

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
COMMON COUNCIL.

REGULAR SESSION.

CHAMBER OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS,  
MONDAY, JANUARY 21ST, 1867, 7 O'CLOCK, P. M. }

The Common Council met in regular session.

Present—His Honor, the Mayor, John Caven, in the chair, and the following members:

Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Colley, Emerson, Glazier, Grosvenor, Jameson, Kappes, Loomis, MacArthur, McNabb, Seidensticker, Staub and Thompson—14.

Absent—Councilmen Allen, Fletcher, Kemker and Schmidt—4.

The proceedings of the regular session held January 14th, 1867, were read and approved.

Mr. Brown presented the following petition :

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

The undersigned respectfully represents that he purchased of Mrs. Jane Ferry in 1863, for \$2,400, lot 51, and part of lot 52, of out-lot 24, (No. 287 South Pennsylvania street.) The assessment by the City Assessor for the year 1866, on this property, fixes the valuation at \$2,900, the lots being appraised at \$900, and the house at \$2,000. Your petitioner claims that the house is appraised at least \$600 more than it is worth, and asks your honorable body to order the refunding to him an amount equal to the tax on \$600 of such valuation. And your petitioner will ever pray.

H. REITZ.

Which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. Brown offered the following motion :

That the City Auditor be directed to issue to O. B. Stout a duplicate Order for \$100, in lieu of War Fund Order No. 742, issued in favor of Theo. P. Haughey, or bearer, on producing satisfactory proof of its loss by said Stout, and on the filing of proper bond in double the amount of such order.

Which was adopted.

Mr. Colley presented the following petition :

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

Your petitioner respectfully represents to your honorable body, that on the night of the 13th inst. your petitioner was driving his team of two horses attached to a sleigh, containing himself and other persons, at a moderate speed, along Vermont street, going westward; that at a point on said Vermont street, between Noble and Davidson streets, within the corporate limits of said city, there was and is a ditch extending the entire width of said Vermont street, about two and one-half feet in depth, and about three feet in width, of the existence of which your petitioner was not aware; that in crossing said ditch the horses attached to said sleigh attempted to jump across the same and in so doing broke the tongue of the sleigh and a large splinter from the broken tongue struck and wounded one of your petitioner's horses in the leg, injuring said horse to the amount, as your petitioner believes, of sixty dollars. Your petitioner's sleigh was injured, as he believes, in the sum of eleven dollars. (\$11.) Your petitioner respectfully prays your honorable body to take such measures as by you may be deemed proper to ascertain the truth of the facts herein set forth, and to grant him such relief as he may be found entitled to.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN E. HEIZER.

Which was referred to the Judiciary Committee and City Attorney.

Mr. Emerson presented the following petition :

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—Your petitioner would state that he paid taxes on lot No. 11, in out-lot No. 151, in Blackford's addition to the City of Indianapolis, which is right, but he was taxed for improvements, which was not right; there was no improvements on said lot at the time, and there is none yet, and your petitioner asks that the tax so erroneously assessed and paid be refunded; and as in duty bound your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

WILLIAM DARNELL.

Which was referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Emerson presented the following petition :

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—Your petitioner respectfully asks that the tax assessed against him for 1866 for improvements on lot 161, in Wiley's sub-division to the City of Indianapolis, be abated. Said improvements are assessed for two thousand dollars, and there was no improvements on the lot at the time the assessment was made; I owned the lot at the time, for which I expect to pay;

the taxes on. The improvements on said lot were made the past summer, and are not done yet. I will also state that I have paid the taxes on the property I sold for the money to build with; as in duty bound your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

GANAWAY F. ROUTON.

Which was referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Grosvenor offered the following motion :

That the Committee on Revision of Ordinances be instructed to revise the ordinance in reference to the standing of hacks and hotel runners at the Union Depot; also, giving to the Mayor the power to revoke the license of hack drivers at his discretion, upon becoming satisfied of the violation of any ordinance controlling hacks in the city.

Which was referred to the Committee on Revision of Ordinances.

Mr. Loomis presented the following petition :

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—HENRY F. BARNES, a practicing physician and resident of the City of Indianapolis, would respectfully show unto your honorable body, that at the corner of Vermont street and Alabama street, in said city, and along said streets, there are from five to seven huge piles of dirt and rubbish in the middle of and along the sides of said streets that are dangerous, and render said streets unsafe for the ordinary passing and repassing of wagons and carriages along said streets, and that said piles of dirt and rubbish have been and remained in said street for the space of three months; said piles of dirt having been gathered there under the direction of the Street Commissioner and remained unnecessarily for said space of three months. The Street Commissioner of said city has made no efforts or attempts to move said piles of dirt, although within said space of time there have been frequent thaws that would have rendered the removal of said rubbish easy.

Your petitioner would further show that on the evening of the 14th day of January, A. D. 1867, as your petitioner was in his buggy, accompanied by his wife and niece, driving along Vermont street and going into Alabama street, and carefully driving and endeavoring to avoid said piles of rubbish, he ran against one of said piles, owing to the darkness, thereby overturning his buggy and violently throwing your petitioner, his wife, and his niece out upon the ground and severely injured your petitioner in the right arm and shoulder, so much so that for five days he was not able to attend to his ordinary duties as a physician.

Your petitioner would further show that his wife was severely injured in the right arm and shoulder, and that his niece sustained severe injuries in the head.

Your petitioner would further show that by reason of the overturning of said buggy the top was broken off and the shafts and springs of said buggy were broken and an axle badly bent, thereby damaging the same to the amount of one hundred dollars.

Wherefore, in consideration of the injuries your petitioner, his wife, and niece have sustained by reason of said action, and of the damages to his buggy, he would respectfully ask your honorable body to reimburse him for the injuries and damages so sustained, and to pay him the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars, and for such other relief as your honorable body shall deem just and equitable in the premises.

H. F. BARNES.

Which was referred to the Committee on Accounts and Claims.

On motion by Mr. Loomis,

Thomas Williams was allowed 60 days further time to complete his contract for grading and graveling the sidewalk on Kentucky Avenue, provided his security consent to such postponement and continue their security.

On motion by Mr. Loomis,

The Street Commissioner was directed to clear away the snow on the most prominent street crossings without delay, as far as the same is practicable.

On motion by Mr. Loomis,

W. H. Loomis was permitted to deliver to the City Clerk a petition claiming damages, on account of Virginia Avenue flood, by one Huffer, and that the same is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF BOARDS.

Mr. Coburn, from the Board of Public Improvements, made the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, JAN. 21, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—The Committee, to whom was referred the bids for lighting the street lamps have examined the same, and find that Daniel Glazier is the best bidder, his bid being 40 cents per month per post, and would recommend that the contract be awarded to him.

HENRY COBURN, } *Board.*  
J. A. GROSVENOR, }  
JOHN G. WATERS, } *City Auditor.*

Which was received.

Mr. MacArthur, from the Board of Public Improvements, made the following minority report :

OFFICE BOARD OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, }  
*Indianapolis, Jan. 21, 1867. }*

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

GENTLEMEN:—The Board of Public Improvements, to whom the matter was referred, would respectfully report to your honorable body the following minority report on awarding the contract to light, extinguish and keep in repair the street lamps.

After due consideration they are of the opinion that Messrs. Cathcart and Bramwell are the lowest and best bidders for the following reasons, viz. :

That Mr. Cathcart is one of our best machinists and thoroughly proficient in everything pertaining to gas, he having had at one time the superintendence of the Cincinnati Gas Works. Also, that Mr. Bramwell (who learned his trade with Mr. Cathcart) is as good an engineer and as energetic a man as any in the city.

And further, Messrs. Cathcart and Bramwell propose to light, extinguish and keep in repair the city gas lamps two (2) cents lower than Mr. D. Glazier, and give as security five of the best men in the city.

The difference in favor of Messrs. Cathcart and Bramwell is this, one of the partners will attend to the work in day time, the other at night, and

both will give it their special attention and guarantee to give the fullest satisfaction.

Finally, the difference in favor of Messrs. Cathcart and Bramwell will be a saving to the city of over fourteen dollars per month.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

JOHN B. MACARTHUR.

Which was received.

Mr. Loomis moved that the majority report be concurred in, and the contract awarded to Daniel Glazier.

Mr. Brown moved to amend by awarding the contract for lighting the south half of the city to John Lavery, and called for the ayes and noes.

The question being on awarding the contract for lighting the south half of the City to John Lavery, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Emerson, Jameson, Kappes, McNabb and Seidensticker—7.

Those who voted in the negative were Councilmen Colley, Glazier, Grosvenor, Loomis, MacArthur and Staub—6.

Dr. Thompson asked to be excused from voting.

Which was granted.

So the contract for lighting the street lamps in the south half of the city was awarded to John Lavery.

Mr. MacArthur moved to award the north half to Messrs. Cathcart and Bramwell.

Mr. Kappes moved to amend Mr. MacArthur's motion by inserting "Mr. Schulmeier," instead of "Messrs. Cathcart and Bramwell," and called for the ayes and noes.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment to Mr. MacArthur's motion, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Colley, Glazier, Jameson, Kappes, Seidensticker and Staub—6.

Those who voted in the negative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Emerson, Grosvenor, Loomis, MacArthur and McNabb—7.

Dr. Thompson asked to be excused from voting.

Which was granted.

So the amendment was not adopted.

Mr. Brown moved to amend Mr. MacArthur's motion by inserting "Miller" instead of "Cathcart and Bramwell."

Pending which, Mr. Coburn moved to lay the amendment on the table, and called for the ayes and noes.

The question being on laying the amendment on the table those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Coburn, Colley, Emerson, Jameson, Loomis, MacArthur and McNabb—7.

Those who voted in the negative were Councilmen Brown, Glazier, Grosvenor, Kappes, Seidensticker, Staub and Thompson—7.

There being a tie vote, His Honor, the Mayor, voted in the negative, making 8.

So the motion to lay on the table failed.

Mr. Coburn, then moved to reconsider the vote awarding the contract to John Lavery, for lighting the lamps in the south half of the city.

Which motion prevailed.

Mr. Colley moved that the whole matter be referred back, and the City Auditor be directed to re-advertise for proposals to light the city lamps. Bids to be received for the whole city, or by districts, making Washington street the dividing line.

The ayes and noes being called for, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Colley, Emerson, Kappes, MacArthur, McNabb, Seidensticker, Staub and Thompson—9.

Those who voted in the negative were Councilmen Coburn, Glazier, Grosvenor, Jameson and Loomis—5.

So the motion prevailed.

#### REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES.

Dr. Jameson, from the Finance Committee, made the following report:

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

Your Committee, to whom was referred the petition of Wm. W. Smith in relation to an over assessment of real estate for city taxes, would respectfully report, with the recommendation that \$500 be thrown off the assessment.

P. H. JAMESON, *Chair. Com. on Finance.*

Which was concurred in.

Mr. Seidensticker, from the Committee on Revision of Ordinances, made the following report:

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

Your committee, to whom was referred the report of the Committee on Streets and Alleys, recommending a supplementary ordinance in reference to the system of house numbering, herewith report an ordinance.

A. D. SEIDENSTICKER,	}	<i>Committee.</i>
S. A. COLLEY,		
P. H. JAMESON,		

Which was received.

Also, general ordinance No—78, entitled:

AN ORDINANCE supplementary of an ordinance regulating the numbering of houses on the different streets of the City of Indianapolis, and fixing a penalty for failure to comply with such regulations, ordained October 17th, 1864,

Which was read the first time by its title, and passed to a second reading.

Dr. Jameson, from the Committee on Printing and Stationery, made the following report:

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

Your Committee on Printing and Stationery would respectfully report that it will cost one dollar a page to translate the ordinances into the German language.

P. H. JAMESON, *Chairman Committee.*

Which was concurred in.

His Honor, the Mayor, from select committee, reported that general ordinance No. 76, authorizing the issue and delivery of bonds to the Junction Railroad Company was correct.

On motion by Dr. Jameson, the ordinance was referred back to His Honor, the Mayor, and the Committee on Revision of Ordinances, with instructions to embrace all pending amendments to the same.

## REPORTS FROM CITY OFFICERS.

The City Treasurer made the following report:

OFFICE OF CITY TREASURER,  
Indianapolis, Jan. 21, 1867. }

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

Report submitted by the City Treasurer of Receipts and Disbursements, from March 20 to November 23, 1866, inclusive.

## RECEIPTS.

Delinquent tax collected-----	\$12,443 94
Fines from Mayor Caven-----	5,239 66
Licenses-----	2,659 25
Part of Balance from English, former Treasurer-----	4,129 76
Licenses for former years from City Clerk-----	1,147 95
Loan from W. R. Nofsinger-----	40,000 00
Market Rents-----	1,195 05
On sale of old engine, from Chief Fire Engineer-----	234 00
Rent and Pumping-----	52 50
Interest on United States Bonds-----	109 50
Printing on Precepts-----	97 55
Hospital Fund from Dr. Woolen-----	38 70
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from H. Bates	6,000 00
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from Dr. J. M. Kitchen-----	8,000 00
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from Treas. Centre Lodge, I. O. O. F-----	300 00
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from Hume, Adams & Co-----	1,000 00
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from W. H. English, President-----	14,190 73
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from W. H. English-----	11,309 27
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from S. P. Daniels-----	807 59
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from Ind. Gas Co-----	23,242 78
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from Newton Kellogg-----	2,023 88
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from J. H. Ross-----	303 75
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from S. A. Fletcher-----	2,535 42
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from Rev. N. A. Hyde-----	5,069 43
Orders received in exchange for 10 per cent. Warrants from John C. New-----	1,000 00
Balance on hand March 20, 1866-----	9,201 67
<b>Total Receipts and Balance-----</b>	<b>\$152,332 38</b>

## DISBURSEMENTS.

Interest on Loan-----	\$7,200 00
Hospital Furniture-----	1,307 42
Lighting and Ext. Lamps-----	2,177 55
Rent-----	250 00
Specific-----	1,451 97
Police-----	10,678 07
Fire Department-----	6,605 95
<b>Amount carried forward-----</b>	<b>\$29,670 96</b>



Amount brought forward .....	\$29,670 96
Salary .....	4,675 79
War Fund Sub .....	90 00
Assisting Civil Engineer .....	423 75
Jail Expenses .....	157 71
Cisterns .....	2,293 44
Loan .....	40,000 00
Books and Stationery .....	651 47
Damages .....	200 00
Town Clock .....	25 00
War Fund .....	12,410 00
Street Improvements .....	7,532 60
Government tax on Gas .....	637 02
Interest on Bonds .....	840 00
Bridges .....	1,464 30
Gas .....	19,421 16
Detective Police .....	725 00
Fuel .....	37 65
Street Repairs .....	15,322 00
Nuisances .....	70 00
Lumber .....	37 35
Tax Refunded .....	796 42
Percentage .....	842 50
Interest on Orders .....	3,522 95
Gas Fixtures .....	159 65
Printing .....	512 28
Pest House .....	385 55
Assisting City Clerk .....	82 50
Hospital .....	1,818 30
Markets .....	97 50
Costs .....	22 00
Elections .....	19 00
Wood for Poor .....	200 00
Total Disbursements .....	\$145,143 85
Balance to next report .....	7,188 53
Total .....	\$152,332 38

Respectfully,

WM. H. CRAFT, *City Treasurer.*

I hereby certify that the within report has been examined by me, and I find the same correct.

JOHN G. WATERS, *City Auditor.*

Which was accepted and approved.

The City Civil Engineer made the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

Having noticed the kind of lanterns in general use throughout the city, and the kind that are at present being contracted for, would respectfully beg leave to submit the following for your favorable consideration :

The Iron Lanterns, that are in general use in the city, are of no particular size; no two of them being alike. For instance, the glass for the Lantern comes already cut; but when the Lamplighter goes to renew the glass that has been broken, he has to cut and fit each pane of glass to each lamp. The glass cut for one lamp will not fit any other, therefore increasing the work for the Lamplighter, he having to fit each pane of glass to each particular place in lamp. It requires a great deal of time, and an experienced hand in cutting glass. A person not being used to it, will break

nearly as many panes of glass as he can put in, and can not renew all the broken glass in one day.

The cost of glass alone for Iron Lanterns now in use, taking the cost of glass for the past six months as data, we have cost of glass for all City Lamps one year, \$615.82, or .97 44-100 cents per lamp.

You have also thirty-four (34) Galvanized Iron Lamps in use on South Meridian and South Delaware streets. The cost of glass for repairs for this kind of Lantern, taking the cost of keeping the above number in repair for the past three months as data, is as follows; that is, assuming all the Lamps in the city to be of this kind:

Cost of repairs (glass) for all the city lamps, \$297.25; showing a saving of glass in favor of the Galvanized Lantern, of \$318.57, per year.

The glass for this Lantern comes already cut, is easily put in without fear of breaking. The Lanterns are all of the same size, and the glass that will fit one will fit them all, consequently the Lamplighter will have no fitting of glass to do. In cleaning or washing the Lamps, (which has not been done very recently,) the Galvanized Iron Lantern can be easily taken down, and washed much easier and quicker than on top of the post, or the glass can be slipped out and cleaned without any trouble or fear of breakage.

The Iron Lantern cannot be taken from the post without the assistance of two or three men; the glass can not be taken out without a great deal of trouble; also, one is liable to break the glass in so doing, consequently they are obliged to clean them as they stand.

Another thing in favor of the Galvanized Lantern is that there are no doors, the gas being lit from the bottom. There is a great amount of glass broken in our present lamps from the opening and shutting of the doors; and in a great many instances the catches are defective, consequently the doors are swinging back and forth, breaking glass continually. In rainy, wet, freezing weather, the doors are frozen up, and it is almost impossible to open them, and in many instances the glass in the doors are broken by so doing.

I would respectfully add that the Common Council in future, when contracting for Lamps, contract for the Galvanized Iron Lamp or Lantern, and use no more Iron Lanterns; also, that they get rid of the old Iron and Tin Lanterns at once, and use the Galvanized Iron Lanterns, as being the best and cheapest Lantern, as they cost less, costing from \$5.50 to \$6 per Lantern, where the Iron Lantern, now in use, costs \$6.50 per Lantern; making a saving in cost of Lanterns, of from 50 cents to \$1, in each Lantern put up.

They cost less for repairs, are easier cleaned, easier and quicker lighted, and also a better style of lamp than the present style in use.

A private individual, when purchasing a Lantern for his own use, generally gets a Galvanized Iron Lantern, as you will find several instances of this kind in your city.

As private affairs are generally better managed than public affairs, this is only a proof of the old fog system that this city is still working on.

The above are facts which I have learned recently, and which I have taken the trouble to figure out. There are many other defective points in the present style of Lanterns, which a more experienced person might point out to you.

I have no personal interest in this matter, only that the city should have the best and cheapest Lanterns, and the one that costs the least for repairs.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSHUA STAPLES, JR., *Civil Engineer.*

Which was concurred in and the City Auditor directed to specify in his advertisements hereafter for "galvanized iron lanterns."

The City Auditor made the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—The City Auditor respectfully reports the following :

1st. First and partial estimate allowed James Mahoney for grading and graveling Massachusetts Avenue and sidewalks, between Chatham street and the Corporation line east.

2d. A corrected estimate for grading and graveling New York street, exclusive of the sidewalks, between West street and the west side of Blackford street, in favor of James and John Huffer, as directed by your honorable body.

3d. At the last session of your honorable body, on motion by Mr. Loomis, I was directed to re-advertise for the erection of lamp posts, lamps and fixtures, except the service pipes, on Virginia Avenue, between South and Bradshaw streets. Since your order to me to re-advertise, Mr. Root, the contractor, called on me and informed me that he was ready at any time to put up the posts and lamps, but cannot do so until the Gas Company put in the service pipes, which under the new Charter granted them by the Common Council, you make it their duty. However, as directed, I have re-advertised for proposals to be received on the 28th day of January, 1867, but no service-pipes can be laid until the ground thaws out.

4th. Contract and Bond of Charles Roney to grade and pave with brick the west sidewalk on Alabama street, between Vermont and North streets.

5th. Would also report that I have made a settlement with the City Treasurer up to the 23d day of November, 1866, a copy of which statement he presents you to-night. The amount of Orders redeemed one hundred and forty-five thousand one hundred and forty-three dollars and eighty-five cents, (\$145,143.85,) have been canceled and marked "paid."

6th. I also present you herewith a corrected estimate in favor of Samuel C. Adams, the contractor, for grading and paving with brick the east sidewalk on Delaware street, between the first alley south of Ohio street and Fort Wayne Avenue, an error was made in the description of the property owned by one of the parties, and could only be corrected by making him a new estimate.

Respectfully,

JOHN G. WATERS, *City Auditor.*

*Resolved,* That the first and partial estimate allowed James Mahoney, for grading and graveling Massachusetts Avenue and sidewalks, between Chatham street and the Corporation line east be, and the same is hereby adopted as the estimate of this Council, and that the property owners are hereby required to pay the sums set opposite their respective names.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Colley, Emerson, Glazier, Grosvenor, Jameson, Kappes, Loomis, MacArthur, McNabb, Seidensticker, Staub and Thompson—14.

No Councilman voting in the negative.

So the resolution was adopted.

*Resolved,* That the second and corrected estimate allowed James and John Huffer for grading and graveling New York street, exclusive of the sidewalks, between the west side of West street and the west side of Blackford street, be, and the same is hereby adopted as the estimate of this Council, and the property owners are hereby required to pay the sums set opposite their respective names.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Colley, Emerson, Glazier, Grosvenor, Jameson, Kappes, Loomis, MacArthur, McNabb, Seidensticker, Staub and Thompson—14.

No Councilman voting in the negative.

So the resolution was adopted.

*Resolved*, That the second and corrected estimate allowed Samuel C. Adams for grading and paving with brick the sidewalk on the east side of Delaware street, between the first alley south of Ohio street and Fort Wayne Avenue be, and the same is hereby adopted as the estimate of this Council, and the property owners are hereby required to pay the sums set opposite their respective names.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Colley, Emerson, Glazier, Grosvenor, Jameson, Kappes, Loomis, MacArthur, McNabb, Seidensticker, Staub and Thompson—14.

No Councilman voting in the negative.

So the resolution was adopted.

On motion the Contract and Bond of Charles Roney, reported by the City Auditor, were accepted and approved.

On motion, the balance of the Auditor's report was concurred in.

His Honor, the Mayor, made the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1866.

*To the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis :*

GENTLEMEN :—The amount of fines collected by me during the month of December, 1866, was \$465.40, which amount I have paid over to the City Treasurer, as shown by quietus of Auditor herewith filed.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN CAVEN, *Mayor*.

Which was accepted and approved.

The Street Commissioner made the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 21, 1867.

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

The undersigned respectfully reports, that Seibert and Buchanan have finished their contract for furnishing 250 yards of gravel for repairs on Bluff Road, and that they are accordingly entitled to the contract price.

Respectfully,

AUGUST RICHTER, *Street Commissioner*.

Which was concurred in, and the City Auditor directed to report an ordinance.

ORDINANCES ON THIRD READING.

Dr. Jameson called up special appropriation ordinance No. 7—1867, entitled:

AN ORDINANCE appropriating money for the payment of sundry claims against the City of Indianapolis.

Which was read the second and third times and placed upon its passage.

The question being shall the ordinance pass? those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Colley, Emerson, Glazier, Grosvenor, Jameson, Kappes, Loomis, MacArthur, McNabb, Seidensticker, Staub and Thompson—14.

No Councilman voting in the negative.

So the ordinance passed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

Mr. Seidensticker moved that the question of separating the office of Mayor and Police Judge be made the special order of business for the next regular meeting of Council.

Which was adopted.

On motion by Mr. MacArthur the Council adjourned.

JOHN CAVEN, *Mayor.*

ATTEST:

C. S. BUTTERFIELD, *City Clerk.*