which such a restraint might be properly applied, are those in which the lots lying contiguous to each other, are assessed to one and the same individual; but when there are several lots so located, on which the taxes have not been paid, it would be manifestly unjust to sell but one to cover the taxes and the cost upon them all. There is another class of cases in which the proposed restraint would be improper and unjust. These cases are very numerous, and consist of lots or extensive quantities of ground which are assessed to owners unknown, and on which, for that reason, no tax has been paid for many years. These lots and this ground belong to different individuals; and if one or a few lots be sold to pay the tax and expenses on all the parcels so situated, it would be doing great injustice to those, whose ground under such circumstances, should be sold. One case has occurred in which one lot was sold for the payment of the tax and cost upon five lots of the same size. It subsequently appeared, that but one-half the lot sold belonged to the same individual, and a resolution was passed by the Council instructing the Register to refund to that individual all the amount of money applied to the payment of his proportion of the tax and the expenses, except his own proportion. Thus nine tenths of the tax and the same proportion of the expenses in that case, have been lost to the city. We therefore propose the accompanying as an additional section to the bill under consideration.

Samuel Harker
Joseph Breck
James Fields
First Branch

Samuel Barnes
William Baker
Ja. Essender
Second Branch

Mr Harker from the committee submitted the following report which was read and laid on the table:

The joint committee on policies to whom was referred the report of the Counsellor for the city, beg leave to report: that they

they have examined the document committed to their consideration, and find that it contains nothing which requires legislative action. Therefore, they submit the following resolution.

Samuel Harker
Joseph Breck
James Fields
First Branch

Samuel Barnes
Wm Baker
Ja Essender
Second Branch

Resolved, that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

On motion of Mr Hudson, this branch adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at half past 3 O'Clock.

By order
Geo F Woodward Clerk

Tuesday February 4. 1845.

The Branch met pursuant to adjournment.

Present Henry Snyder Esq President and all the members except Mr Reilly.

Mr Brown presented the annual report of the Watchman Fire Company, which was read and referred to the joint Committee on Fire Companies.

Mr Harker called up the resolution offered by him, relative to authorising the City Commissioners to offer a premium for the best design of a City Hall.

The question being on the adoption of the substitute, it was determined in the affirmative.

Mr Walsh moved to strike out "200" and insert "500" — also strike out after the word "best" — "100 for the second best". which was lost by the following vote, the yeas and nays being called for by Mr Barnet.

Yeas — Messrs Walsh and Breck — 2

Nays — Messrs President, Cooper, Conney, Hudson, Fields