as assessed by the Commissioners for opening streets shall require the examination of title and certificate of title to establish said claim they shall pay for such examination and certificate to the City Counsellor, the sum of five dollars.

Mr Turner called for the second reading of the resolution attached to the report of the joint committee on fire companies, on the petition of the Liberty Fire Company.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr Walsh on leave offered the following resolution which was read a first and by special order the second time and adopted.

Resolved by the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, That the City Commissioners be, and they are hereby authorised to advertise for plans of an iron bridge, suitable to be erected over the fall in Fayette street.

A minority report and resolution from the joint committee on ways and means; and

Bill No 93. entitled "An ordinance supplementary and explanatory of an ordinance to provide for exercising certain powers vested in this corporation, in relation to streets in the City of Baltimore"; were received from the Second Branch, read and laid on the table.

The Second Branch returned the report and resolution from the joint committee of conference, relative to a Light Boat in the Seven foot Knoll. endorsed "concurred in"

The Second Branch returned bill No 89. entitled "A supplement to an ordinance to appoint City Commissioners and port Wardens, and to prescribe their duties," endorsed "will pass with proposed amendment"

Amendment proposed.

Strike out all after the word "ordained" in 2 section and insert.

"That the forty first section of the ordinance, to which this is a supplement approved May 22. 1838. be and the same is hereby repealed".

On motion of Mr Davis the proposed amendment was "concurred in"

Mr Brown from the committee, submitted the following report, which was read and laid on the table.

The joint committee on ways and means to whom was referred the communication of Robert Gilmor in relation to taxes on bank stock, believe it to be a matter over which they have no control, and beg leave to report the following resolution.

John S. Brown
Wm M. Starr
First Branch

B H. Richardson
Wm J Baker
H. R Londeman
Second Branch

Resolved

Resolved That the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

On motion of Mr Hack the Branch adjourned until to-morrow afternoon at half past 3. O'Clock

By order
Geo F. Woodward Clerk

Friday, May 1. 1846.

The Branch met pursuant to adjournment

Present Jacob S. Cohen Esq President and all the members except Messrs Dutton and Neilson.

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

The joint committee on streets, to whom was referred a communication from Christian Keener, complaining of the manner in which the contract for paving Sharp street was made by the City Commissioners, report that they have examined the same, and are of opinion that the ordinance under which the City Commissioners acted, gave to all owners of property of not less than one square, the right of making a private contract, that wish was signified in writing to the Commissioners, within the time specified. Without going extensively into the merits of the other objection, your committee do consider, from the tenor of the communication of C. Keener and others, owners of property on Sharp and other streets, under date of 15th of December 1845, complaining of their decision in the following words, viz. — "Thus debarring us of the right of making a private contract, a right which the law accords to all owners of property, and which we especially claim as our right in this instance, for the reasons above, &c" — That the City Commissioners were fairly appised of the wishes of these applicants so to do in writing, and moreover, their application to pave all Sharp street to Ostend street, accompanied as it was with the private contract and placed in the hands of the City Commissioners, would of itself have sufficiently apprised them of such wish, if the latter had not. As to the propriety of the Commissioners restricting themselves to the strict letter of the law, and refusing to delay their decision in a case, where other applications in relation to the said property came to their knowledge, your committee express no opinion. And in relation to the objection urged against the insufficiency or illegality of the notice, this is rather a question of legal decision than one for your committee.

We