

PROCEEDINGS

COMMON COUNCIL.

REGULAR SESSION

CHAMBER OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS,
MONDAY, DECEMBER 23D, 1867, 7 O'CLOCK, P. M. }

The Common Council met in regular session.

Present—His Honor, the Mayor, Daniel Macauley, in the chair,
and the following members:

Councilmen Brown, Burgess, Coburn, Colley, Cottrell, Davis,
Foster, Geisel, Henschen Jameson, Kappes, Loomis, MacArthur,
Schmidt, Seidensticker and Woodburn—16.

Absent—Councilmen Goddard and Stanton—2.

The proceedings of the regular session held December 16, 1867,
were read and approved.

Mr. Brown moved that the rules be suspended for the purpose of
hearing reports from Committees.

The question being on the suspension of the rules, those who voted
in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Burgess, Coburn, Colley,
Cottrell, Davis, Foster, Geisel, Jameson, Kappes, Loomis, Seiden-
sticker and Woodburn—13.

No Councilman voting in the negative.

So the rules were suspended.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES.

Mr. Colley, from the Judiciary Committee, made the following report:

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

Your committee, to whom was referred an account of Dr. Bigelow, herewith hand you a report of the City Attorney on the subject, in which we concur.

S. A. COLLEY,
AD. SEIDENSTICKER, } *Committee.*

Also, the following:

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—I have examined the papers presented by Dr. J. K. Bigelow, and respectfully report, that if it be true, as shown by the papers, that the professional services were rendered by Dr. Bigelow, and that the city had been in the habit of paying for such services, his claim should be allowed.

Respectfully, B. K. ELLIOTT, *City Attorney.*

Mr. Brown called for the ayes and noes on the concurrence in the report.

The question being, shall the report be concurred in? those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Burgess, Colley, Davis, Jameson, Loomis, MacArthur, Seidensticker and Woodburn—8.

Those who voted in the negative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Cottrell, Foster, Geisel and Kappes—6.

So the report was concurred in.

Mr. Seidensticker, from the Judiciary Committee, made the following report:

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

Your committee, to whom a petition of Scott & Nicholson was referred, in which they pray a repeal or modification of the franchises granted to the Indianapolis Furnace Company and the Vincennes and Indianapolis Railroad Company in reference to the laying of railroad tracks on Kentucky Avenue, respectfully report:

The question involved in the petition is, whether the Council, after having granted such franchises to Railroad and other Corporations, can, without their consent, abrogate or withdraw them after they have been formally accepted by the other contracting party. Unless this question can be decided in the affirmative, it would be out of the power of Council to comply with the prayer of the petitioners, unless they would first procure the consent of the Furnace or Vincennes Railroad Company.

Your committee feel constrained to report in this case, as in similar ones heretofore reported upon, that the weight of opinion seems to decide against

the power of Council to take away, in whole or in part, such franchises after they have been given and accepted.

Respectfully,

S. A. COLLEY,
AD. SEIDENSTICKER, } *Committee.*

Which was received and concurred in.

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

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN—The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the motion relative to graveling carriage ways in City Cemetery, have had that matter under consideration, and would report that according to estimates of the Engineer 1236 yards of gravel were placed on said carriage ways by order of the City Sexton ; said gravel is of the kind used in making sidewalks, being largely composed of sand.

Your committee recommend the appropriation of four hundred and ninety-four dollars and forty cents (\$494.40) to the Sexton in payment of the same at the rate of 40 cents per cubic yard, and that the Auditor report an ordinance in accordance therewith.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

P. H. JAMESON,
THOMAS COTTRELL, } *Committee.*
C. F. SCHMIDT,

Also, the following :

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 28, 1867.

To Dr. P. H. Jameson :

SIR:—The graveling by the City Sexton on the carriage ways in the City Cemetery amounts to 1236 cubic yards.

Respectfully,

R. M. PATTERSON, *Civil Engineer.*

The question being, shall the report be concurred in ?

Mr. Brown offered the following amendment :

Strike out \$494.40 and insert \$435.60.

Dr. Woodburn moved to lay the amendment on the table, and called for the ayes and noes.

The question being to lay the amendment on the table, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Burgess, Coburn, Colley, Jameson, Loomis, MacArthur, Schmidt and Woodburn—8.

Those who voted in the negative were Councilmen Brown, Cottrell, Davis, Foster, Geisel, Henschen, Kappes, Seidensticker and His Honor, the Mayor—9.

So the amendment was not laid on the table.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment, Mr. Davis declined to vote.

Dr. Jameson moved that Mr. Davis be excused from voting, and called for the ayes and noes.

The question being on the adoption of the motion to excuse Mr. Davis, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Coburn, Cottrell, Foster, Jameson, Schmidt, Seidensticker and Woodburn—7.

Those who voted in the negative were Councilmen Brown, Burgess, Colley, Geisel, Henschen, Kappes, Loomis and MacArthur—8.

So the motion to excuse Mr. Davis was not adopted.

Mr. Burgess moved the previous question.

The question being, shall the main question be now put?

Which was decided in the affirmative.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Cottrell, Davis, Foster, Geisel, Henschen, Kappes and Seidensticker—8.

Those who voted in the negative were Councilmen Burgess, Coburn, Colley, Jameson, Loomis, MacArthur, Schmidt, Woodburn and His Honor, the Mayor—9.

So the amendment was not adopted.

The question then being on the adoption of the original motion,

Mr. MacArthur called for the ayes and noes.

Those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Burgess, Coburn, Colley, Jameson, Loomis, MacArthur, Schmidt and Woodburn—8.

Those who voted in the negative were Councilmen Brown, Cottrell, Davis, Foster, Geisel, Henschen and Seidensticker—8.

There being a tie vote, His Honor, the Mayor, voted in the affirmative.

So the report was concurred in.

Mr. Burgess asked for and obtained leave of absence.

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

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

Your committee, to whom was referred the opinion of the City Attorney explaining the necessity of collecting and preserving documentary evidence of the publication of penal ordinances, entirely coincide with the opinion of the City Attorney, and herewith report the ordinance, submitted by said officer, back to your honorable body with some slight amendments calculated to make it more effective, and recommend the passage of said ordinance without further delay.

Respectfully,

A SEIDENSTICKER,	} <i>Com. on Revision</i>	
S. A. COLLEY,		} <i>of Ordinances.</i>
THOS. COTTRELL,		

Which was concurred in.

On motion by Mr. Seidensticker general ordinance No. 118, entitled :

AN ORDINANCE relative to publication of ordinances.

Was called up and read the second time and ordered to be engrossed.

Mr. Seidensticker moved that the rules be suspended and the ordinance read the third time and placed upon its passage.

The question being on the suspension of the rules, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Colley, Cottrell, Davis, Foster, Geisel, Henschen, Jameson, Kapes, Loomis, MacArthur, Schmidt, Seidensticker and Woodburn—15.

No Councilman voting in the negative.

So the rules were suspended.

General ordinance No. 118, entitled :

AN ORDINANCE relative to the publication of ordinances.

Was then read the third time and placed upon its passage.

The question being, shall the ordinance pass? those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Colley, Cottrell, Davis, Foster, Geisel, Henschen, Jameson, Kappes, Loomis, MacArthur, Schmidt, Seidensticker and Woodburn—15.

So the ordinance passed.

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

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

Your committee, to whom was referred an ordinance entitled "An ordinance protecting public morality, decency and order," respectfully report :

If said ordinance was intended to supply the vacuum cause by the doubt as to whether the present ordinance was ever published, and therefore in force, it is no longer necessary, as the City Attorney has procured proof that said ordinance was properly published, and is, therefore, in full force.

If, on the other hand, this ordinance is intended as a substitute for the present ordinance, your committee deem that the question whether this new draft is an improvement on the existing ordinance, can best be settled in open Council. Expressing no opinion, as a committee, on this question we simply call your attention to the more important changes proposed by this amendment.

1. In section 2 the words "male and over the age of twelve years," are left out, having the effect that females and children under 12 years of age can be fined for being found in company with a prostitute, while the penalty is limited to males over 12 years by the present ordinance.

2. In section 5 the words "more than 12 years old," are left out again, having the effect that children under 12 years can be fined for bathing in White river, Fall creek, etc., in the same manner as grown persons.

3. Section 4 is entirely left out the amended ordinance, having the effect that the offence of unlawful assembly is entirely wiped out from the ordinance book, or, in other words, that prostitutes and males or lewd and disorderly persons generally may congregate in any number, without subjecting themselves to a penalty.

4. Section 14 is also left out of the amended ordinance, having the effect that Police Officers are deprived of the authority to enter gambling houses and houses of ill fame for the purpose of suppressing them, and that persons who have visited such houses for the purposes of gambling and prostitution are not subject to any penalty for such acts.

5. In section 15 the words "without special orders from the Chief of Police, or, in case of emergency, to make an arrest or suppress riotous or disorderly conduct," are stricken out, having the effect that Police Officers who enter houses of ill fame to carry out a special order of the Chief of Police, or to suppress a riot or effect an arrest and are seen there, can be prosecuted and fined before the City Judge in any sum from five to fifty dollars.

With the exception of the above changes, and a few verbal alterations of slight importance, the new ordinance is an exact transcription of the old ordinance. Having thus pointed out the proposed changes, your committee report the ordinance back for your further deliberation and decision.

Respectfully,

A. SEIDENSTICKER,
Com. on Revision of Ordinances.

I concur in the above report, except that I do not consider the ordinance in the printed edition of ordinances in force.

S. A. COLLEY,
THOS. COTTRELL,

Also, the following ordinance :

AN ORDINANCE protecting public morality, decency and order.

SECTION 1. *Be it ordained by the Common Council of the city of Indianapolis,* That every prostitute found wandering about said city, or within one mile from the corporato limits thereof, or found in any public act of prostitution within said limits, shall, on conviction of such offence before the City Judge, be fined therefor in any sum, not less than five nor more than fifty dollars.

SEC. 2. Every person, convicted before the City Judge of having been found associating with any prostitute, in any public place, street, alley, common, or field of said city, or within one mile of its limits, shall be fined therefor in any sum not less than five nor more than fifty dollars.

SEC. 3. Any person who shall, in public, make any indecent exposure of his or her person, or use any obscene language, or exhibit any obscene print, painting or representation, or be guilty of any other obscene conduct, upon conviction before the City Judge, be fined in any sum not less than two nor more than fifty dollars.

SEC. 4. Any person convicted before said City Judge of having bathed, in the day time, in the Canal, in White River, or in Pogue's Run, or at any point in said city subject to the view of citizens thereof, or in White River, opposite and near to said city, shall be fined therefor in any sum not less than five nor more than twenty-five dollars.

SEC. 5. The Marshal of said city, or his assistant, or any police officers of said city, shall arrest, without process, any person violating, in his or their presence, any provision of the first four sections of this ordinance, and take such offender forthwith before said City Judge for trial, filing complaint of such offense; or, if such arrest be made on Sunday, or in the night time, said Marshal, or his assistant, or any police officer of said city, shall commit such offender to jail, or the city prison, or otherwise guard him, until ten o'clock the next ensuing morning, when such trial shall proceed, unless continued for good cause; and such officer failing to perform the duty required of him by this section, shall be liable to a fine of not less than five nor more than fifty dollars.

SEC. 6. Any legal voter or householder of said city may, without breach of the peace, apprehend any person found violating any provision of the first five sections of this ordinance, and cause or require such person to be taken before said City Judge, in order to be legally dealt with.

SEC. 7. Any person taken in the act of violating any provision, as last aforesaid, and convicted of refusing, on such legal requisition, to be taken before said City Judge for trial, shall be fined therefor in any sum not exceeding twenty-five dollars.

SEC. 8. Any person, convicted before said City Judge of keeping a house of ill-fame or prostitution in said city, shall be fined therefor, on such first conviction, in any sum not less than five, nor more than thirty dollars, and, on every such subsequent conviction, in any sum not less than thirty, nor more than fifty dollars.

SEC. 9. Any party, being the owner or occupant of, or the agent for renting, any building in said city, and convicted, before said City Judge, of having knowingly rented the same to be used as a house of ill-fame or prostitution, shall be fined therefor in any sum not less than five nor more than fifty dollars; and good proof that the owner, lessor, or agent for the renting of such building was apprised, beforehand, of the previous ill-repute of the lessee or lessees thereof, shall be full evidence that such owner, lessor, or agent of any tenement, after the notification of any freeholder or householder, shall not take the proper legal steps to exclude therefrom any persons who shall use the same for a house of ill-fame, said owner, lessor, or agent shall, upon conviction thereof before the City Judge, be fined in any sum not less than five nor more than fifty dollars.

SEC. 10. Any person convicted before said City Judge of having publicly exhibited, in said city, any stallion, or jack, or bull, or of having caused or suffered any such animal publicly to cover any mare, jenny, or cow, therein, shall be fined therefor in any sum not less than five nor more than twenty dollars.

SEC. 11. Any owner or occupant of any building in said city, and convicted before said City Judge of permitting the same to be used or occupied for the purpose, or in the practice of gaming, in any way, for money or its equivalent, shall be fined therefor in any sum not less than five nor more than fifty dollars.

SEC. 12. Any person convicted before said City Judge of having permit-

ted any disorderly noise or conduct in or about his grocery or other establishment, existing in said city, and wherein distilled or fermented liquors are sold, or kept for sale, or for being given away, or of having permitted any person to become intoxicated therein, shall be fined therefor in any sum not less than three nor more than fifty dollars.

SEC. 13. Any policeman who shall be found in any house of ill-fame or prostitution, or gambling house in said city, except in pursuance of a warrant of law or in case of a riot, shall, upon conviction before the City Judge, be fined in any sum not less than five nor more than fifty dollars, and be liable to dismissal; and any legal voter or householder of said city, may, without breach of the peace, apprehend any policeman found violating this section of this ordinance.

SEC. 14. Any person convicted before said City Judge of having disturbed the peace and quiet of said city, or of its inhabitants, by making loud and unusual noises, by crying the alarm of fire, or any other alarm, without good cause, or by threatening any person, or by challenging him to fight, or menacing him with corporal or pecuniary harm, shall be fined therefor in any sum not less than one dollar nor more than ten dollars.

SEC. 15. Any person convicted before said City Judge of having, on Sunday and within said city, pitched quoits or coins, or of having played at cricket, bandy, cat, town-ball, or any other public game or amusement, shall be fined therefor in any sum not less than one dollar nor more than five dollars.

SEC. 16. Any person convicted before said City Judge of having appeared in a state of intoxication in any public part of said city, shall be fined therefor in any sum not less than one dollar nor more than ten dollars.

SEC. 17. Said Marshal, or his assistant, or any police officer of said city, is hereby empowered and enjoined to arrest, with or without process, any person who, in the night time, or on Sunday, and within said city, or within one mile therefrom, shall be found rioting, fighting, or in any manner disturbing the public peace, or who shall be found intoxicated in any public portion of said city; and said Marshal, or any person acting under his authority, or any police officer of said city, shall commit such offender to jail, or to the City Prison, for safe keeping until complaint against him can be made to said City Judge: *Provided*, That no person shall be so imprisoned longer than until ten o'clock of the succeeding day, unless such succeeding day shall be Sunday, in which case complaint against such offender shall be made on the next following Monday: *And provided further*, That nothing in this ordinance contained shall be construed to affect any action now pending, or right of action now existing, in favor of said city.

SEC. 18. Any person violating any provision of this ordinance to which there is not a specific penalty attached, shall, upon conviction thereof before the City Judge, be fined in any sum not exceeding twenty dollars.

SEC. 19. That all ordinances or parts of ordinances coming in conflict with any of the provisions of this ordinance, and especially an ordinance entitled "An ordinance protecting public morality, decency and order," passed November 30, 1863, be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

SEC. 20. This ordinance shall be in force from and after its passage and publication once a week, for two consecutive weeks, in the Indianapolis Daily Journal; and it is hereby made the duty of the City Clerk to procure proof of publication of this ordinance, and record the same in the Record of Ordinances of the City.

Which, on motion by Mr. Brown, was made the special order for the meeting to be held on the first Monday in January, 1868.

Mr. Coburn, from the Committee on Fire Department, made the following report :

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—The Chief Fire Engineer and Committee on Fire Department would report that the Engine contracted to be furnished the city has arrived and been tried found to fill the contract, so far as we can see. We would recommend that the Engine be accepted.

GEO. W. BUCHANAN, *Chief Fire Engineer.*
HERNY COBURN, } *Committee.*
J. H. KAPPES, }

Which was concurred in.

Mr. Coburn introduced special appropriation ordinance No. 73—1867, entitled :

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

Which was read the first time by its title.

REGULAR ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. Brown offered the following motion :

That the Street Commissioner be directed to repair the pavement on the sidewalk of Pennsylvania street, between Georgia street and Pogue's Run, injured by the rain storm of Saturday night.

Which was referred to the Board of Public Improvements, with instructions to have the work done.

Mr. Coburn offered the following motion :

That the Chief Fire Engineer be instructed to ship the Engine J. W. Davis, No. 3, to Seneca Falls, to H. C. Silsby, to have it rebuilt as per agreement on purchase of new Engine.

Which was adopted.

Mr. Geisel presented the following communication :

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 16, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—I will render medical attendance to all our City Prisoners for two hundred dollars per annum. I am situated near the Sheriff's Office, and make this proposition with his knowledge and approval. I have the honor to be a graduate of the Medical College of the University of Michigan, and to have spent two years and a half in the late War. I will thank you for the contract, and will perform the duties to the best of my ability.

I have the honor to be, gentlemen,

Very Respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

JOHN MCCOY, M. D.

Also, the following :

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

John McCoy, M. D., proposes to render medical attendance to all our City Prisoners for the reasonable sum of two hundred dollars per annum, and I would earnestly recommend that he be employed to render said services. He is near my office and will perform the duties satisfactorily. Hoping you will grant this request, I am, gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

GEO. W. PARKER.

Dr. Woodburn presented the following communication :

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—I will render medical and surgical services to City Prisoners for two hundred dollars (\$200) a year, payable quarterly.

Yours Respectfully,

W. WANDS,

Physician of Marion County.

In reference to which Mr. Cottrell offered the following motion :

That the communications be referred to the City Attorney, with instructions to report whether the County Physician is not required to give medical attention to prisoners committed to the county jail and boarded there at City's expense for violations of city ordinances.

Which was adopted.

Dr. Jameson offered the following motion :

That the City Attorney and Committee on Finance be directed to inquire the amount due the Sheriff of Marion county for keeping prisoners not in litigation, and report an ordinance for payment of the same.

Which was adopted.

Dr. Jameson presented the following communication :

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—I hereby appoint, and ask your honorable body to concur in the appointment of H. P. Randall and Samuel Strong Deputy City Assessors for the year 1868.

WM. HADLEY, *City Assessor.*

Which was received.

Dr. Jameson offered the following motion :

That H. P. Randall and Samuel Strong be confirmed by this Council Deputy City Assessors for the year 1868.

The question being on the adoption of the motion, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Colley, Cottrell,

Davis, Foster, Geisel, Henschen, Jameson, Kappes, Loomis, MacArthur, Schmidt, Seidensticker and Woodburn—15.

No Councilman voting in the negative.

So the motion was adopted.

Dr. Jameson offered the following motion :

That the Township Assessor and his Deputies, Wm. C. Phipps, Nelson Hoss and Asa M. Strong be confirmed Deputy Assessors to legalize their assessments in the city, not to be paid by city.

The question being on the adoption of the motion, those who voted in the affirmative were Councilmen Brown, Coburn, Colley, Cottrell, Davis, Foster, Geisel, Henschen, Jameson, Kappes, Loomis, MacArthur, Schmidt, Seidensticker and Woodburn—15.

No Councilman voting in the negative.

So the motion was adopted.

Dr. Jameson presented the following communication :

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—The undersigned respectfully inform your body that they are contractors for building two cisterns for the city, one on North street, near Winston street, and one on Alabama street, near Washington street, for the sum of \$1,913.00. These cisterns are now complete and filled, but one of them has not yet been received by the Engineer. We have received from the city on these two cisterns \$600, the balance of \$1,313 remaining unpaid; we would, therefore, respectfully ask for an appropriation of \$600 on our work, which will leave still \$713 in the hands of the city as a guarantee for the durability of the work. Respectfully,

FEARY & DILLON.

Which was referred to the City Auditor, with instructions to report ordinance.

Dr. Jameson introduced general ordinance No. 120, entitled :

AN ORDINANCE providing for the issuing of ten per cent. two years warrants and appropriating money for the payment of the interest thereon.

Which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. Loomis presented the following communication :

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—I beg to report to your honorable body that we are greatly annoyed in the Police Office with beggars and vagrants asking charity; we are frequently required at Roll Call to contribute from \$1 to \$3 for the relief of the destitute; to provide lodging is the special plea.

We respectfully ask Council to afford some adequate and immediate relief. Respectfully yours,

Thomas S. Wilson,
John S. Bray,
Wm. Boaz,

Henry Paul,
S. M. Russell,
And 4 others.

Which was referred to the Committee on Benevolence and Hospitals.

Mr. MacArthur presented the following communication :

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

The undersigned would respectfully ask to have an error corrected in my report of taxables for the year 1867, of which a duplicate copy is hereto attached. Instead of two thousand dollars for merchandize, my report should read and be two hundred dollars, making a difference of eighteen hundred dollars. Will the correction by your honorable body be made?

Respectfully submitted,

W. R. HOGSHIRE.

STATE OF INDIANA, }
MARION COUNTY, } ss:

W. R. Hogshire, being duly sworn according to law, says that the foregoing statement and account is true and correct.

P. W. BARTHOMOMEW, N. P.

Which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. Loomis offered the following resignation :

COUNCIL CHAMBER, Dec. 23, 1867.

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

GENTLEMEN:—I ask respectfully to tender my resignation as one of the Board of Public Improvements. Wishing, sincerely, your acceptance hereof,
I am, respectfully, yours,

W. H. LOOMIS.

Which, on motion, was made the special order for the next regular meeting.

On motion by Mr. Seidensticker, the Council adjourned.

DANIEL MACAULEY, *Mayor*

ATTEST:

D. M. RANDELL, *City Clerk*.