

INDIANA LEGISLATURE.

(Omissions and curtailments of this report for want of space in this column will appear in an appendix to Volume XXII of the Brevier Legislative Reports.)

IN SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 25, 1885—9:30 a. m.

ANOTHER JUDICIAL CIRCUIT.

On motion by Mr. PETERSON the bill (H. R. 20) fixing court terms in the Twenty-first (Montgomery) and Forty-seventh (Vermillion and Parke) Judicial Circuits was read the second time by title and the third time by sections under a dispensation of the constitutional restriction.

Mr. OVERSTREET: In view of the fact a committee has been appointed to redistrict the State for judicial purposes, it seems to me there ought not to be new circuits created. There will be too many on hand, and they will be hard to get rid of. At the last September term of the courts there was but little business done anywhere in the State on account of the political convulsions, and now because they are a little overloading it is not to be wondered at. There are enough circuits already established to do all the business of the State with dispatch.

Mr. FOWLER: I have some knowledge of the business of some of the counties proposed to be created in new circuits. The bar of Montgomery County is not unanimous on the measure. Park and Vermillion have about three weeks' court in each, and I think it is a simple matter to transfer the business in those counties; indeed, there is not more than two-thirds labor in those counties for a Judge to perform. And the committee appointed to redistrict the State ought not to be hampered by the creation of new districts.

Mr. WILLARD: I have some experience with committees appointed to sit during the recess. Last session there was a committee appointed on prison convict labor, and yet today that subject is no better digested than it was two years ago. It is simply impracticable, the committee men can not afford to leave their private business without pay, to attend to such matters. I have never cast a vote for a new circuit, but as the county of Montgomery is a year and a half behind with court business, it would be a practical denial of the constitutional provision that justice shall be dispensed speedily and without delay, unless relief is granted. I think the bill ought to pass.

Mr. MARSHALL: The people should have justice meted out to them, and it seems to be an utter impossibility for Montgomery County to get along without the relief asked for in this bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Hendricks: I understand the Senators from these districts are not only adverse to this bill, but state there is a necessity for it, and I shall vote in favor of it.

Mr. HILLGASS: I understand there is a necessity for this bill and consequently shall vote for it. There is no State in the Union but has more courts and different courts than the State of Indiana.

Mr. McCULLOUGH: There are less than 8,000 voters in Montgomery County, and there are 500,000 in the State. Upon that basis there would have to be more than sixty Judges to do the work of the State, to be paid out of the State Treasury. I am opposed to this measure. There is nothing to show that the counties should have the Judges they ask for.

Mr. BAILEY: In Montgomery County they are over 500 cases behind, including four under trials, and there is an earnest necessity for the passage of this bill.

Mr. WILLARD demanded the previous question. The demand was seconded, and under its operation the bill passed by yeas 80, nays 13.

Mr. FAULKNER: Though it has been intimated that those who may vote against this measure are parsimonious and so on, I do not believe it is sanctioned by any such talk, and I vote "no."

Mr. MAGRE, being informed they can't very well get along without this bill, voted "aye."

Mr. WEIR: Out of deference to the presiding officer and to the Senator from Montgomery, and from information I have received from private parties, I vote "aye."

The vote was announced as above. So the bill finally passed.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

Mr. Foulke's Civil Service bill (S. 1—see pages 18 and 20) was read the third time and failed to pass—yeas, 17; nays, 24.

Mr. RAHM: In explanation of my vote I will say, Although the author introduced this bill for the sake of civil service reform, I do not believe he is in favor of it himself, because when we had the Metropolitan Police bill before the Senate last session, which was a civil service reform measure, he was opposed to it. I believe the Republican party needs civil service reform, and very badly, but inasmuch as the Democrats have control of the State and National governments, I think it is fair to let President Cleveland and Governor Gray and the balance of the Democracy show that there is a necessity for civil service reform. I believe they will reform everything to the satisfaction of a majority of the people. As this bill is for burlesque anyhow, I vote "no."

Mr. SELLENS, when his name was called, said: I am in favor of civil service reform, but I desire it made applicable only to Democrats, and as this bill makes no such provision I vote "no."

The vote was then announced as above, so the bill was rejected.

RAILROADS (OVER RAILROADS).

Mr. Youche's bill (S. 12) to authorize owners of tracts of land separated by the right of way of a railroad company to construct wagon and driveways over the same, was read the third time.

Mr. YOUCHE: I introduced this bill at the request of a gentleman who is affected by a railroad running through his land, not giving him a crossing. Since then it has occurred to me it may be unconstitutional. If it were constitutional we could all vote for it.

Mr. FOUKLE: The right of way of a railroad company is said to be not a fee simple, but an easement only; yet there are Supreme Court decisions declaring that the right of way of a railroad company is exclusive. The matter is not wholly free from doubt.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Hendricks: If the parties under this bill could in any way at present to interfere with the right of way of a railroad, it would be objectionable, but I think the bill ought to pass in the interest of the public at large, and let the question of constitutionality come up afterward if occasion should require.

On motion by Mr. YOUCHE the bill was passed over informally, to give friends of the measure a further opportunity to examine its provisions.

Mr. McClure's bill, S. 15, being read the third time.

Mr. McCLURE: On the first day of the session I introduced this bill; the Senator from Jennings also introduced a similar bill, which I returned to the Senate, but it was voted down. I requested the Senator from Marion (Mr. Winter) to write a bill including

the provisions of the two, which he did, and this is the bill. It is a just one. It is for the purpose of having a contingent fund set aside from which the Superintendent of the Insane Hospital may draw from month to month to pay contingent expenses of the institution.

Mr. WINTER: The bill provides that \$2,000 shall be set apart out of the appropriation for the asylum as a contingent fund for the use of the Superintendent of the Hospital for the Insane. The necessity of it is stated in a letter from the present Superintendent, Dr. W. B. Fletcher. (Reads.) During every month he borrows from \$500 to \$1,500, which he disburses for this institution, as I understand. I don't think that sort of responsibility ought to be placed upon him. The Board of Trustees, as I am informed, are in favor of this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON: I am satisfied of the propriety of passing this bill. This will release the Superintendent from considerable trouble. The bill passed by yeas 38, nays 0.

CHILDREN LABOR.

Mr. Bailey's bill (S. 20—see pages 107 and 210) to prohibit the employment of any child under the age of twelve years in mining or manufacturing companies, was read the third time and failed to pass for want of a constitutional majority by yeas 29, nays 15.

Pending the roll-call—Mr. Brown, in contemplation of his vote, said: Believing this to be a vicious bill, I vote "no."

Mr. CAMPBELL, of St. Joseph: If this bill proposed to state what children under twelve years of age should do; that is, if it required them to be in school, I should be in favor of the bill, but as it simply provides that they shall not be at work to aid their parents in providing for the family home—in other words, to leave them to run without employment on the streets—I believe it is vicious legislation, and therefore vote "no."

Mr. JOHNSON, of Tippecanoe, when his name was called, said: I think the best feature of the bill was destroyed when the limitation of fourteen years was stricken out. I also, like the Senator from St. Joseph, would be in favor of another clause for compulsory education under the age of fourteen years, but as it is the best we can do I vote "aye."

The vote was then announced as above. So the bill failed to pass.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Mr. YOUCHE submitted an amendment to his bill, requiring the owner to keep the gates securely closed and be liable for any damage or accident consequent upon negligence of the owner or employes.

Mr. WEIR: That amendment would make a man liable without being in fault. Suppose some one trespassing should leave a gate open, it might make the owner of the land liable to heavy damages. I am in favor of the bill just as reported from the committee.

Mr. OVERSTREET suggested a difficulty. Suppose the rate is left open, it must be shown that it was not left open.

The amendment was agreed to upon a division—affirmative, 23; negative, 19—Mr. Youche insisting he had unanimous consent this forenoon to so amend.

LIVE STOCK CORPORATIONS.

The bill (H. R. 70—see pages 181 and 184) coming up on the third reading—Mr. FOUKLE explained the provisions of the bill as he did on page 181.

Mr. FOUKLE: I have examined this bill, heard both sides, and I think it ought not to become a law. Foreigners may assist in the organization of such corporations—as many as may be possible to organize. There is no question that if this bill becomes a law in less than five years will neither blood nor brains, soul nor heart, be left on the defeat of this bill.

Mr. FOWLER: I see no danger in creating a stock corporation of this character. I anticipate no trouble in that respect, and the other provisions will be sanitary.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of St. Joseph: I believe that this proposition to throw the importing and trading in live stock into the hands of large corporations must be of great harm to the farmers of this State, who are as much interested in the raising and selling of stock as they are in the raising of grain. If imported corporations are to take lands, and with a capital stock of \$250,000, which will be paid for in a few months, are to take the business of the farmers who are conducting it in a small but profitable way, must be injured, as for the last few years profits on grain have been small, and farmers are more and more looking to fine stock for profits. The agricultural interests are paramount to all others, and I hope this bill will be defeated.

Mr. FOUKLE: I am in favor of this bill, but I desire it made applicable only to Democrats, and as this bill makes no such provision I vote "no."

The Senate seconded the demand, and under its operation the bill failed to pass, yeas 21, nays 17.

Mr. BROWN, when his name was called, said: Believing this bill it passes would be a dangerous law to the agricultural interests of the State, I vote "no."

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Hendricks: Believing that this bill if it passes will promote the agricultural interests of the people of Indiana, I vote "aye."

Mr. FOUKLE: I would like to say in explanation of my vote, that when this bill was originally introduced I had great fear that general stock raising business would interfere with the agricultural business, but I think we have hedged that around so as not to hinder competition, except as to importing and breeding from imported cattle, and in as much as I think it may be productive of good in that way, I vote "aye."

The vote was then announced as above. So the bill failed to pass.

SOLDIERS' ORPHANS' HOME.

On motion of Mr. SMITH, of Jennings, his bill (S. 338) authorizing the Governor to appoint Trustees for the Soldiers' Orphans' Home and Asylum for Feeble Minded Children, was taken up under a suspension of the rules—yeas, 38; nays, 1—and read the second time by title.

He said: I offer an amendment, at the suggestion of the committee which is making the investigation. One great cause of trouble has been a conflict between the power of the Trustees and Superintendent to discharge employes. This gives that power to the Superintendent.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADKISON moved that the Trustees be chosen from the two political parties casting the highest number of votes.

Mr. WILLARD: I demand the previous question. The demand for the previous question was seconded, and under its operation—The amendment (Mr. Adkison's) was rejected by yeas 20, nays 24.

The bill (S. 338) was read the third time and passed by yeas 40, nays 3.

THE DEFICIENCY BILL.

On motion of Mr. WILLARD the House message announcing the refusal of the House to concur in the Senate amendments to the Deficiency bill (H. R. 327), and asking a committee of free conference was taken up (without reading) and the Senate adhered to its amendments. The Lieutenant Governor made the conference committee on the part of the Senate to consist of Messrs. Willard and Youche.

ATTORNEY GENERAL FEES.

On motion of Mr. CAMPBELL, of Hendricks, his bill (S. 392) in relation to fees of the Attorney General was taken up under a suspension of the constitutional rule—yeas, 39; nays, 0—read the second time by title, the third time by sections, and passed the Senate by yeas 37, nays 0.

Mr. Moon's bill (S. 341) in relation to claims against municipal corporations being up—Mr. BAILEY: I regard this bill with suspicion. The Senator who introduced it says he does not know much about it; that he introduced it by request.

Mr. DAVIS: The bill requires that claims shall be presented to the corporation before suit be brought, etc. I know no objections to its features, and I think the bill ought to pass.

Mr. WINTER: Persons frequently meet with an accident on streets, and the plaintiff has the right to join in an action all persons he may think liable. This bill cuts that off, and the claimant would be compelled to sue all in a separate suit, which might result in no recovery against any.

Mr. WILLARD: This bill provides the only remedy shall be an appeal from the action of the Common Council, and the result will be Council will throw the onus on the claimant. I don't believe this bill should pass.

Mr. FOUKLE: A skillful lawyer, under this bill, could keep a claimant out of his money for a long time. It is much worse than existing laws.

On motion by Mr. Smith, of Jennings, the bill was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Smith, of Jennings, the constitutional rule was suspended—yeas, 36; nays, 1—and his bill (S. 192) concerning appeals to the Supreme Court, was read the second time by title, the committee amendments agreed to, the third time by sections, and passed by yeas 33, nays 4.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 25, 1885—9 a. m.

The House was opened with prayer by Rev. Thomas M. Smith, a Representative from the county of Warrick.

The SPEAKER directed a call of the House, which being taken, discovered 90 members present and answering to their names.

The reading of the clerk's minutes of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with.

GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. HELMS offered the following: Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Grand Army of the Republic in session at the Missouri Hall in this city, that they are entitled to the respect and confidence of the people as the brave defenders of our country.

Be it resolved, That the freedom of the House of Representatives be held by them, and that a committee of three be appointed by the Speaker to invite them to visit us at any time during the session of this House.

Mr. WILLIAMS offered the following amendment: "And that the same courtesy be extended to the Grand Lodge of Knights of Honor."

The amendment was agreed to and the resolution adopted.

The SPEAKER made a committee to consist of Messrs. Helms, Barney and Flesch.

DITCH LAWS.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the special order for this hour, being Mr. Boyd's Drainage bill (H. R. 232—see page 206) proposing a repeal of all existing laws on the subject and the enactment of entirely new laws on the subject.

Pending which—The House took a recess for dinner.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The House resumed consideration of Mr. Boyd's bill (H. R. 232) to abolish the office of Ditch Commissioner.

Mr. BROWNLEE: I do not believe that any man in the State thinks more of a good ditch law than I do. But the one at present in force should be amended or repealed. I believe in the majority theory. I do not think that any member here would vote to repeal the free gravel road law in regard to a majority petitioning for a road. I stand with the gentleman from Hancock (Mr. Gooding), that it should take a majority to start the ditch. I was in favor of the bill which would be repealed. I believe that this bill will do as I think it best for our drainage. I shall support it.

Mr. KELLISON: Take it all in all this bill will make the best law. Property will be as well protected under this bill as well as any law on the subject books. The gentleman from Wells (Mr. Mock) makes the objection that ten days are given for reconsideration while the petitioners have but one day. But suppose the petition is defective in form, all the petitioners have to do is, by one stroke of the pen, correct it, and the movement goes on. There is not one thing in that criticism that is of any weight for the petitioners to correct in ten minutes' time any defect may be corrected. The second objection was that a majority may defeat the bill. I regard that as a redeeming feature. If a ditch is of public benefit I undertake to say that it will affect a majority before the expiration of the public utility. Will any one say that anything regarding the State is of public utility when it does not affect a majority of the taxpayers of the State? Suppose some of wealth near land owners who have little should go to the latter and say: "We propose to make you rich in spite of yourselves, and we know and we propose to cut a canal through your land." This would be the majority urging against public utility. I regard this majority feature of the bill one of the best in it, and I say to those gentlemen of the House, who are now objecting to it, that I verily believe that they must take it as it is or it must fail. The third objection to the law was that in relation to cleaning ditches—that of taxing all benefited to keep it clean. Suppose a man should own a small bit of land with quicksand in it. Should he constantly labor to keep that from the ditch for the benefit of all the others who might be benefited? There was an insinuation thrown out here that this law is in the interest of attorneys. I can not say how, because if the property is not gone ahead with properly then the whole thing falls at once—no prolonging for fees. The old law is far more to the advantage of the State than the new one. I have ditch trials—remonstrances—in my county (Marshall) where it took nine days with three lawyers on a side, and their fees running up to \$300 or \$500.

Mr. WILSON: I come from a county in which this law has operated. In that county we have made over 100 miles of ditch

under the old law, and in that county I have seen \$23,000 of property confiscated under it. I am opposed to the majority confining the property of the minority, and, of course, an action more opposed to the minority confining the property of the majority. I shall at least vote to repeal the old law, if we can not have the proposed bill made a law.

Mr. BOYD: There are some objections to this bill, but it is far better than the old one. When it goes to the Senate I hope that the bill will be amended as to strike out lines 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 and all before the word "provided" in line 32 of Section 3 page 3 (printed bill), so as to allow any man the right to drain his land if he is willing to pay damages.

Mr. GORDON moved the previous question. The House seconded the demand, and under its operation the bill passed by yeas 90, nays 30.

Mr. FRENCH explaining his vote, said that the bill had been so drafted as to become a monstrous, and he would be compelled to vote "no."

Mr. GORDON, when his name was called, said: The bill is far better than the old one. It does away with the most serious objections, and I shall vote "aye."

Mr. HOBAN in explanation of his vote, said: The old law was a robbery on poor people, who are obliged to support their families, and as poor men generally are Democrats I vote "aye."

Mr. SMITH, of Tippecanoe, said: This bill repeals a very bad law, and while the bill may not be free from objections, just as it is far better than the law, I shall vote "aye."

So the bill passed.

NARCOTICS IN THE SCHOOLS.

Mr. Stanley's bill (H. R. 16) relating to the teaching of physiology and hygiene in the public schools was read the third time and passed by yeas 54, nays 39.

Mr. FRENCH explaining his vote, said he thought that if there were morality and intelligence in the public schools, this question would be properly taught; therefore he voted "no."

Mr. HARRELL when his name was called, said he believed that such a law on the statute books would throw our school-books to a change and make everything inconsistent; he therefore voted "no."

Mr. LOYD explaining his vote: Ever since I have been here I have been opposed to all laws that will necessitate unnecessary change in our text books, and as this bill, if it becomes a law, will compel that, I vote "no."

Mr. McHENRY: For two reasons I do not favor this bill. One is because of the change of the text books, the other because it is too comprehensive to be defined clearly in any law. I vote "no."

Mr. McMICHAEL, when his name was called, said: I do not see in the measure where a benefit can occur, because it is not clearly defined. I vote "no."

Mr. PASSAGE: Because it will necessitate change in text books, and because the evils of alcohol should be learned in the schools, I vote "aye."

Mr. PATTON, in explaining his vote, said: It looks like a jobbery, especially in our common schools. I vote "no."

Mr. STALEY, when his name was called, said: I will teach children what they will have no other means of learning, the evils of alcohol, I vote "aye."

Mr. SMITH, of Tippecanoe: I am not a fanatical temperance man, but as the text books on this question are already prepared, and as it should be taught to check the era of drunkenness, I vote "aye."

Mr. STALEY, when his name was called, said: I owe it to my constituents to support the bill, and were my wife and daughter here they would urge me to vote for it; aye, the sainted mother above would urge me to vote for it. I vote "aye."

Mr. BOYD: It is not taught as it should be, and believing that it should be made mandatory, I vote "aye."

Mr. GOODING: If this bill were confined to alcohol and tobacco I should vote for it, but it embraces all narcotics, and to teach all the latter would be to consume all the school time. I vote "no."

The bill was then announced as above, so the bill passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed. In the haste to call up the bill one feature of it was overlooked—that is that all pupils shall be so taught—even the abecedarians.

Mr. STALEY, when his name was called, said: I move to reconsider the motion on the table. There could have been no surprise. The motion to reconsider was laid on the table by yeas 58, nays 30.

JOHN MARTIN'S CLAIM.

Mr. Pondleton's bill (H. R. 56) for work done on the Insane Asylum came up on the second reading.

The question being upon the engrossment of the bill—Mr. SMITH, of Tippecanoe, said: The bill is just and should be passed. It was examined and put in the specific appropriation, which failed to reach passage. The committee has just reported favorably upon it.

The SPEAKER: I would suggest that members wait until after the bill is engrossed and comes upon its passage to make debate.

Mr. PENDLETON: As author of the bill I want to say that the claim is just and should go through. The work was done, the claim is just.

Mr. PENDLETON moved the previous question. The demand was seconded by the House, and under its operation the bill passed by yeas 41, nays 33.

Mr. BROWNING explaining his vote, said: There has been a good deal said about new law, and here comes a judgment from the quarter least looked for. We have no chance to amend it.

The SPEAKER: There was time given for amendment. Mr. Patton wished to offer an amendment out of order, but there was objection. A gentleman has just said to me that it was the understanding that the bill should be reduced to \$45,000. The only way to get it is to defeat the motion to engross and so amend it.

Mr. PATTON explaining his vote: I was shut out from debate and could offer no explanation as to the original contract, which was for \$45,000. I vote "no."

The bill as amended was ordered engrossed.

FOR RELIEF OF MRS. T. A. HAUGH. Mr. TOWNSEND moved that his bill (H. R. 197), for the relief of Mrs. Theophania A. Haugh, be called up and put upon its passage.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill passed by yeas 78, nays 0.

The House then adjourned.

The B. and O. has in Washington and in its lines reaching the city advantages for the prompt care of its patrons in inauguration times possessed by none other. In fact, its facilities are beyond all comparison, the best, and those who want to get in and out of the city in anything like comfortable shape will prefer themselves of B. and O. tickets. There are but two railroad depots in Washington. One of them is the B. and O., where only its own passengers and their friends have any business, and wherein only its own trains arrive and depart. In the other, East-bound trains and West-bound, South-bound trains and North-bound of various roads all every line of track space, close the depot platform like sheep in a pen, and sardines in a box would be a loose comparison to the packed condition of things in the waiting-room.

Vigor and Purity. You have no admiration for a signpost pool of a malarious swamp. The waters of the merry mountain brook are clear, pure and beautiful. So with the blood. When pure, it courses rapidly through arteries and veins, and you are well and hearty. When in bad condition, your circulation is poor and sluggish, and you are not worth a cent. Brown's Iron Bitters invigorates the blood, and gives you renewed life and health. Mr. H. W. Devere, Endicott Centre, N. H., says: "I have derived splendid results from the use of Brown's Iron Bitters as a blood purifier."

Price Baking Powder Co., Chicago, Ill. St. Louis, Mo.

Gr. Price's Cream Baking Powder and Best Dry Hop Yeast. FOR SALE BY GROCERS. WE MAKE BUT ONE QUALITY.

CITY ADVERTISEMENTS.

C. O. 2, 1885.—An ordinance providing better regulations for the City of Indianapolis, and empowering the Board of Health to enforce the observance thereof, and repealing section 3 of an ordinance entitled "An ordinance regarding public safety, comfort and conveniences."

Section 1. Be it ordained by the Common Council of Indianapolis, Indiana, February 21, 1885, That it shall be unlawful, after the taking effect of this ordinance, for any person to slaughter, or procure to be slaughtered, within the corporate limits of the city of Indianapolis, any animal intended for sale, except at the regular public houses along or in the vicinity of White River. Any one violating the foregoing provision shall be fined in any sum not exceeding one hundred dollars, to which may be added imprisonment not exceeding thirty days.

Section 2. It shall be lawful for the members of the Board of Health of said city, and all officers and persons in the employ of said city, assisting said Board, to confiscate and destroy all meats, fish, oysters, berries, fruits, vegetables, milk, butter, or other articles found in the possession of any butcher, manufacturer, grocer, commission merchant, or other person in the habit of dealing in such articles for food, in the city of Indianapolis, or within two miles thereof, whenever the same shall be so rotten, diseased, putrid, or otherwise so spoiled as to be utterly unfit for human food and valueless; and to so cut, puncture, mutilate, or otherwise mutilate, such meats and other articles found in possession of any such person, which are unfit for human food, as to prevent the offering thereof for sale as food.

Section 3. It is hereby made the duty of each and every officer and person employed to assist them, as aforesaid, to confiscate, destroy, mutilate, as aforesaid, all articles described in the foregoing section, falling under their notice; and also to cause to be notified, by Market Masters, police, and other officers and citizens, in proceeding all persons found violating the statutes of the State and ordinances of the city in reference to the sale or having in possession, found, diseased, spoiled, adulterated, or unwholesome meat, drink, or other articles intended for human food, that they are prohibited from so doing, and to so mutilate such articles, or to so prosecute or aid in prosecuting all such offenders, shall work a forfeiture of their respective positions.

Section 4. It shall be unlawful for any person to haul or transport through any public street of the city of Indianapolis, the refuse and offal of any such slaughter, commonly called "hog wallows," unless the same is so hauled or transported in tanks or beds which are water tight upon the sides, and covered with a tight cover, and lighted covered that no odor can escape therefrom. Any person violating the foregoing provision shall be fined in any sum not exceeding one hundred dollars, to which may be added imprisonment not exceeding thirty days.

Section 5. Section three (3) of an ordinance, entitled "An ordinance regarding public safety, comfort and convenience," ordained December 4, 1883, be and the same be hereby repealed.

This ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage and publication for one day each week for two consecutive weeks in the Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, published by the Common Council, this 21st day of February, 1885.

JOHN L. MCMASTER, Mayor. Attest: GEORGE T. BURKES, City Clerk. Passed by the Board of Aldermen this 23rd day of February, 1885.

FRANK W. RIFEY, Clerk. Ordained and established this 23rd day of February, 1885.

JOHN L. MCMASTER, Mayor. Attest: GEORGE T. BURKES, City Clerk.

Notice to Contractors.

OFFICE OF CITY CIVIL ENGINEER, Indianapolis, February 21, 1885. Notice is hereby given that sealed proposals will be received by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, on Monday Evening, March 2, 1885, as follows: To wit: No. 31—(S. O. 92, 1884). For grading, bowldering