a salary of not to exceed one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per month, payable monthly.

B. There shall be one Custodian, who shall receive a salary of not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) per year, payable monthly.

C. There shall be one Night Watchman, who shall receive a salary of not to exceed fifty dollars (\$50.00) per month, payable monthly.

D. There shall be two elevator operators, who shall each receive a salary of not to exceed fifty dollars (\$50.00) per month, payable monthly; provided, however, that when either of said elevator operators shall be ordered by the Board of Public Works to report for duty at night and shall so report and serve, he shall receive an additional compensation of seventy-five cents (75c) for each such night's service, upon the next succeeding pay-day.

E. There shall be not more than two telephone operators, who shall each receive a salary of not to exceed thirty-five dollars (\$35.00) per month, payable monthly.

F. There shall be not more than seven janitors, who shall each receive a salary of not to exceed fifty dollars (\$50.00) per month, payable monthly; provided, however, that the Board of Public Works may employ, at their option, one additional janitor, at the same salary, for not more than eight months in any one year.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage.

Which was read a first time and referred to the Committee on Fees and Salaries.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING.

Mr. Owen called for General Ordinance No. 55, 1911, for second reading. It was read a second time.

Mr. Denny moved that General Ordinance No. 55, 1911, be ordered engrossed, read a third time and placed upon its passage.

The roll was called and the motion of Mr. Denny carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

General Ordinance No. 55, 1911, was read a third time and passed by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Mr. Owen called for Appropriation Ordinance No. 75, 1911, for second reading. It was read a second time.

Mr. Denny moved that Appropriation Ordinance No. 75, 1911, be amended as recommended by the minority report of the committee.

The roll was called and the motion of Mr. Denny carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Mr. Denny moved the Council take a recess of five minutes, which carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 9, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, McCarthy, Copeland, Rubens, Denny, Owen, Stilz, Troy and President John Blumberg.

Noes, none.

At 9:15 o'clock P. M. President Blumberg called the Council to order.

Mr. Denny moved that Appropriation Ordinance No. 75, 1911, be ordered engrossed as amended, read a third time and placed upon its passage.

The roll was called and the motion of Mr Denny carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Appropriation Ordinance No. 75, 1911, was read a third time and placed on passage. The vote on passage resulting as follows:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

President Blumberg announced the result of the vote and declared Appropriation Ordinance No. 75, 1911, had failed to pass for want of a constitutional majority.

Messrs. Johnson and Denny entered objections to the decision of President Blumberg subject to the decision of the Legal Department.

Mr. Johnson called for General Ordinance No. 52, 1911, for second reading. It was read a second time.

Mr. Johnson moved that General Ordinance No. 52, 1911, be amended as recommended by the committee. Carried.

Mr. Johnson moved that General Ordinance No. 52, 1911, be ordered engrossed as amended, read a third time and placed upon its passage. Carried.

General Ordinance No. 52, 1911, was read a third time and passed by the following vote:

Ayes, 9, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, McCarthy, Copeland, Rubens, Denny, Owen, Stilz, Troy and President John Blumberg.

Noes, none.

Mr. Owen moved the rules be suspended and General Ordinance No. 44, 1911, be taken up for further consideration.

The roll was called and the motion to suspend the rules carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 9, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, McCarthy, Copeland, Rubens, Denny, Owen, Stilz, Troy and President John Blumberg.

Noes, none.

Mr. Owen moved that General Ordinance No. 44, 1911, be ordered engrossed, read a third time and placed upon its passage.

Mr. Denny moved that further consideration of General Ordinance No. 44, 1911, be made a special order of business at the next regular meeting.

Mr. Owen moved to lay the motion of Mr. Denny on the table, which motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen, Troy and President John Blumberg.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny and Stilz.

The roll was then called on the motion of Mr. Owen for engrossment which carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen, Troy and President John Blumberg.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny and Stiliz.

General Ordinance No. 44, 1911, was read a third time and passed by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen, Troy and President John Blumberg.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny and Stiliz.

Mr. Troy called for General Ordinance No. 67, 1910, for second reading. It was read a second time.

Mr. Troy moved that General Ordinance No. 67, 1910, be amended as recommended by the committee. Carried.

Mr. Troy moved that General Ordinance No. 67, 1910, be ordered engrossed as amended, read a third time and placed upon its passage.

The roll was called and the motion of Mr. Troy carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stiliz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

General Ordinance No. 67, 1910, was read a third time and passed by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stiliz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Mr. Owen moved to adjourn, which motion failed to carry by the following vote:

Ayes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Noes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

MR. PRESIDENT: I move that the vote by which General Ordinance No. 55, 1911, passed to third reading, be reconsidered.

GEORGE L. DENNY.

Mr. Copeland moved to lay the motion upon the table, which motion failed to carry by the following vote:

Ayes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Noes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

The motion of Mr. Denny was then called and carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Mr. Denny moved that General Ordinance No. 55, 1911, be amended as recommended by the minority report of the committee, which motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Mr. Denny called for General Ordinance No. 55, 1911, for second reading. It was read a second time.

Mr. Denny moved that General Ordinance No. 55, 1911, be ordered engrossed as amended by minority report of the committee, read a third time and placed upon its passage.

The roll was called and the motion of Mr. Denny carried by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

Mr. Copeland moved to adjourn, which motion failed to carry by the following vote:

Ayes, 2, viz.: Messrs. Copeland and Owen.

Noes, 7, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, McCarthy, Rubens, Denny, Stilz, Troy and President John Blumberg.

General Ordinance No. 55, 1911, was read a third time and passed by the following vote:

Ayes, 5, viz.: Messrs. Johnson, Rubens, Denny, Stilz and Troy.

Noes, 4, viz.: Messrs. McCarthy, Copeland, Owen and President John Blumberg.

On motion of Mr. Owen, the Common Council, at 9:55 o'clock P. M., adjourned.

John Blumberg

.....
President.

ATTEST:

Edward A. Ramsay

.....
City Clerk.

