

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
COMMON COUNCIL.

REGULAR SESSION.

CHAMBER OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS, }
Monday, April 10th, 1876—7½ 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 Adams, Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig, Craft, Curran, Darnell, Diffley, Geiger, Gimber, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Kenzel, Laughlin, Madden, McGill, Ransdell, Reasner, Reed, Schmidt, Stratford, Stuckmeyer, Thalman, Ward and Webster—26.

Absent—None.

The proceedings of the regular session held April 3d, 1876, were read and approved.

Sealed proposals for grading and graveling Ellis street and sidewalks between Maryland and Georgia streets.

Also, for grading and graveling St. Clair street and sidewalks, from the United States Arsenal grounds to the west side of the western portion of Dorman street.

Also, for grading and graveling Everson street and sidewalks from Prospect to Orange street.

Also, for grading and graveling the first alley east of West street, between the first alley south of McCarty and Ray street.

Also, for grading and graveling the first alley south of St. Clair street, between the C., C., C. & I. Railroad Company's grounds and Winston street.

Also, for grading and graveling the alley running south from Lincoln avenue, between Park and Central avenues.

Also, for grading and paving with brick the south sidewalk of Merrill street, between East and New Jersey streets.

Also, for grading and paving the west sidewalk of Linden street, between Prospect and Orange streets.

Were received, opened, read and referred to the Committee on Contracts.

Mr Kahn, from the Committee on Contracts, submitted the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876.

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

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Contracts, to which was referred the proposals presented to Council April 3d, 1876, have examined the same and find them to be as follows, to wit :

FIRST.

For grading and graveling Columbia street and sidewalks, from New York to Vermont streets :

James W. Hudson, 65 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Henry Clay, 55 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Geo. W. Buchanan, 49 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Samuel Heverling, 48 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Richard Carr, 47 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

James Garner, 47 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Wm. L. White, 47 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

S. W. Patterson & R. P. Dunning, 43 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

James Mahoney, $39\frac{3}{4}$ cents per lineal foot front on each side.

James Muse, 39 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

James Muse being the lowest and best bidder, we recommend that he be awarded the contract.

SECOND.

For grading and graveling Pennsylvania street from Tinker or Seventh street to the north line of said street :

Samuel J. Smock, 49 cents per lineal foot for grading and graveling street where 60 feet wide, and 60 cents per lineal foot where the street is 50 feet wide.

Samuel J. Smock, 55 cents per lineal foot front for grading and graveling the street and grading the sidewalks where the same is 60 feet wide, and 74 cents per lineal foot front on each side where the same is 50 feet wide.

James Muse, for grading and graveling street only, 55 cents per lineal foot front on each side, and for grading and graveling the street and grading the sidewalks, 60 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Richard Carr, for grading and graveling the street, excluding the sidewalks, 62 cents per lineal foot front on each side, and for grading and graveling street and grading sidewalks, 75 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Wm. L. White, 72 cents per lineal foot front on each side where the street is 60 feet wide, and 68 cents per lineal foot front where the street is 50 feet wide.

John J. Palmer, 98 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

- James W. Hudson, 95 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 Michael Foust, 88 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 James Mahoney, 87 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 B. Hammill, 87 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 Geo. W. Buchanan, 70 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 Jesse T. Murphy, 69½ cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 Defrees, Morris & Co., 69 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 Henry Clay, 67 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 O. W. Kelly, 65 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 John Greene, 62½ cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 E. B. Elliott, 57 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 Samuel Heverling, 54 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 S. W. Patterson & R. P. Dunning, 49 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 Irwin & Hanna, 39 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

There is quite a remonstrance against this improvement, and as the property owners desire a different kind of improvement, we recommend that all the bids be rejected.

THIRD.

For grading and graveling Lexington avenue and sidewalks, from Linden to Reid streets :

- James W. Hudson, 85 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 S. W. Patterson & R. P. Dunning, 79 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 Samuel Heverling, 69 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 Wm. L. White, 61 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 John Schier, 60 cents per lineal foot front on each side.
 Richard Carr, 59 cents per lineal front foot on each side.
 Michael Foust, 58 cents per lineal front foot on each side.
 O. W. Kelly, 55 cents per lineal front foot on each side.
 John Greene, 53 cents per lineal front foot on each side.
 Geo. W. Buchanan, 52 cents per lineal front foot on each side.

Fred. Gansberg, 49 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Hiram Seibert, 48 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

James Muse, 47 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

James Mahoney, 44 cents per lineal front foot on each side.

James Mahoney being the lowest and best bidder, your Committee recommend that he be awarded the contract.

FOURTH.

For grading and graveling the alley between Huron and Elm streets, from Cedar to Grove streets :

James W. Hudson, 35 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Wm. L. White, 27½ cents per lineal foot front on each side.

George W. Buchanan, 23 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Richard Carr, 23 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

John Greene, 21 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Samuel Heverling, 21 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Irwin & Hanna, 21 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

James Mahoney, 18 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Wm. Sonnefeld, 17 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Wm. Sonnefeld being the lowest and best bidder, your Committee recommend that he be awarded the contract.

FIFTH.

For grading and graveling the first alley north of Fletcher avenue, from Dillon to Laurel streets:

Wm. L. White, 35 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Geo. W. Buchanan, 31 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Samuel Heverling, 25 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Low & Robinson, 27 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Richard Carr, 25 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

C. A. Webb, 25 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Wm. Sonnefield, 24 cents per lineal front foot on each side.

John Greene, 21 cents per lineal front foot on each side.

James Mahoney, 21 cents per lineal front foot on each side.

M. A. Huffington, 20 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

M. A. Huffington being the lowest and best bidder, your Committee recommend that he be awarded the contract.

SIXTH.

For grading and graveling the alley between Hoyt and Fletcher avenues, running from Dillon to Linden streets :

Samuel Heveling, 29 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Wm. L. White, 27½ cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Richard Carr, 24 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Geo. W. Buchanan, 24 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

John Greene, 22½ cents per lineal foot front on each side.

C. A. Webb, 22 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Irwin & Hanna, 21½ cents per lineal foot front on each side.

M. A. Huffington, 20 cents per lineal foot front on each side.

Wm. Sonnefield, 19½ cents per lineal foot front on each side.

James Mahoney, 14¾ cents per lineal foot front on each side.

James Mahoney being the lowest and best bidder, your Committee recommend that he be awarded the contract.

Respectfully submitted.

LEON KAHN,

ROBT. C. MCGILL,

P. H. CURRAN,

Committee on Contracts.

Which report was concurred in and the contracts awarded, except the second paragraph, which was concurred in and the bids rejected.

REPORTS FROM CITY OFFICERS.

The City Civil Engineer submitted the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876.

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

Gentlemen :—Bids come up this evening for the improvement of St. Clair street between the United States Arsenal grounds and the west side of the western portion of Dorman street, by grading and graveling the same.

I discovered, upon taking the levels for said improvement, that Pogues Run occupies the center of the street, entering the same at the west line of the United States Arsenal grounds and running west 200 feet.

Under these circumstances the street cannot be improved under the present ordinance. The course of Pogues Run will either have to be changed, or stone abutments built on both sides of the creek for 200 feet before said improvement can be made. I would recommend that the matter be referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys, and the bids for the present improvement be rejected.

SECOND.

I was directed to report to your honorable body the cost of building a brick sewer in and along Reid street, from English avenue to Pleasant Run, of sufficient capacity to properly drain the locality east of said street.

A sewer for draining the surface water of the locality mentioned, and for receiving the water from what is known as "Virginia River," will require a capacity of 4 feet in diameter from English avenue in and along Reid street to Pleasant street, and capacity of 4½ feet in diameter in and along Reid street from Pleasant street to Pleasant Run, the estimated cost of which will be, viz :

15,000 cubic yards excavation at 50 cents.....	\$7,500 00
878 thousand brick, including labor, at \$14.00 per thousand.....	12,298 00
Total cost.....	<u>\$19,798 00</u>

By lowering the grade of said sewer, the drainage of the cellars adjacent thereto can be secured, but at the same time increase the cost of construction estimated as follows :

19,000 cubic yards of excavation at 50 cents.....	\$9,500 00
878 thousand brick, including labor, at \$14.00 per thousand.....	12,298 00
Total cost.....	<u>\$21,798 00</u>

In taking the levels for this sewer, I find that, on account of the elevation of the ground, Reid street will not be the best route for the sewer.

The most advantageous route for said sewer would be as follows : Commencing at the intersection of English avenue and Reid street, thence west in and along

English avenue to Laurel street, thence south in and along Laurel street to Pleasant Run. By adopting this latter route, an additional territory of about 15 squares west of Reid street could be drained into said sewer, which must otherwise be drained at a long distance into South street sewer, should the sewer be located in Reid street. The latter route would also relieve many of the gutters west of Reid street, which are now at times overflowed, especially during heavy rains.

The estimated cost of building the sewer along the latter route would be as follows:

16,000 cubic yards excavation at 50 cents.....	\$8,000 00
1188½ thousand brick, including labor, at \$14.00 per thousand.....	16,639 00
Total cost.....	\$24,639 00

To secure the drainage of cellars along the line of said sewer and adjacent thereto, by lowering the grade of sewer, the cost would be:

21,500 cubic yards excavation at 50 cents	\$10,750 00
1188½ thousand brick, including labor, at \$14.00 per thousand.....	16,639 00
Total cost.....	\$27,389 00

In the event of building the sewer mentioned, I would recommend the latter route by way of Laurel street be adopted, as it would afford drainage to a much larger territory than by locating it on Reid street.

Respectfully submitted.

BERNHARD H. DIETZ,
City Civil Engineer.

The first paragraph was concurred in and the second paragraph was received.

The City Clerk submitted the following report:

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876.

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

Gentlemen:—I hereby report the following affidavit now on file in my office for the collection of sewer assessment by precept, to-wit:

Bruner & Riner vs. Joseph J. Bingham for..... \$114 00

And respectfully recommend that you order the precept to issue.

BENJ. C. WRIGHT,
City Clerk.

Which was concurred in, and the precept ordered to issue by the following vote:

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig,

Craft, Curran, Darnell, Duffley, Geiger, Gimber, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Kenzel, Laughlin, Madden, McGill, Ransdell, Reasner, Reed, Schmidt, Stratford, Stuckmeyer, Thalman, Ward and Webster—26.

Negative—None.

The City Treasurer submitted the following report :

REPORT of the City Treasurer for the month of March, 1876.

RECEIPTS.

Balance from February.....	\$31,491 07
From taxes collected.....	162,343 03
From all other sources	1,122 38
Total.....	<u>\$194,956 48</u>

DISBURSEMENTS.

Assisting City Assessor.....	\$321 46
Assisting City Engineer.....	891 42
Bridges.....	2,611 59
Board of Health.....	188 85
Bill posting	8 04
Bonds and interest	1,491 49
City Commissioners.....	112 99
Cisterns	1,063 59
Damages	532 49
Donations.....	2,218 83
Elections.....	44 97
Fire Department.....	19,964 74
Fuel.....	6 17
Gas and gas fixtures.....	24,013 35
Hospitals	1,724 34
Incidental.	104 58
Lamp lighting.....	982 56
Markets.....	389 80
Office fixtures.....	15 74
Police.....	12,456 47
Parks.....	131 91
Printing.....	1,144 90
Rents.....	2,058 50
Street repairs.....	7,942 12
Street improvement.....	3,882 89

Salary	1,625 21
School Board.....	20,689 58
Station House.....	263 29
Sewers.....	1,372 31
Tomlinson estate.....	312 78
Tax refunded.....	72 89
Balance April 1, 1876	86,316 61
Total	\$194,956 48

At the close of the above report, \$50,000 of the balance on hand was used in paying bonds due in New York April 1st, 1876, and the city was indebted to the following:

Sinking Fund	\$9,924 92
Interest Fund	27,789 77
School Board.....	32,836 87
	<hr/>
	\$70,251 56

All orders redeemed during the month were in payment of taxes, except in cases of School Board and interest on bonds.

HENRY W. TUTEWILER,

To BENJ. C. WRIGHT, City Clerk.

City Treasurer.

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10th, 1876.

Which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. Madden offered the following motion:

Moved, That the Mayor be instructed to have that provision of the charter enforced, requiring the City Treasurer to make monthly reports to the Common Council; especially that part which requires a report to be made by that officer fifteen (15) days before the annual election.

Mr. Gimber moved to refer the motion to the Committee on Finance, with instructions to report next Monday night.

Which motion to refer was adopted by the following vote:

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Bollman, Craft, Curran, Darnell, Diffley, Geiger, Gimber, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Kenzel, Ransdell, Reasner, Reed, Schmidt, Thalman, Ward and Webster—19.

Negative—Councilmen Albershardt, Buehrig, Laughlin, Madden, McGill, Stratford and Stueckmeyer—7.

The Board of Health submitted the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876.

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

Report of deaths in the City of Indianapolis from 6 o'clock P. M., on the 1st day of April, to 6 o'clock P. M. on the 8th day of April, 1876.

Under 1 year.....	9
1 to 2 years.....	3
2 to 3 ".....	1
3 to 4 ".....	0
4 to 5 ".....	0
5 to 10 ".....	1
10 to 20 ".....	1
20 to 30 ".....	4
30 to 40 ".....	0
40 to 50 ".....	2
50 to 60 ".....	1
60 to 70 ".....	0
70 to 80 ".....	0
80 to 90 ".....	2
90 to 100 ".....	0
Above 100 ".....	0
Unknown ".....	0
Total.....	24

C. E. WRIGHT, M. D.,
President Board of Health.

A. STRATFORD, M. D.,
Secretary Board of Health.

Which was received.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES.

Mr. Darnell introduced general ordinance No. 14, 1876, entitled :

An ordinance concerning the Sellers Farm.

Which was read the first time.

Also, general ordinance No. 15, 1876, entitled

An ordinance defining certain duties of sanitary policemen in reference to the Sellers Farm.

Which was read the first time.

Dr. Hook introduced special ordinance No. 36, 1876, entitled :

An ordinance to provide for grading and graveling Tinker or Seventh street from Columbia avenue to Hill avenue.

Which was read the first time.

Mr. Ransdell presented the following petition :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876.

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

Gentlemen :—We the undersigned, property owners, living on lots running back to the 30-foot alley between Tennessee and Mississippi streets and Walnut and St. Clair, hereby petition to have the said alley graded and graveled at our cost.

Harry Taylor; John Wymond, 49 ft.; Wm. Coughlen,
97 ft.; A. B. Gates, 39 ft.; E. M. Patterson.

Which was received.

Mr. Ransdell introduced special ordinance No. 37, 1876, entitled :

An ordinance to provide for grading and graveling the alley running north and south through out-lot thirty-three, between Walnut and St. Clair streets.

Which was read the first time.

Also, special ordinance No. 38, 1876, entitled :

An ordinance to provide for grading and graveling the alley running north and south through square No. nine, from Michigan to North streets.

Which was read the first time.

Mr. Schmidt introduced special ordinance No. 39, 1876, entitled :

An ordinance to provide for bouldering and curbing Wabash street, and paving with brick the sidewalks thereof, between Delaware and Pennsylvania streets.

Which was read the first time, and referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys with instructions to report next Monday night.

Dr. Ward introduced general ordinance No. 16, 1876, entitled :

An ordinance appropriating certain fines to the Home for Friendless.

Which was read the first time.

Dr. Ward moved to suspend the rules for the purpose of placing the above entitled ordinance on its passage.

Which motion was adopted by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig, Craft, Curran, Darnell, Diffley, Geiger, Gimber, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Kenzel, Laughlin, Madden, McGill, Ransdell, Reasner, Reed, Schmidt, Stratford, Thalman, Ward and Webster—25.

Negative—None.

The above entitled ordinance was read the second time and ordered engrossed, and read the third time and passed by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig, Craft, Curran, Darnell, Diffley, Geiger, Gimber, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Kenzel, Laughlin, Madden, McGill, Ransdell, Reasner, Reed, Schmidt, Stratford, Thalman, Ward and Webster—25.

Negative—None.

Mr. Craft moved to suspend the rules for the purpose of receiving and hearing the report of the Chief of Police.

Which motion was adopted by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig, Craft, Curran, Darnell, Diffley, Geiger, Gimber, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Kenzel, Madden, McGill, Ransdell, Reasner, Reed, Schmidt, Stratford, Thalman and Ward—23.

Negative—Councilmen Laughlin and Stuckmeyer—2.

Mr. Reed presented the following report from the Chief of Police :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 3, 1876.

To the Honorable Board of Police :

Gentlemen :—I have the honor to submit the following report of the Police Department, showing its condition, number of men in each department, and a few remarks in general. It is required by law in most of cities to make an annual report to the Police Board, so that they and the public may be better enabled to judge of just how the Department is conducted.

THE POLICE FORCE.

The regular force, as at present constituted, consists of 64 men, as follows :

Chief.....	1
Captains.....	2
Sargeants.....	4
Detectives.....	1
Patrolmen.....	50
Special policemen	5
Station keepers.....	2
	65
Total.....	65

Deducting the permanent details and officers from the above total, it will be seen that we have but 50 patrolmen remaining for regular patrol duty. The population of the city of Indianapolis is estimated at about 110,000, and comparing the population with the number of officers as shown by the above statement, it will be observed that there is just one policeman for every 2,200 inhabitants. There can be no doubt that at the present time our population amounts to fully 110,000, which divided by 50, the number of active policemen gives one to every 2,200 inhabitants. It is estimated that under ordinary circumstances, the numerical strength of a police force should be one policeman to each 500 inhabitants. This estimate is, however, for densely populated cities, and would be no fair criterion for a population spread out and scattered as Indianapolis is.

The special design of a police force is the preservation of order and the preventions of crime. This object can only be obtained in proportion as a district is carefully patrolled and guarded in every part by the frequent and almost constant presence of officers. To reach this end, a much larger force is required in this city than we have at present, and without this, much which is required and expected of the force cannot be accomplished.

The city is divided into four divisions, as follows: A, B, C and D, and twelve men are allowed to a division, except Division D, which is allowed fourteen, as Indianola is added to that division.

DIVISION A.

All that part of the city divided as follows shall be known as Division A. On the north by the north corporation line; on the east by the east corporation line; on the south by Washington street; and on the west by Delaware street.

DIVISION B.

All that part of the city divided as follows shall be known as division B: On the north by the north corporation line; on the east by Delaware street; on the south by Washington street and National Road to White River; on the west by the west corporation line east of White River.

DIVISION C.

All that part of the city bounded as follows shall be known as Division C: On the north by Washington street and National road; on the east by the east corporation line; on the south by the south corporation line; on the west by Delaware street and Madison avenue. The South Park is added to and included in this division.

DIVISION D.

All that part of the city bounded as follows, shall be known as Division D: On the north by Washington street and National Road to White River; on the east by Delaware street and Madison avenue; on the south by the south corporation line; on the west by White River. West Indianapolis is added to and included in this division. Washington street being the dividing lines east and west, and Delaware north and south of each division.

And fifty men are all the Council allow the police board to invest with powers to look after the lives and property of a city with 110,000 inhabitants! "But, Mr. Chief," says one, "does not the ordinance of May 18, 1874, provide in section 1st that the city shall hereafter be divided into four divisions and each division into three districts; and does not section 2d provide for four patrolmen for each district, which makes twelve men for each division; and, as there are four divisions, forty-eight men for the city of Indianapolis?" In reply to that question, I will call the gentleman's attention to part of section 1st. which is as follows: *Provided*, That the Police Board shall establish an additional district, the bounds of which shall be all the territory within the city limits lying west of White river, and shall appoint for duty within such districts two patrolmen, only. They did establish an additional district, and made West Indianapolis that district, according to section 1st, which gives them the power to do so. If you look once more at section 2d you will see that it does not mention station-house keepers—or is there any provisions made for a cook? But if you will turn to Section 10 you will see that it provides for them as follows: The keepers of the station-houses, and their assistants, shall be

appointed by the Police Board, and said Board shall be required to make rules and regulations for the government of the station houses and see that the same are enforced. So it will be seen that the station house keepers, their assistants, and the two patrolmen for West Indianapolis are not to be included in section 2d.

The following is the number of arrests made by the police force during the past year:

April	209
May	393
June	566
July.....	613
August	530
September	472
October	434
November.. ..	362
December.....	490
January	297
February.....	309
March.....	255
Making the total number of arrests for the year ending March 31, 1876,...	4,530

For offenses as follows:

Minor offenses.....	4,115
Grand larceny	227
Pettit larceny	96
Robbery.....	8
Assault and battery with intent to kill.....	33
Burglary.....	18
Rape.....	2
Arson.....	1
Shooting with intent to kill.....	3
Obtaining money and goods under false pretense.....	3
Receiving stolen goods	4
Forgery.....	5
Murder.....	4
Embezzlement.....	1
Concealing stolen goods.....	4
Pick pockets.....	2
Passing counterfeit money.....	4
<hr/>	
Total.....	4,530

The amount of stolen property reported at police headquarters during the past year is about \$15,000, and this includes the \$5,800.00 taken from the Central Bank last June, as well as \$900.00 taken on a confidence game from a Mr. Plummer, of Rushville, by one Clark, who was arrested and sentenced to Michigan City for two years, but the money was never recovered. The amount of stolen property recovered

by the Police Department during the same period is between \$4,000 and \$5,000, which will compare very favorably with other cities, as will be seen by the following statements :

In 1874, the amount of property stolen in St. Louis and reported to the authorities was \$8,042.50 ; amount recovered, \$1,190.00. In Washington, D. C., amount stolen, \$113,883.57 ; amount recovered, \$88,857.55, etc. It will be seen that I take the reports of 1874 instead of 1875, and my reason for so doing is that the reports of 1875 do not give the amount reported stolen, only the amount recovered.

I would respectfully suggest the propriety, as soon as practicable, of the construction of a police telegraph, by which the Central Station House shall be placed in telegraphic communication with the railroad depots and the four engine houses, where police roll calls are held. The cost would be about \$3,000 for said lines and instruments included, and the new method of communicating by letter is so simple that any man of ordinary capacity can learn it in a few hours. There is not a city in the Union as large as Indianapolis without a police telegraph, and it is regarded by all who have experienced its advantages as indispensable. I earnestly recommend this matter to your consideration and to the Common Council.

As it is the general impression among a great many of our citizens that the Police Department of Indianapolis is costing a great deal more than it should, in fact more than any city of its size or in proportion to its size in the country, I shall endeavor to correct that impression, in the mind of all fair minded citizens, by showing what it costs to run the Police Departments in the cities of Chicago, St. Louis, Boston, Baltimore, New Orleans and Washington, by presenting the following table :

NAMES OF CITIES.	Population.	Police force all told.	Pay of Patrolmen per annum.	Cost of Department.
St. Louis	500,000	405	\$900 00	\$461,886
Chicago	450,000	590	1,000 00	672,624
Boston	375,000	700	1,095 00	815,000
Baltimore.....	305,000	574	936 00	538,757
New Orleans	250,000	428	1,000 00	587,639
Washington	150,000	238	1,000 00	346,295
Indianapolis.....	110,000	64	900 00	59,200

It will at once be seen that \$59,200, the actual cost of running the Police Department at its present strength, is very small in comparison with the cities quoted above. Washington, with a population of only 150,000, costs five times more to run its Police Department than it costs to run the department in Indianapolis at its present strength. The force for the past year ending April 1st, has cost the city of Indianapolis just \$79,270.75, but it must be taken into consideration that the force was reduced last month twenty-five men, making the present strength 64 ; therefore I base my report on its present strength. The idea has been advanced by certain newspapers and citizens of this city that the police force of Indianapolis is too large ; that it costs too much ; that the citizens cannot afford to pay such heavy taxes to

maintain it ; that a few years ago we got along with a small force, and a thousand other ideas of a like nature. If the Board will look for one moment, they will see how inconsistent the idea is, that the police force of Indianapolis is too large, and the maintenance of such a large force is an outrage upon the citizens and tax-payers of the city, by the fact that a very large majority of the citizens who have to bear the the burden of taxation are paying out every week to private watchmen from one to two dollars to watch their property. Why is it done? Because the police force is so small and the territory so large that a policeman cannot patrol his beat and do justice, more than twice in twelve hours, and the fact is well known to almost every fair minded person of the city.

For an example I will show you the territory that two men have to patrol : Bounded on the north by First street, on the south by Washington street, on the east by Delaware street, and on the west by Missouri street, making a beat extending ten squares north and south, and five squares east and west. It will at once be seen that it is impossible for two men having that amount of territory to patrol to do justice to it, and until the Council does increase the force twenty-five or thirty more, we must expect that crime will not decrease in our fair city, and would it be right to hold the Chief of Police and his men alone responsible? I think, gentlemen, you will coincide with me by saying that a power higher must assume part of the responsibility.

SECRET SERVICE.

Whatever difference of opinion may be entertained in relation to the organization of a proper system for the prevention of crime, the detection of criminals and the recovery of stolen property. One thing is certain, so long as crime is committed or property stolen, injured parties have a right to demand the services of the police in recovering their goods and bringing the offenders to justice; and a most important and difficult service it is. A work that not only demands the best and most active talent in the department, but is attended with more hazard and beset with more temptations and inducements to wrong-doing than any other known in the land.

He that is robbed of his goods, perhaps his last dollar, finding himself reduced in one short hour from affluency to poverty, first thinks of the loss of his fortune, and next of the detective who can render him the most efficient service in recovering it; and he is ready to give ten or even twenty per cent. to any one who will recover it. What an inducement is here held out to an officer who has a large family to support and nothing to depend on but his small salary. Who best knows and who can best tell the officers where to look for stolen treasures? Be his purpose ever so honorable, will he have any inducement to visit the haunts of thieves to obtain information? Can he accomplish his work in that direction without associating with them and securing their confidence and good will? Will he have any inducements held out to him to share with them a generous reward if they will aid him to obtain it? The detective officer is virtually the "man about town," and is supposed to know more of the haunts and habits of the violators of the law; and more of their secret devices and machinations, and of the means and manner in

which they accomplished their various purposes, than any other man. Would not that class of persons, under such circumstances, be likely to leave no means untried to secure his favor?

I do not pretend to say that these things have ever been done; but no sane man can shut his eyes to the fact that the detective officer is at every step liable to meet with these temptations and thousands of others of a like character; and be he ever so honest the nature of his work is such that he is often subjected to the most unjust suspicions, under circumstances which he can neither control nor satisfactorily explain to the public.

The first duty of the police officer is the protection of life and property and the prevention of crime. While acting in that capacity his character and position should always be known to the public. But another most important and difficult duty devolves upon him in the detection of criminals. In this should his character and position be as fully known, or should his power be felt, but not seen; a power that bad men can not avoid, because unseen; that they can not corrupt because unknown; would not a mere suspicion, even, that such a force existed, have its influence on bad men. The peace of our city, the lives and property of our citizens are involved in these questions. They are worthy of a careful consideration, not only by the Police Board and Common Council, but by the press of our city who have, from time to time, tried to impress upon the minds of its readers that it was a useless expenditure of public money and should be abolished.

I have in this report endeavored as far as possible to draw no partisan lines.

I cannot close this report without thanking the board for their kindness in aiding me in every way in their power, and by so doing you have made my duties seem lighter than they actually were.

I have two as good captains, one detective and four sergeants as can be found in any force in the country, and as for the patrolmen, they are all good and competent men.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANK WILSON,
Chief of Police.

Which was received.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES.

Mr. Gimber, from the Committee on Streets and Alleys, submitted the following report:

INDIANAPOLIS, March 13, 1876.

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

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Streets and Alleys, to whom was referred sundry papers, would respectfully report:

FIRST.

An ordinance and petition and also remonstrance, introduced by Dr. Ward

grade and pave with brick the west sidewalk on Railroad street, between North and St. Clair streets. The property owners who remonstrate own more feet front than the petitioners, and that the above named street is not improved. Your Committee would recommend to strike the ordinance from the file, and recommend the passage of an ordinance for the improvement of said Railroad street.

SECOND.

A motion introduced by Councilman Curran, for the construction of wooden culverts on both sides of Cedar street, between Fletcher avenue and Dillon street, amended by Dr. Stratford to include east side of English avenue from Cedar street to Dillon street. Your Committee would report that the city is not responsible to lay culverts the entire length of the line of any street for street crossings. We therefore recommend not in favor of the above motion.

THIRD.

A motion was introduced by Councilman Ransdell, to put down stone flag crossing crossing at the following points: On Market street north side, at crossing on Illinois street; on west side Indiana avenue across New York street; also across Indiana avenue, from Moody's drug store to Ryan's block.

Your Committee would recommend not in favor of the passage of the above motion.

FOURTH.

A motion was introduced by Councilman Darnell to lay stone crossing across North Illinois street on the north side of Tinker street, thence south across Tinker street.

Your Committee would not recommend the passage of the above motion.

FIFTH.

A motion was introduced by Dr. Ward, directing the Street Commissioner to construct a wooden culvert over the north and south crossings of North street, at the intersection of Liberty street.

Your Committee would recommend in favor of the above motion.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY GIMBER,
W. F. REASNER,
ISAAC THALMAN,
Committee on Streets and Alleys.

Which was concurred in.

Also, the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, March 27, 1876.

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

Gentlemen.:—Your Committee on Streets and Alleys, to whom was referred sundry papers, would respectfully report :

FIRST,

A motion, introduced by Councilman Craft, directing the Committee on Streets and Alleys to examine the repairs made on the gutters of Massachusetts avenue, between Pennsylvania and Alabama streets, by the Street Commissioner and report to this Council as to why cement pipe, to the amount of several hundred feet, was used when the repairs could have been better and at a very trifling cost by simply carrying out the orders of the Council. Your Committee have examined the work and found that there was a mistake made between the City Civil Engineer and the Street Commissioner. The Engineer awarding such work on the corner of Massachusetts avenue and Vermont street, and the Street Commissioner also understood the same to be done on the corner of New York and Massachusetts avenue, the latter part not yet finished. The gutter at headquarters Engine House, on New York street had to be placed there on account of engine going in and out. The whole amount of money expended for the above work, according to the estimate of the Street Commissioner and Engineer, will not exceed one hundred dollars (\$100.) Your Committee would recommend that such work done hereafter that will exceed fifty dollars, (\$50,) shall only be done by order of this Council.

SECOND.

A motion introduced by Councilman Diffley and referred to your Committee, directing the Street Commissioner to place a stone crossing on the south side of West Washington street, at the crossing of Mississippi street, your Committee would report not to recommend the adoption of the motion.

THIRD.

A motion was also referred to your Committee, instructing the Street Commissioner to place a wooden culvert at the crossing of Home avenue with Broadway street and College avenue. Your committee would recommend that the Street Commissioner be directed to do the above work

FOURTH.

A motion was referred to your Committee, introduced by Councilman Thalman, directing the Street Commissioner to put a wooden culvert at the south crossing of Market and California streets, your Committee would recommend the Street Commissioner to do the above work.

FIFTH.

A motion was introduced by Councilman Laughlin and referred to your Committee instructing the Street Commissioner to lay a stone crossing on each side of Alabama street, across South street. Your Committee would not recommend in favor of the passage of the motion.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY GIMBER,

WM. F. REASNER,

ISAAC THALMAN,

Committee on Streets and Alleys.

Mr. Craft moved to refer the first paragraph back to the Committee, with instructions to have the cement pipe taken out and the boulders replaced.

Which motion failed to pass by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Craft, Darnell, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Ransdell, Reed, Thalman, Ward and Webster—11.

Negative—Councilmen Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig, Curran, Diffley, Gimber, Kenzel, Laughlin, Madden, Reasner, Schmidt, Stratford and Stuckmeyer—13.

The first paragraph of the report was then adopted by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig, Curran, Diffley, Geiger, Gimber, Kenzel, Laughlin, Madden, Ransdell, Reasner, Schmidt, Stratford, Stuckmeyer and Thalman—17.

Negative—Councilmen Craft, Darnell, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Reed, Ward and Webster—8.

The remainder of the report was concurred in.

Also, the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 3, 1876.

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

Gentlemen :—Your Committee on Streets and Alleys and Civil Engineer, to whom was referred the motion directing us to examine and report upon the practicability and cost of protecting the street in West Indianapolis which terminates at the west bank of White River, would report that we have examined the same and find that it can be protected in two different ways:

FIRST.

By building a stone wall along the west bank of White river, and filling up that portion washed out. This would cost in round numbers the sum of one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars.

The second plan would be by purchasing that portion of the ground washed out, and owned by private individuals, and sloping the bank as it now stands and protecting the same with rip rap. This plan would cost in round numbers the sum of fifty-five thousand dollars.

Owing to the present condition of the treasury, we would recommend that the matter be indefinitely postponed.

HENRY GIMBER,
WM. F. REASNER,
ISAAC THALMAN,

Committee on Streets and Alleys.

BERNHARD H. DIETZ,
City Civil Engineer.

Which was concurred in.

Mr. Reasner, from the Committee on Accounts and Claims, submitted the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876.

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

Gentlemen :—Your Committee, to whom was referred sundry petitions, beg leave to report as follows :

On the petition of Joseph Caylor, asking to have refunded to him certain taxes paid by him in the year 1874, claiming that in making up the schedule of credits of stocks and other personal property, that most of it consisted of promissory notes which he had received from sale of certain property made by him to certain parties

that were unable to comply with terms of said sale, whereby he was compelled to take back said property. Your Committee are of the opinion that the prayer of the petitioner should not be granted, as it would involve the refunding of numberless claims.

SECOND.

The petition of Matilda Caskey, asking to have refunded to her certain taxes paid on the north equal fourth of lot 109, in Butler's add. to College Corner; that by a clerical error the face of the deed was made to read the north full fourth of lot 119, in said addition, which lot belongs to one said Lewis Shively, and that by means of said error she has paid the sum of \$27.50 upon lot 119, which should have been assessed against and paid by said Lewis Shively, as is shown by the certificate of the City Treasurer, that the said Shively had refused payment to the petitioner. She further represents that by means of said error, her lot No. 109 in said addition was returned delinquent, and the sum of \$20.11 is charged against said lot No. 109, as penalty and interest. Said petitioner prays at the hands of the Council that the City Treasurer be authorized and instructed to make a credit of the sum of \$27.50 upon the assessed taxes of lot No. 109, and that the sum of \$20.11 assessed against lot No. 109 as penalty and interest be abated.

The opinion of your Committee is that the error cited in the petition was not the fault of the city, and the assessment was properly made according to the records and therefore the party praying relief at the hands of the Council should seek it from the parties directly interested in the matter.

THIRD.

The petition of Dennis Cooney, asking to have deducted the sum of \$16.87 from his current taxes by reason that a certain note held by him and returned for taxes was given by a party now a bankrupt.

Your Committee are in this case of the same opinion as in the case of Jos. Caylor, and recommend that it be not allowed.

FOURTH.

That the petition of Wm. H. Lyons, representing that on the 10th day of March, 1873, he purchased at the sale for city taxes lot 27, in out-lot 108, in Vajen's subdivision, paying therefor the sum of \$6.35. The certificate of the City Treasurer accompanying the same shows that the sale was an error, as the taxes had been paid on said lot by Wm. Hensley.

We therefore recommend that the City Clerk be instructed to make a bill and

have the same incorporated in the next appropriation ordinance, for the sum of \$6.35, to said W. H. Lyons.

Respectfully,

WM. F. REASNER,
GEO. C. WEBSTER,
GEO. W. GEIGER,
Committee on Accounts and Claims.

WM. HADLEY,
City Assessor.

Which was concurred in.

Mr. Adams, from the Committee on Judiciary, submitted the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876.

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

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Judiciary, to whom was referred the proposition of Sam. J. Patterson, offering to sell the city the eleven acres of ground necessary for the proposed change of Fall creek, at \$1,000 per acre, together with communication of John G. Blake, Geo. W. Parker and others, certifying that the above ground is fairly and justly worth \$1,000 per acre.

Your Committee would respectfully report that the only proper and equitable manner of appraising the grounds of Mr. Patterson would be for Mr. Patterson to choose a man, the city another, and the two thus chosen select a third. Then these gentlemen thus chosen appraise the ground, and Mr. Patterson and the city agreeing to abide by the judgment of the three gentlemen thus selected.

Respectfully submitted,

J. C. ADAMS,
J. J. DIFFLEY,
H. F. ALBERSHARDT,
Committee on Judiciary.

Which was concurred in.

Dr. Stratford, Chairman of the Committee on Sewers, submitted the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876.

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

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Sewers, to which was referred the motion of Dr. Hook, to award the contract for building the Archer street and Clifford avenue

sewer to C. E. Whitset, would respectfully report that we have examined the premises and are satisfied there is a great necessity for said sewer, there being no other outlet for the water which accumulates at the junction of Archer street and Malott avenue, and the territory thereabout.

We also find that almost the whole line of the sewer runs along the line of property not benefitted by the sewer, it being high ground and needs no surface drainage, and according to the Engineer's profile it will not be of sufficient depth for sewerage purposes, but only for drainage of the low ground, since the sewer must be built very soon.

We therefore recommend that the contract be awarded as recommended by the the Committee on Contracts.

I. W. STRATFORD,
F. SCHMIDT,
Committee on Sewers.

Mr. Buehrig, from the same Committee, submitted the following minority report :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876,

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

Gentlemen :—As a minority of your Committee, I respectfully report against the adoption of any report recommending the building of the Archer street and Cliff avenue sewer, for the following reasons :

First.—I do not believe that the city should bear all the expense of a sewer where private property is benefitted, but should be taxed \$1.50 per foot on either side.

Second.—We have not the money in the treasury at this time to undertake the building of extensive public works.

Third—At this time it is not politic that the out-going council should tie the hands of the new Council, who have to provide means to pay for the proposed improvement.

Very respectfully,

WM. BUEHRIG.

Dr. Stratford moved to lay the minority report on the table.

Which motion was adopted by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Craft, Darnell, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Laughlin, Ransdell, Reed, Schmidt, Stratford, Ward and Webster—13.

Negative—Councilmen Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig, Curran, Diffley, Geiger, Kenzel, Madden, Reasner, Stuckmeyer and Thalman—11.

The report submitted by Dr. Stratford was then concurred in by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Craft, Darnell, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Laughlin, Ransdell, Reed, Schmidt, Stratford, Ward and Webster—13

Negative—Councilmen Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig, Curran, Diffley, Geiger, Kenzel, Madden, Reasner, Stuckmeyer and Thalman—11.

On motion by Mr. Kahn, the report of the Committee on Contracts, recommending the award of the above mentioned sewer to C. E. Whitsit, was concurred in and the contract awarded.

Dr. Hook presented the contract and bond of C. E. Whitsit, for constructing the above mentioned sewer.

Mr. Stuckmeyer moved to postpone action on approval of the bond for one week.

Mr. Schmidt moved to lay Mr. Stuckmeyer's motion on the table.

Which motion to lay on the table failed to pass by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Darnell, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Reed, Schmidt and Stratford—8.

Negative—Councilmen Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig, Craft, Curran, Diffley, Geiger, Kenzel, Laughlin, Madden, Ransdell, Reasner, Stuckmeyer, Thalman, Ward and Webster—16.

Mr. Stuckmeyer's motion was then adopted.

Mr. Albershardt, from the Committee on Water Works, submitted the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, March 27, 1876.

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

Gentlemen :—Your Committee on Water Works, to whom was referred a motion

introduced by Councilman Albershardt, directing the City Civil Engineer to advertise for bids for seven drinking fountains to be located at different places in the city, respectfully report that, in our opinion, all those fountains are needed. Therefore, your Committee recommends that the City Civil Engineer be instructed to carry out the provisions of said motion.

Respectfully submitted,

H. F. ALBERSHARDT,
F. M. HOOK.
J. J. DIFFLEY,
Committee on Water Works.

Which was concurred in by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Albershardt, Buehrig, Darnell, Diffley, Hall, Hook, Reed, Schmidt, Stratford, Thalman, Ward and Webster—13.

Negative—Councilmen Bollman, Craft, Curran, Geiger, Kahn, Kenzel, Laughlin, Madden, Ransdell, Reasner and Stuckmeyer—11.

Also, the following report:

INDIANAPOLIS, March 27, 1876.

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

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Water Works, to whom was referred a motion offered by Councilman Ward, directing the Civil Engineer to advertise for bids for the erection of a drinking fountain on Fort Wayne avenue, between St. Joe and St. Mary streets.

Also, a motion offered by Councilman Buehrig, directing the City Civil Engineer to advertise for bids for the erection of a drinking fountain at the southwest corner of Kentucky avenue and West street.

We, your Committee, are of the opinion that a fountain is badly needed at the above named places, and therefore recommend the adoption of said motions, and that the Civil Engineer be instructed to carry out the provisions of said motions.

Respectfully submitted,

H. F. ALBERSHARDT,
F. M. HOOK
J. J. DIFFLEY,
Committee on Water Works.

Which was concurred in by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig,

Darnell, Diffley, Geiger, Hall, Hook, Kahn, Kenzel, Madden, Ransdell, Reasner, Reed, Schmidt, Stratford, Thalman, Ward and Webster—20.

Negative—Councilmen Craft, Curran, Laughlin and Stackmeyer—4.

Also, the following communication :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876.

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

Gentlemen :—The following is a list of fire plugs set and connected since my report dated January 3, 1876, the location of which were made by the Chief Fire Engineer, under directions from the Committee on Water Works and Fire Department :

- One on Pennsylvania street, first alley south of Washington street.
- One on Tennessee street, corner of Court street.
- One on Tennessee street between Vermont and Michigan.
- One on South street east of Jeffersonville R. R. depot.
- One on Ohio street at alley between Illinois and Meridian.
- One on Market street west side of Circle street.
- One on Illinois street between Washington and Market.
- One on Court street at alley between Pennsylvania and Delaware.
- One on Ohio street between Alabama and Delaware.
- One on South street corner of Eddy street.
- One on South street between Illinois and Meridian.
- One on South street between Meridian and Pennsylvania.
- One on Arsenal avenue corner of Ohio.
- One on Georgia street between Illinois and Tennessee.
- One on Georgia street between Tennessee and Mississippi.
- One on Georgia street between Pennsylvania and Meridian.
- One on Maryland street between Meridian and Illinois.
- One on Maryland street between Illinois and Tennessee.
- One on Tennessee between Washington and Maryland.
- One on Alabama between Washington and Market.
- One on Market between New Jersey and East.
- One on Market between Alabama and New Jersey.
- One on New Jersey between Washington and Market.
- One on Delaware between Washington and Maryland.
- One on Virginia avenue between Washington and Maryland.
- One on East street between South and Valley streets.
- One on Illinois between Vermont and Michigan.
- One on Vermont between Delaware and Alabama.

- One on Washington street west side of railroad tracks, near Noble.
- One on Massachusetts avenue between New Jersey and East.
- One on Massachusetts avenue between New York and Vermont.
- One on Michigan street between Delaware and Alabama.
- One on North street between New Jersey and Alabama.
- One on Pennsylvania street between Maryland and Georgia.
- One on Michigan street at first alley east of Illinois.
- One on Delaware street north of and near St. Joseph.
- One on Malott avenue near I. P. & C. R. R.
- One on Pennsylvania street north of First street.
- One on Louisiana street between Meridian and Illinois.
- One on National Road between Geisendorf and Blake.
- One on Pennsylvania street between Vermont and Michigan.

At the request of the Chief Fire Engineer the fire plug on the southeast corner of Davidson and Ohio streets, previously reported, was removed to Tennessee street between Georgia and Louisiana streets.

The Chief Fire Engineer was notified, as fast as plugs were put in and ready for use for fire protection, giving him the location and date in each case.

The following is a recapitulation of the fire plugs now in use, a full list of which has been furnished the Chief Fire Engineer and the City Civil Engineer:

Old fire plugs	186
Fire plugs reported January 3, 1876	324
Fire plugs now reported.....	41
<hr/>	
Total fire plugs	551

I report that the new machinery erected for this company by the Holley Manufacturing Company is now in complete running order, and was formally accepted by this company on the 8th inst. It is proposed to give a public exhibition of the power and capacity of the new machinery as soon as the filter can be properly paced and connected, and the connection with the large mains of the old and new works, in the water works building, can be made, of which due notice will be given your Honors.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

JOHN R. ELDER,
President Water Works Company.

Which was received, and the Chief Fire Engineer directed to see that the plugs are properly counted.

Mr. Geiger, from the Committee on Fire Department, submitted the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 8, 1876.

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

Gentlemen :—Your Committee on Fire Department, to whom was referred the motion of Mr. Gimber, relating to the replacing of the fire engines located at the No. 4 and 5 Engine Houses, by exchange, beg leave to report that a motion was passed by the Council in 1874, instructing the Chief Fire Engineer to locate the engines as he, in his judgment, thought best for the interests and protection of property, and we beg to refer the motion back to your honorable body.

Respectfully,

GEO. W. GEIGER,
GEO. KENZEL,
W. H. CRAFT,
Committee on Fire Department.

Which was received.

Also, the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, April 10, 1876.

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

Gentlemen :—We, your Committee on Fire Department, would respectfully report that we have received the following proposals for furnishing the Department with three thousand (3,000) feet of hose recently ordered to be purchased by your honorable body, which said proposals are herewith submitted :

Gutta Percha and Rubber Co., New York, four bids, as follows :

Bid No. 1—Patent carbolized fire hose, 5-ply, with 6-ply and capped ends, warranted 30 months, per foot, \$1.50.

Bid No. 2—Patent carbolized fire hose, 4-ply, with extra length 5-ply and capped ends, 30 months' warrant, per foot, \$1.25.

Bid No. 3.—Patent carbolized fire hose, 4-ply, 5-ply and capped ends, warranted for 18 months' service, per foot, \$1.10.

Bid No. 4—Patent carbolized fire hose, 4-ply, 5-ply ends, per foot, \$1.00.

Bull & Co.—

4-ply hose with 5 ply and capped ends, warranted to stand 400 lbs. pressure to the square inch and last 30 months, on board of cars at Trenton, N. J., \$1.00.

Harry Taylor and John J. Palmer, 6 bids—

New York Rubber Co's best 4-ply with 5-ply and capped ends, per foot, 99 cents.

Goodyear Rubber Co's best 4-ply, with 5-ply and capped ends, per foot, 75 cents.

Goodyear Rubber Co's carbolized 4-ply, with 5-ply and capped ends, per foot, \$1.05.

Goodyear Rubber Co's Maltese Cross, 4-ply, with 5-ply and capped ends, per foot, \$1.24½.

Torrey's carbolized end protected 4-ply and 5-ply capped ends, per foot, \$1.15.

New York Gutta Percha and Rubber Co's carbolized 4-ply, and 5-ply capped ends, per foot, \$1.18.

Edward Cary—

Rubber fire hose, 4-ply, with 5-ply and capped ends, warranted to stand 550 lbs. pressure to the square inch, and last 30 months, per foot, \$1.00.

John Fishback—

Steam fire engine hose, 4-ply, ends strengthened and warranted to last 24 months, per foot, with couplings, \$1.27.

Hilderbrand & Fugate—

Boston Belting Co's excelsior hose, 4-ply, with 5-ply capped ends, warranted to stand 400 lbs. pressure to the square inch, per foot, 92 cents.

Boston Belting Co's fire hose, 4-ply, with 5-ply capped ends, and warranted to stand 300 lbs. pressure to the square inch, per foot, 74 cents.

Chas. Dougherty—

Steam fire hose, 4-ply, with 5-ply capped ends, per foot, \$1.24.

C. Ahrens & Co.—

Boston Belting Co's Excelsior Hose, 4-ply, 5-ply capped ends, warranted to stand 400 lbs. pressure to the square inch and last 30 months, per foot, 98c.

Akron Rubber Works—

White anchor hose, 4-ply, 5-ply ends (capped), (extra heavy duck,) warranted to stand 450 lbs. pressure to the square inch and last three years, per foot, \$1.00.

Red cross fire engine hose, 4 ply, 5-ply capped ends, stand 400 lbs. pressure and last 30 months, per foot, 80c.

W. F. Corne, Blake rubber lined cotton hose—four bids.

Sample "A," warranted to stand 400 lbs. pressure and last 30 months, per foot \$1.40.

Sample "B" and "C," guarantee same as above, per foot, \$1 25.

Sample "D," warranted to stand 300 lbs. pressure, per foot, \$1.00.

We have carefully examined the above proposals and warranties (where any warranty was submitted), together with all samples submitted, and we are of the opinion that, in consideration of the nature of the guarantee submitted with their proposal, that the Akron Rubber Company, of Akron, Ohio, to furnish 3,000 feet of their "white anchor" hose of one (\$1.00) dollar per foot is the best bid received.

We therefore recommend that the contract be awarded to the Akron Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio, and that the City Attorney be and is hereby instructed to prepare the contract and bond, and that he be instructed to insert in said contract a copy of the warranty submitted, with the proposition of the said Akron Rubber Co.

GEO. W. GEIGER,

W. H. CRAFT,

GEO. KENZEL,

Committee on Fire Department.

Which was concurred in and the contract awarded.

Mr. Craft, from the Committee on Railroads, submitted the following report and agreement :

INDIANAPOLIS, March 20, 1876.

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

Gentlemen :—The undersigned, members of the Committee on Railroads, to which was referred sundry papers looking to the consolidation of the C., C., C. & I., and the I., P. & C. Railway tracks, on a line east of the present C., C., C. & I. Railroad shops and transfer depot east of Winston street, and the abandonment by said companies of Railroad street, from Market to North streets, would report that we have had the same under consideration for several months, and have at last succeeded in bringing the said companies to a mutual agreement, which is duly signed and accompanies this report, together with a large number of petitioners, asking that the same be accepted by the city.

Respectfully,

W. H. CRAFT,

JOHN STUCKMEYER,

Committee on Railroads.

CONTRACT.

WHEREAS, Two suits are now pending in the Civil Circuit and Superior Courts, of Marion county, between the city of Indianapolis and the Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati & Indianapolis Railway Company, concerning the opening of Michigan street, and the use of the grounds now belonging to said company, lying between Massachusetts avenue and Market streets,

AND WHEREAS, The said C., C. C. & I. Railway Company, and the I. P. & C. Railroad Company, as between themselves, are proposing to re-arrange their tracks, within the city of Indianapolis, abandoning some—changing, consolidating, and building others, and otherwise providing for their mutual benefit and convenience, as well as that of the public.

AND WHEREAS, To do so, it is essential that the city and each of said railroad companies should have their rights definitely and permanently fixed, so that hereafter no controversy in relation thereto, can or shall arise.

Now as a compromise and settlement, of all matters in controversy in said suits, and as a full and final adjustment of the question, of the rights of said company, and said city over said premises, and the future occupancy and control of the same, and in order to enable it to fully carry into effect its proposed arrangement and contract with said I. P. & C. R. R. Company, and secure mutual protection therein, the said C., C., C. & I. Railway Company, offers the following propositions for a complete amicable adjustment of all of said matters in controversy, to which the said I. P. & C. Railroad Company, as to all matters and things relating to it, assents and agrees.

First. The city of Indianapolis shall on the petition of said C., C., C. & I. Railway Company, without cost to it, vacate forever all that part of East Second streets lying south of Massachusetts avenue.

Second. And also, in like manner, to vacate so much of East Maryland street, a lies between East street and Pogue's Run.

Third. And also, in order to afford convenient access by the public, to the proposed upper city freight depots, that may be hereafter erected, by this or the I. P. & C. R. R., Company, south of Massachusetts avenue, the city will, without cost to either, widen the alley, lying between lots 25 and 26, in out-lot 43, to the width of sixty feet, and maintain the same as a continuation of John street; and when said depot or depots are erected, permit said railway companies to lay, use and maintain such side-tracks and switches as they may find necessary for the convenient transaction of their business at such depot or depots. But they shall not cross or touch Massachusetts, or John street with said tracks and switches. The C., C., C. & I. Railway Company, agree to widen John street where it passes through their grounds, west of their tracks, to the width of sixty feet.

Fourth. And also, in order that said companies or either of them, may conveniently reach their proposed lower city freight depots, to be erected on the square No. 79, in said city, on or near Alabama street, said city shall grant to the said companies, the irrevocable privilege to lay, use and maintain such tracks as they may deem necessary for the convenient transaction of their business, with the public across East and New Jersey streets, and intervening streets, and alleys, between Pearl street and their tracks on the north side of Pogue's Run; but at the crossing of New Jersey street no tracks shall be laid down or maintained north of the line of square 79, and said city shall not at any time lay out, open and maintain any alley, street or passage way over the ground owned by the said companies or either of them between East and Alabama streets, and Pearl street and Pogue's Run.

Fifth. The grounds now held by said companies in squares 79, 80, 83 and 84, together with the grounds in squares 83, 84 and 85, lying north of the Union Railway tracks, to be purchased by parties other than those to this contract, and the same conveyed free of incumbrance in fee simple, to said I. P. & C. Railway Company, shall be divided between them so as to give to the I. P. & C. Company, all lying north of and to the C., C., C. & I. Company, all south of the line commencing at a point forty feet west of the west side of Liberty street, and two hundred and twelve feet north of the north side of Maryland street, which starting point shall be at least three feet south of the south rail of the present switches of the said I. P. & C. Company, to its round house, which line shall be drawn in a south westerly direction, so as to leave off the grounds of the I. P. & C. Company, south of said line an amount equal in square feet to one hundred and thirty feet off the north side of that part of square 79, held by the C., C., C. & I. Company, which line shall be located as near as practicably to the lines shown by the survey map made by Jas. W. Brown, engineer, and in a way, so as to make both parcels as available as possible for railway purposes, and when the line is fixed by said Brown each company shall convey to the other by warranty deed in fee simple, so as to give all of said grounds lying south of said line to the C. C. C. & I. Company, and all lying north of said line, including 130 feet of the north side of the square 79, to the I. P. & C. Company. The line of Division named in this section, is not permanently fixed, but is to be fixed by the companies themselves, so as to give the I. P. & C. Company one hundred and thirty feet off the north end of square 79, and an equal number of square feet to the C., C., C. & I. Company, off the south side of the I. P. & C. Company's grounds. If in the division an excess of ground falls to either, it shall be paid for by the company receiving the same at its fair value.

Sixth. And each company shall maintain under the direction of the city authorities, good and safe plank crossings, at the several street and alley crossings, when such switches and tracks are constructed.

Seventh. The I. P. & C. Company, shall abandon its main track from Cross street to Christian avenue, and from the north side of North street, all of its tracks to Market street, and shall be furnished, free of cost to said company by parties other than those to this contract, the perpetual right of way from a convenient point north of Christian avenue on and along the West side of Macy street, to Massachusetts avenue; and in like manner, the right of way of a width sufficient to operate a single track and not less than fifteen feet in width, so as to connect its proposed main track by a cross over switch, with so much of its present track as shall remain between Cross and North streets, and shall have the right to locate and shall use and maintain its main tracks between Massachusetts avenue and Winston street, at its junction with Ohio street, on a strip of ground twenty-five feet wide, which the C., C., C. & I. Company, will deed to the said I. P. & C., Company, in fee simple out of a strip 100 feet wide, between said points, the same to be laid out and used as hereinafter set forth. And the two tracks, of the C., C., C. & I. Company from Winston street at its junction with Ohio street to Market street, shall be used and maintained in common by both companies, the same as now used in common from Market street south to the Union tracks, and the said companies agree to surrender all right to use Railroad street from north side of North street to Market street, when abandoned as aforesaid by the I. P. & C. Company.

Eighth. Upon the acceptance and fulfillment of the foregoing provisions the C., C. & I. Co. will re-arrange its tracks over its said grounds between Massachusetts Avenue and Ohio streets, so as not to occupy a space more than one hundred feet wide at any street crossing including said twenty-five feet to be given to said I., P. & C. Co., said C., C. & I. Co. being granted the privilege at any time its officers may find it necessary to accommodate the business of said road to lay, use and maintain two tracks in addition to those now in use from Ohio to the east line of Noble street, said one hundred feet strip to be laid out over said Second street, and passing south through its said grounds on a line east of or near to its present shops and round house and near to its present transfer depot, and there shall not be more than seven tracks on said strip at any of said street crossings, including the the I., P. & C. Co. track.

Ninth. And when its tracks are so re-arranged it will open and extend Michigan, North, Vermont, St. Clair and Biddle streets, across its present grounds and the tracks as aforesaid, to the full width of said streets in said city immediately west thereof, and grade and gravel the same under the direction of the City Civil Engineer, free of all cost and expense to the city within two years from this date or sooner if it can conveniently without detriment to its business, and also open and extend Maryland street through square 79 as hereinafter provided. In consideration whereof, and as liquidated damages, the said city shall pay to the said C., C. & I. R. W. Co. fifteen thousand dollars, as follows: One-third in one, one-third in two, and one-third in three years with six per cent. interest. When this contract shall have been accepted by all the parties hereto, the city shall issue to said company her orders on the City Treasurer, payable as herein provided: *And further*, That the city shall not at any time open or permit any other street or alley to be laid out, opened or extended, over its said grounds between Massachusetts avenue and Market street, except by the written consent of the Company.

Tenth. And if at any time said city shall build or permit any bridge or viaduct to be built over said strip hereby exclusively reserved for tracks and railway purposes one hundred feet wide as aforesaid, the height of said passage ways and the width between the arches or supports, shall be fixed by the Chief Engineers of the respective railroad companies, and the City Civil Engineer, so as to secure the free and safe passage of all locomotives and trains through and under the same, and prevent accidents to passengers and employes.

Eleventh. And all passage ways that may hereafter be built over or under said strip one hundred feet wide shall be without any other cost or expense to said companies or either of them, other than their share of any general tax levied therefor on all property then within the limits of said city.

Twelfth. The track to be built for the I., P. & C. Co., from Massachusetts avenue to Winston street and there connecting with the present main line of the C., C. & I. Co. shall be a gauge of four feet eight and one-half inches, which track shall be built for and furnished to said I., P. & C. Co. free of cost, except that said company shall allow the iron now on its main track, lying between Market and North streets to be taken and used in making said new track: *And provided further*, That the other cost and expense incurred in building said track shall be borne and paid by

parties other than the parties to this agreement. And the I., P. & C. Co. shall build a like track alongside thereof, upon said twenty-five feet strip, which track shall be connected by proper switches with another track to be built or furnished alongside thereof by the C., C., C. & I. Co. on its grounds, and said two tracks shall be used and maintained jointly and in common by both companies as a double track, the said two tracks to be built and used in common, shall be upon a compromise gauge of four feet, nine and one-quarter inches.

Thirteenth. The work necessary to be done in changing the tracks of, and so adjusting or changing the position of the present city freight depot, of the I., P. & C. R. R. Co., so as to remove it from the grounds to be deeded to the C., C., C. & I. R. W. Co., necessitated by the exchange of property herein provided for shall be done by parties other than those to this agreement, free of cost to said I., P. & C. Co. or the city.

Fourteenth. Maryland street shall be opened and extended through square 79, forty feet wide, upon and over the proposed line dividing the grounds of said railway companies as herein provided for, each company giving twenty feet for the use of said street.

Fifteenth. All promises, privileges, covenants and agreements herein accrue to and rest upon the successors and assigns of each.

Sixteenth. This settlement to be in force when signed by the proper officers of said companies, and accepted by the Common Council of said city and a copy filed in said courts, where said suits are pending, and judgment rendered therein by agreement and for the plaintiff in conformity with the provisions of this compromise and agreement.

We, David Macy, for the Indianapolis, Peru & Chicago Railroad Company, and H. B. Hurlbut, for the Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati & Indianapolis Railway Company, hereby covenant and agree that the railway companies we respectively represent, will accept and carry out and perform the terms, provisions and obligations contained in the foregoing contract, upon the acceptance and performance of the provisions therein contained, by the other parties thereto.

The words "by said Brown," in section five, line twenty-two, to be struck out.

DAVID MACY,

President I., P. & C. R. W. Co.

H. B. HURLBUT,

President C., C., C. & I. R. W. Co.

INDIANAPOLIS, February 21, 1875.

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

Gentlemen:—We, the undersigned citizens and tax-payers, do most earnestly and sincerely petition your honorable body to pass or adopt the ordinance or proposition of the C. C. C. & I. and the I. P. & C. Railway Companies consolidating

their several tracks on a line east of the Bee Line shops, and removing the switch tracks and opening the streets and alleys crossing said roads, and we will ever pray

WM. H. SCHMITTS,
N. HOFMEISTER,
CHAS. HULZEN,
F. M. FREITAG,

and 143 others.

Which was received, ordered printed in the minutes, and made special order for next Monday night.

Mr. Thalman, from the Committee on Parks, submitted the following report:

INDIANAPOLIS April 10, 1876.

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

Gentlemen:—Your Committee on Parks, to whom was referred several communications, respectfully report,

FIRST.

That having considered the matters set forth, we recommend that the Commissioner of Circle Park be authorized to put in order and make such repairs as are necessary in said Park.

SECOND.

Also, that the Commissioner of Southern Park be authorized to put in repair the fence, as per Councilman Buehrig's motion March 18th.

ISAAC THALMAN,
WM. BUEHRIG,
HENRY GIMBER,

Committee on Parks.

The question being on the consideration of the first paragraph,

Mr. Kahn offered the following motion:

Moved, That an amount not exceeding fifty dollars should be expended on Circle Park.

Mr. Craft offered the following motion as substitute to above motion :

Moved, That the Committee on Parks be and are hereby instructed to have Circle Park opened and gravel walks put down across the same, running East and West and North and South, and to expend not more than \$100 on the same.

Which substitute was adopted by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Albershardt, Bollman, Buehrig, Craft, Curran, Darnell, Difley, Geiger, Hall, Hook, Kenzel, Rana-dell, Reasner, Reed, Schmidt, Stratford, Ward and Webster—19.

Negative—Councilmen Kahn, Laughlin, Madden, Stueckmeyer and Thalman—5.

Mr. Geiger presented the following communication :

INDIANAPOLIS, March 31, 1876.

Geo. W. Geiger, Esq.

Dear Sir:—I see that the Council has complimented me by offering me the Circle Park Commissionership, but must beg leave to decline the honor, for the reason that I am totally unacquainted with the duties appertaining to the post, and my business would not allow me the time to attend to it even if I were. I would suggest Mr. A. C. Remy as the right man for the place. He is thoroughly conversant with trees, etc., and is largely interested in property on the Circle. Please convey my thanks and declination to the Council in proper shape and I will feel under many obligations to you.

Respectfully, &c.,

JAMES H. MCKERNAN.

Which was received and resignation accepted, and A. C. Remy, Esq., appointed to fill the vacancy.

The second paragraph of the report was then concurred in.

Mr. Reed moved that the Police Board be authorized to appoint one policeman for Military Park.

Mr. Geiger moved to adjourn.

Which motion was adopted and the Council adjourned by the following vote :

Affirmative—Councilmen Adams, Bollman, Buehrig, Curran, Geiger, Hall, Hook, Kenzel, Ransdell, Reed, Thalman, Ward and Webster—13.

Negative—Councilmen Albershardt, Craft, Darnell, Diffley, Kahn, Laughlin, Madden, Reasner, Schmidt, Stratford and Stuckmeyer—11.

JOHN CAVEN, Mayor.

Attest :

BENJ. C. WRIGHT, City Clerk.