fuse to do so because he is doubtful of the capacity of the same, and doubts its fitness for the last named street? If it is unfit, or lacks the capacity for one bridge, it does not, according to my ideas, possess the capacity for the others; for, permit me to say, gentlemen, you are not legislating for to-day, or the present alone, but for days that are yet to come, and others who are yet to follow. The bridges at Baltimore, and Gay streets, are not to-day, called upon to sustain the same amount of weight, as the one at Pratt street, but is there any assurance, that one or both may not be called upon, in one day, to do as much or even more than is at this time demanded of the Pratt street bridge?

The wheels of improvement and enterprise still continue to roll onward, and many in much less time than anticipated, claim from the two bridges, (at Baltimore and Gay streets,) as much capacity as is now claimed from the bridge at Pratt street.

Mr. Lepson states that Messrs. Hayward & Bartlett are responsible men, (which I acknowledge with pleasure,) and that they will guarantee their bridge. Their guarantee, gentlemen, (although in case of accident, it will hold the city and tax payers free from any loss that might thereby occur,) will not make the bridge sustain one single additional pound above its capacity, for it is doubtless fresh in the memory of all, that not many years since, a gentleman, (and bridge builder,) did likewise, and yet his bridge was scarce completed, ere it fell into the falls - guaranty to the contrary.

We want a bridge at each of the points designated, about which there can be no doubt as to capacity. In the one case there is at least doubt, in the other I conceive no doubt exists. In conclusion, gentlemen, I desire it to be distinctly understood, that if assured of the strength, fitness and capacity of the Hayward & Bartlett bridge, I have no objection in the world to it, but on the other hand, (in consideration of the price,) prefer it, - all I ask is that the fact may be established, and no one will more willingly adopt the plan than I will

With the hope, gentlemen, that some satisfactory conclusion may be arrived at, which will enable me

to make the improvement so much desired, and withal so necessary, I remain,

Very respectfully,

J. P. Shannon, City Commissioner.

Mr. Mullen moved that the communication be laid on the table until the third of September next, which was not agreed to.

Mr. Suter offered the following resolution, which was read:

Resolved, that the city Commissioner be and he is hereby directed to report to the First Branch of the City Council of Baltimore, the best plan or plans and cost of an iron bridge, suitable for Baltimore, Gay and Pratt streets, and all other information that may lead the Council to a proper conclusion with reference to the proper bridge to have erected at the streets above named, and report on the first day of the session in September.

Pending the question,

On motion of Mr. Wright, the whole subject was laid on the table by the following vote, the yeas and nays being required by Mr. Regester:

Yeas - Messrs. France, Mullen, F. H. B. Boyd, Crawford, Harker, Cox, Kraft, Wright, Quail, Counselman, White, Lepson, Nicholls - 13.

Nays - Messrs. President, G. H. Boyd, Suter, Regester, Pyle, Woods - 6.

The following message was received and read:

In Second Branch, Baltimore, May 28th, 1855.

Gentlemen of the First Branch:

We respectfully inform you that we have appointed the following gentlemen as the joint standing committee on the McDonogh bequest, viz: Messrs. Thomas, Beale and Moulton.

By order,

Allen E. Forester, clerk.