ing ourselves of the additional light afforded by a perusal and consideration of the ordinances of the City of Boston, so kindly placed within our power by this opportunity, the City Council of Baltimore, we feel assured, will ever take pleasure in keeping pace with our sister cities, profiting by all advancements therein presented to us.

Your committee beg leave to offer the following resolution.

William Bishop Jr — Elias Ware Junr
Stephen Collins — John Keene
J. Wesley Watkins — John Green Junr.
First Branch — Second Branch.

Resolved by the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, That the copies of the reports and ordinances of the City of Boston, presented by the corporate authorities of that city to the City of Baltimore be deposited in the Mayor's Office, and that the communication of the Mayor of the City of Boston, accompanying the same be spread upon the journal of the City Council, and that the Mayor be respectfully requested to forward a copy of this report and resolution to the corporate authorities of the City of Boston.

A resolution directing the City Commissioners to have the wall on the City Dock repaired, was received from the Second Branch, read and laid on the table.

The Second Branch returned the resolution relative to advertising for proposals for an iron bridge, to be erected over Jones Falls at Fayette Street;

The report and resolution from the joint committee on Fire Companies, on the petition of the Liberty Fire Company; and

The report and resolution from the joint committee on markets, relative to painting the new market house on Broadway; severally endorsed "concurred in"

Mr Bishop gave notice that on Tuesday next, he would offer a resolution making an appropriation for building a market house.

Mr Brown moved to take up Bill No 82. entitled "An ordinance to provide for the general valuation and assessment of property in the City of Baltimore" which was determined in the affirmative by the following vote, the yeas and nays being called for by Mr Collins.

Yeas.— Messrs President, Colton, O'Leary, Hickman, Bishop, Soran, Collins, Buchanan, Hooper, and Brown — 10.

Nays.— Messrs Walsh, Turner, Watkins, Davis, Starr, Hack & Gross — 7.

Mr Watkins moved to lay the bill on the table, which was determined in the negative, by the following vote, the yeas and nays being

being called for by Mr Collins.

Yeas.— Messrs Walsh, Bishop, Turner, Watkins, Davis, Hooper and Hack 7.

Nays.— Messrs President, Colton, O'Leary, Hickman, Soran, Collins, Buchanan, Brown and Gross — 9.

The question being on concurring in the amendments proposed by the Second Branch.

On motion of Mr Brown, the amendments proposed to the first section were "concurred in"

On motion of Mr Brown, the amendments proposed to the second section were "concurred in"

Mr Walsh moved to "nonconcur" in the amendment proposed to the third section, which was determined in the affirmative.

On motion of Mr Brown, the amendment proposed to the fifth section was "concurred in"

On motion of Mr Brown the amendments proposed to the tenth section, were "concurred in"

Mr Brown moved to amend the proposed amendment to the Eleventh section, by striking out the letter "a" before "competent", and inserting the words "the county or other", which was determined in the affirmative.

On motion of Mr Brown, the amendments proposed to the 12th section, were "concurred in."

On motion of Mr Brown the amendments proposed to the 13th section, were "concurred in"

On motion of Mr Brown the amendments proposed to the 14th section, were "concurred in"

On motion of Mr Brown, the amendments proposed to the 16th section, were "concurred in"

On motion of Mr Brown, the amendments proposed to the 17th section, were "concurred in"

On motion of Mr Watkins, the amendment proposed to the 21st section, were "concurred in"

On motion of Mr Brown, the amendments proposed to the 22d section, were "concurred in"

On motion of Mr Brown, the amendments proposed to the 25th section, were "concurred in."

On motion of Mr Brown, the amendments to the 27th section, were "concurred in"

On motion of Mr Watkins, the first proposed amendment to the 31st section was "non concurred in"

On