

THE CITY RECORD.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL.

VOL. XV.

NEW YORK, TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1887.

NUMBER 4, 149.



LAW DEPARTMENT.

Statement and Return of Moneys received by E. HENRY LACOMBE, Counsel to the Corporation of the City of New York, for the month of December, 1886, rendered to the Comptroller in pursuance of the provisions of Section 26, Article 1, Chapter V., of the Revised Ordinances of 1866, and of Sections 38 and 96 of Chapter 335 of the Laws of 1873.

DATE.	TITLE OF SUIT.	RECOVERY IN FAVOR OF THE CITY.	COSTS IN FAVOR OF THE CITY.	TOTAL AMOUNT.
1886				
Dec. 1	William E. Clark, personal tax of 1880, shares of National Broadway Bank— Tax \$50 83 Interest 21 68			
" 3	Jerome Park Railway Company— Personal tax of 1882: Tax \$68 51 Interest 19 73 Personal tax of 1883: Tax 77 86 Interest 17 20	\$72 51		
" 4	Robert Halsted, personal tax of 1880, shares of Broadway National Bank— Tax \$108 79 Interest 45 77	183 30		
" 4	Laura P. Halsted, shares of Broadway National Bank— Tax \$108 79 Interest 45 77	154 56		
" 4	Archibald Turner, personal tax of 1880— Tax \$328 00 Interest 136 85	465 75		
" 8	William C. Sturges, personal tax of 1880, shares of Broadway Bank— Tax \$43 51 Interest 18 59	62 10		
" 9	Knickerbocker Steamboat Company, personal tax for 1883— Tax \$2,094 30 Interest 348 87	3,043 17	\$18 00	
" 7	Wall Street Bank—Costs allowed by the General Term.....		36 37	
" 7	Philip Arbogast, personal tax of 1880— Shares of National Broadway Bank \$108 79 Murray Hill Bank 17 71 Interest \$126 50 54 14	180 64		
" 10	Henry Campbell—In settlement of claim for rent of cellar in Washington Market	400 00		
" 10	The Broadway and Seventh Avenue Railroad Company—First installment due for 1 cent fees under the stipulation.....	11,476 50		
" 13	Thomas Sullivan and James Leahy, executors of Eliza Moore— Personal tax of 1882..... \$315 00 Interest 91 26	406 26		
" 13	John G. Vassar, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$25 30 Interest 10 82	36 12		
" 13	B. W. Merriam, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$79 06 Interest 16 91	95 97		
" 13	Smith P. Glover, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$56 60 Interest 21 84	72 44		
" 13	J. W. Hesse, covering personal taxes of 1880— Tax. Interest. Total. H. F. Barrows..... \$63 25 \$13 54 \$76 79 J. D. T. Hersey..... 42 37 9 07 51 44 Lewis Hurst..... 12 65 2 70 15 35 Margaret C. Jackson..... 31 62 6 77 38 39 F. E. Mather..... 63 25 13 54 76 79 Edgar Pincnett..... 34 78 7 44 42 22 William Smith..... 215 05 46 02 261 07 C. A. Wadsworth..... 50 60 10 82 61 42 F. Wiebusch..... 924 71 * 924 71	1,548 18		
" 15	* Excused by Comptroller. W. H. Hewlett, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$50 60 Interest 21 43	72 03		
" 17	Henry Young, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$253 00 Interest 54 14	307 14		
" 17	James H. Young, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$98 67 Interest 21 12	119 79		
" 18	Middleton Savings Bank, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$79 06 Interest 14 44	93 50		
" 21	Sylvester R. Comstock, personal tax of 1880, shares of National Broadway Bank— Tax \$87 03 Interest 16 05	103 08		
" 23	Eva J. Banks, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$25 30 Interest 5 44	30 74		

DATE.	TITLE OF SUIT.	RECOVERY IN FAVOR OF THE CITY.	COSTS IN FAVOR OF THE CITY.	TOTAL AMOUNT.
1886				
Dec. 21	West Shore Railway Company—Arrears of rent prior to December 5, 1885, for Pier at Thirty-sixth street, North river....	\$10,000 00		
" 23	Charles A. Gurley, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$42 37 Interest 18 30	60 67		
" 23	Charles A. Gurley, as guardian, etc., personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$8 22 Interest 3 55	11 77		
" 23	W. K. Reynolds, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$50 60 Interest 20 70	71 30		
" 27	Bridgeport Savings Bank, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham National Bank— Tax \$88 55 Interest 18 95	107 50		
" 27	Edward C. Bull, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$101 20 Interest 21 65	122 85		
" 27	George Farmer, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$49 33 Interest 10 56	59 89		
" 27	Emily B. Sandford, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$79 06 Interest 16 91	95 97		
" 27	James C. Stodder, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$126 50 Interest 27 07	153 57		
" 29	New York Dental Manufacturing Company, personal tax of 1884— Balance of tax \$19 87 Interest 27	20 14		
" 30	Joseph Brandon, personal tax of 1880, shares of Chatham Bank— Tax \$51 23 Interest 22 17	73 40		
" 30	Henry Bergh—Costs awarded to the City		\$113 02	
" 30	Mary E. Squires—Amount of disbursements refunded		3 50	
" 31	The National Meter Company, personal tax of 1884— Tax \$2,250 00 Interest 354 37	2,604 34		
" 30	Second Avenue Railroad Company, personal tax for the year 1881— Tax \$3,106 63 Interest 483 03	3,589 66		
" 31	Royal Baking Powder Company—Balance of tax of 1881	196 25		
" 31	Ledgerwood Manufacturing Company— Balance of tax for 1881..... 115 50 " 1882..... 131 13	246 63		
" 31	Manhattan Chemical Company, balance of tax for 1881.....	70 00		
" 31	H. W. Johns' Manufacturing Company— Balance of tax of 1881..... 143 33 " 1882..... 143 33	286 66		
" 31	Bradley White Lead Company, balance of tax of 1882.....	113 02		
" 31	E. G. W. Woerz, personal tax of 1880, shares of Island City Bank— Tax \$49 33 Interest 21 33	70 66		
	Total.....	\$37,032 65	\$170 89	\$37,203 54

The following schedules form a report of the transactions of the office of the Counsel to the Corporation for the week ending January 1, 1887:

The Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty of the City of New York are defendants, unless otherwise mentioned.

SCHEDULE "A."

SUITS AND SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED.

SUPREME COURT.

- John Connor vs. The Mayor, etc., of the City of New York, and the Board of Health of the City of New York—Salary as Sanitary Engineer from January to October, 1886 at \$100 per month, \$1,000.
- Effingham N. Lawrence, Chester B. Lawrence, and William L. Gerrish, Jr., vs. The Mayor, etc.—Damages by collision of tug "Municipal," with plaintiff's Pier 36, East river, September 12, 1886, \$70.
- Louisa D. Kane vs. The Mayor, etc., of the City of New York, and the Board of the Department of Docks—For possession of premises at Washington and Hammersley streets, between former lines of high and low water-marks of Hudson river, and for damages.
- In re petition of Henry Beers—To vacate an assessment for regulating, grading, curb, gutter and flagging Madison avenue, from Ninety-ninth to One Hundred and Fifth street.
- In re petition of Max Frund—To vacate an assessment for regulating, grading, curb, gutter and flagging Madison avenue, from Ninety-ninth to One Hundred and Fifth streets.
- In re petition of Barbetta Morgenthau and another—To vacate an assessment for One Hundred and Fifty-sixth street regulating, etc., Kingsbridge road and Eleventh avenue.
- In re petition of Robert McCafferty—To vacate an assessment for St. Nicholas avenue sewers, between One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets.

SUPERIOR COURT.

- John Ryan vs. The Mayor, etc.—To recover back excess of assessment for regulating, etc., Manhattan street, from St. Nicholas avenue to Twelfth avenue, in Ward No. 20, Block 1286, \$133.35.

BEFORE THE ASSESSMENT COMMISSION, APPOINTED UNDER CHAPTER 550 OF THE LAWS OF 1880.

- In re petition of Peter A. H. Jackson—To recover an assessment paid for One Hundred and Eighth street regulating, etc., between Fifth avenue and Harlem river.
- In re petition of Claiborne Ferris—To recover the first installment of an assessment paid for Boulevard regulating, etc., between Fifty-ninth and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets.
- In re petition of Leopold Erleben—For an award, assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of John H. Bird—For an award, assessment for Sixth avenue macadamizing, from One Hundred and Tenth street to Harlem river.
- In re petition of Ashbel H. Barney—For an award, assessment for Ninth avenue regulating, etc., from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Tenth street.
- In re petition of Charles Koster—For an award, assessment for Ninth avenue regulating, etc., from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Tenth street.
- In re petition of Ricot J. Dovall—For an award, assessment for Ninth avenue regulating, etc., from Eighty-third to Ninety-second street.
- In re petition of Joseph O. Brown, as executor, etc.—For an award, assessment for One Hundred and Sixteenth street regulating, etc., from Sixth avenue to Avenue A.
- In re petition of Alexander B. Mott—For an award, assessment for One Hundred and Sixteenth street regulating, etc., from Sixth avenue to Avenue A.

- In re petition of Thomas H. O'Connor—For an award, assessment for One Hundred and Sixteenth street regulating, etc., from Sixth avenue to Avenue A.
- In re petition of Jane Robert—To vacate assessment for South Fifth avenue paving, etc., from Canal street to West Fourth street.
- In re petition of Lytle W. Johnson—To vacate assessment for South Fifth avenue paving, etc., from Canal street to West Fourth street.
- In re petition of John T. Hand and another, executors—To vacate assessment for One Hundred and Thirty-fifth street regulating, etc., from Eighth avenue to Harlem river.
- In re petition of Daniel B. Fayerweather and another—To vacate an assessment for One Hundred and Thirty-fifth street regulating, etc., from Eighth avenue to Harlem river.
- In re petition of Anne F. Emmett, trustee—To vacate an assessment for Eighth avenue regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Oliver R. King—To vacate assessment for Eighth avenue regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of John Lehmaier—To vacate an assessment for Eighth avenue regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of John H. Watson—To vacate an assessment for Eighth avenue regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Philip and William Ebling—To vacate assessment for Ninth avenue regulating, etc., from Eighty-third to Ninety-second street.
- In re petition of J. Lagowitz, and another—To vacate assessment for Ninth avenue regulating, etc., from Eighty-third to Ninety-second street.
- In re petition of Philip and William Ebling—To vacate assessment for Ninth avenue, from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Tenth street.
- In re petition of J. Lagowitz, and another—To vacate assessment for Ninth avenue, from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Tenth street.
- In re petition of Cornelia Rowe, and another—To vacate assessment for Ninth avenue, from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Tenth street.
- In re petition of James Wallace—To vacate assessment for Ninth avenue, from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Tenth street.
- In re petition of Lydia A. Everdell and another—To vacate assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of Christopher Meyer—To vacate assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of Margaret Moses—To vacate assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of George R. Schieffelin—To vacate an assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of Sheridan Shook—To vacate assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of Martha E. Cowan—To vacate an assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., Manhattan to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of John C. Fries—To vacate an assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., Manhattan to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Emanuel Knight—To vacate an assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., Manhattan to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Mary J. Pinckney—To vacate an assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., Manhattan to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Max Weil and another—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of James M. Constable—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Elizabeth Dunshell—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of H. S. Deshon—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Joseph H. Godwin—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of John Howe—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of William H. Hays—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of O. Newcombe, executor, etc.—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Mary L. Townshend—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of John Townshend—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of James Wallace—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Hannah S. Gould—For repayment of assessment for Ninth avenue regulating, etc.
- In re petition of Felix Goningpinto—For repayment of assessment for Ninth avenue regulating, etc.
- In re petition of Alexander M. King—For repayment of assessment for Ninth avenue regulating, etc.
- In re petition of James M. C. Tyler—For an award, assessment for paving Seventh avenue, from One Hundred and Tenth to One Hundred and Fifty-fourth street.
- In re petition of James M. C. Tyler—For an award, assessment for regulating Seventh avenue, from One Hundred and Tenth street to Harlem river.
- In re petition of Anna M. Purdy—For an award, assessment for regulating Seventh avenue, from One Hundred and Tenth street to Harlem river.
- In re petition of Richard Lathers—For an award, assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Thomas H. Walter—For an award, assessment for Manhattan street regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Solome Loew—To vacate, modify or revise assessment for Ninth avenue regulating, etc., from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Tenth street.
- In re petition of Solome Loew—No vacate, modify or revise assessment for Eighth avenue paving, from Circle at Fifty-ninth street to One Hundred and Twenty-fifth street.
- In re petition of John Lehmaier—To vacate, modify or revise assessment for Eighth avenue paving, from Circle at Fifty-ninth street to One Hundred and Twenty-fifth street.
- In re petition of John H. Watson—To vacate, modify or revise assessment for Eighth avenue paving, from Circle at Fifty-ninth street to One Hundred and Twenty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Solome Loew—To vacate assessment for Eighth avenue paving, etc., Ninth avenue regulating, etc.
- In re petition of Mary Ahearn—To vacate assessment for Fordham and Pelham drains.
- In re petition of David Bonner—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of William H. Beadleston, trustee—To vacate assessment for One Hundred and Seventy-third and One Hundred and Eighty-third streets drains.
- In re petition of Abraham Bernheimer—To vacate assessment for St. Nicholas avenue regulating, etc., One Hundred and Tenth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Rosalie King—To vacate assessment for St. Nicholas avenue regulating, etc., One Hundred and Tenth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Thomas J. Stevens and another—To vacate assessment for St. Nicholas avenue regulating, etc., One Hundred and Tenth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Adolph Bernheimer—To vacate assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of David L. Baker—To vacate assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of Isaac Blumenthal—To vacate assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Peter A. Cassidy—To vacate assessment for One Hundred and Eighth street regulating, etc., Fifth avenue to Harlem river.
- In re petition of Mary G. Pinckney—To vacate assessment for Manhattan street regulating, etc., Twelfth avenue to St. Nicholas avenue.
- In re petition of Thomas J. McCahill—To vacate assessment for Manhattan street regulating, etc., Twelfth avenue to St. Nicholas avenue.
- In re petition of Thomas J. McCahill—To vacate assessment for Manhattan street regulating, etc., Twelfth avenue to St. Nicholas avenue.
- In re petition of Abraham Dowdney—To vacate assessment for Seventy-fifth street regulating, etc., Fifth avenue to East river.
- In re petition of Patrick J. Thompson—To vacate assessment for Seventy-fifth street, regulating, etc., Fifth avenue to East river.
- In re petition of House of Mercy—To vacate assessment for Seventy-seventh to Eighty-eighth street drains, Ninth avenue to Hudson river.
- In re petition of Charles E. Tripler—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Boulevard, from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of William P. Dixon, ind., etc.—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Boulevard, from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Louis Knaust—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Manhattan street.
- In re petition of Martha B. Wood—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., One Hundred and Fifteenth street, from Seventh to Eighth avenue.
- In re petition of Mary Deering—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., One Hundred and Thirty-fifth street, between Fourth and Eighth avenues.
- In re petition of John C. Ely—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Ninth avenue, from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Tenth street.
- In re petition of William J. Lyons—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Ninth avenue, from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Tenth street.
- In re petition of Aaron Raymond—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., St. Nicholas avenue, between One Hundred and Tenth and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets.
- In re petition of John H. Watson—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., St. Nicholas avenue, between One Hundred and Tenth and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets.
- In re petition of Mary Whiteman and ano.—To vacate assessment for underground drains, from Kingsbridge road to Harlem river.
- In re petition of Joseph Loth et al.—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Tenth avenue, Manhattan to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Roscoe Conkling—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Tenth avenue, from One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of Central National Bank—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Tenth avenue, from One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of William A. M. Culbert—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Tenth avenue, from One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of James A. Deering—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Tenth avenue, from One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of Theodore W. Meyers—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Tenth avenue, from One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of James Rogers—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Tenth avenue, from One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of William J. Syms—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Tenth avenue, from One Hundred and Tenth to Manhattan street.
- In re petition of Lyle Reid—To vacate an assessment for One Hundred and Sixteenth street regulating, etc., from Avenue A to Sixth avenue.
- In re petition of Joseph H. Tooker—To vacate an assessment for One Hundred and Sixteenth street regulating, etc., from Avenue A to Sixth avenue.
- In re petition of William Fanning—To vacate an assessment for Boulevard sewers, between One Hundred and Sixth and One Hundred and Fifty-third streets.
- In re petition of Jacob H. V. Cockroft—To vacate an assessment paid for Boulevard regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Leopold Edlitz—To vacate an assessment for Seventy-seventh and Eighty-eighth streets underground drains, from Ninth avenue to Harlem river.
- In re petition of Adam Leburn—To recover an assessment paid for Eighty-sixth street regulating, etc., from Eighth avenue to Riverside Drive.
- In re petition of Hyman Blum—To recover an assessment paid for Eighty-sixth street regulating, etc., from Eighth avenue to Riverside Drive.
- In re petition of Jacob Lagowitz and another—To recover an assessment paid for Ninth avenue regulating, etc., from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Tenth street.
- In re petition of Jacob Lagowitz and another—To recover an assessment paid for Ninth avenue regulating, etc., from Eighty-third to Ninety-second street.
- In re petition of Orlando B. Potter—To vacate assessment for Manhattan street sewer, between Twelfth and St. Nicholas avenues.
- In re petition of Orlando B. Potter—To vacate assessment for Manhattan street sewer, between Twelfth and St. Nicholas avenues.
- In re petition of Henry Ferris—To recover an assessment paid for Manhattan street regulating, etc., Twelfth avenue to St. Nicholas avenue.
- In re petition of Orlando B. Potter—To recover an assessment paid for Manhattan street, regulating, etc., Twelfth avenue to St. Nicholas avenue.
- In re petition of Hewlett Scudder et al.—To vacate assessment for regulating, etc., Fifth avenue, from Ninetieth to One Hundred and Twentieth street.
- In re petition of Edward Roberts—To vacate assessment for Second avenue paving, from Eighty-sixth to One Hundred and Twenty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Edward Roberts—To vacate assessment for Ninety-second to One Hundred and Sixth street underground drains.
- In re petition of John F. Pupke—To vacate assessment for Sixth avenue macadamizing, One Hundred and Tenth street to Harlem river.
- In re petition of William G. Peck et al.—To vacate assessment for One Hundred and Eighteenth street regulating, etc., Fifth avenue to East river.
- In re petition of Russell Sage—To vacate assessment for Eighth avenue regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Twenty-second street.
- In re petition of Russell Sage—To vacate assessment for Eighth avenue regulating, etc., Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-ninth street.
- In re petition of Farmers' Loan and Trust Co.—To vacate assessment for Ninety-second to One Hundred and Sixth street underground drains.
- In re petition of H. Hewlett Scudder, etc.—To vacate, modify, etc., assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., from Manhattan to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of William Irwin—To vacate assessment for Fordham underground drains.
- In re petition of Clara L. Pilut—To vacate assessment for St. Nicholas avenue regulating, etc.
- In re petition of John Donovan—To vacate, etc., assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., from Manhattan to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Louis Six—To vacate, etc., assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., from Manhattan to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Thomas Auld—To vacate assessment for One Hundred and Thirty-fifth street regulating, etc., from Harlem river to Eighth avenue.
- In re petition of George G. Coffin—For repayment of assessment for Seventy-ninth street regulating, etc., Eighth avenue to Riverside Drive.
- In re petition of William H. Findlay—To vacate assessment for One Hundred and Thirty-fourth street sewer, Willis to Brook avenue.
- In re petition of Christian F. Goeller et al.—To vacate assessment for One Hundred and Thirty-fourth street sewer, Willis to Brook avenue.
- In re petition of Marie L. Fritte—To vacate an assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Samuel M. Purdy—To vacate an assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Benjamin Richardson—To vacate an assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Thomas B. Sturgis—To vacate an assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Joseph Steiner—To vacate an assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Charles F. Willis—To vacate an assessment for Boulevard regulating, etc., from Fifty-ninth to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of Joseph A. Booth—To vacate assessment for Tenth avenue regulating, etc., Manhattan to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street.
- In re petition of James Galway—To vacate assessment for Boulevard sewers, One Hundred and Sixth to One Hundred and Fifty-third street.
- In re petition of United States Trust Company, as guardian, etc.—To vacate an assessment for One Hundred and Fifty-second street regulating, etc., Boulevard to Hudson river.
- In re petition of Joseph O. Brown—To vacate assessment for Seventh avenue sewers, between One Hundred and Twenty-first and One Hundred and Thirty-seventh streets.
- In re petition of Andrew Lester—To vacate assessment for Sixth avenue sewers, between One Hundred and Twenty-ninth and One Hundred and Forty-seventh streets.
- In re petition of Adeline Watson—To vacate assessment for Sixth avenue macadamizing, from One Hundred and Tenth street to Harlem river.

SCHEDULE "B."

JUDGMENTS ENTERED AND ORDERS OF THE GENERAL AND SPECIAL TERMS.

- In re John B. Hunt, One Hundred and Sixteenth street regulating, etc.—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re Lange.
- Cornelius J. Winant (Superior)—Order entered discontinuing action without costs by consent.
- Efingham H. Lawrence et al.—Order entered discontinuing action without costs, etc., by consent.
- James I. Jones—Judgment entered in favor of the City on the verdict and for \$107.10 costs, etc., after trial before Daly, J., and jury.
- In re Thomas Faye, St. Nicholas avenue sewer, One Hundred and Thirty-second to One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street—Order entered vacating order entered May 5, 1886, and opening matter for further proofs by consent.
- Matter N. Y. & Harlem R. R. Co.—For appointment of Commissioners of Appraisal of portions of Fourth avenue, Forty-third and Forty-fourth streets to be taken pursuant to Act May 20, 1869—Order entered substituting Frank Loomis, Esq., as attorney for petitioner, in place of Beach and Brown, by consent.
- Peo. ex rel. The Hanover Fire Ins., Co., vs. Tax Commissioners; tax for year 1885—Order entered vacating and canceling assessment on relators' bank shares.

George W. McLean, as Receiver of Taxes, etc., vs. Mary E. Squires—Order entered discontinuing action without costs by consent.

George W. Peel—Judgment entered in favor of the plaintiff for \$204.11, without costs, upon offer.

Annie B. Phelps—Judgment entered in favor of plaintiff for \$57.33, without costs, upon offer.

Charles Sedgwick—Order entered dismissing complaint with \$10 costs for lack of prosecution upon motion before Barrett, J.

Thomas Gray—Order entered dismissing complaint with \$10 costs for lack of prosecution upon motion before Barrett, J.

Joseph Hall—Order entered dismissing complaint with \$10 costs for lack of prosecution upon motion before Barrett, J.

George W. Mason—Order entered dismissing complaint with \$10 costs for lack of prosecution upon motion before Barrett, J.

Dennis Dermody—Order entered dismissing complaint with \$10 costs for lack of prosecution upon motion before Barrett, J.

Thomas J. Ridden—Order entered dismissing complaint with \$10 costs for lack of prosecution upon motion before Barrett, J.

Stephen O'Brien—Motion entered dismissing complaint with \$10 costs for lack of prosecution upon motion before Barrett, J.

Patrick H. Jones—Order entered discontinuing action without costs by consent.

Wellington Porter—Order entered discontinuing action without costs by consent.

George W. McLean, as Receiver, etc., vs. The Second Avenue Railroad Co., tax, 1882—Order entered discontinuing action without costs by consent.

George W. McLean, as Receiver, etc., vs. The Second Avenue Railroad Co., tax, 1881—Order entered discontinuing action without costs by consent.

George W. McLean, as Receiver, etc., vs. The Manhattan Medicine Co—Judgment entered in favor of the plaintiff for \$766.22 after trial before Ingraham, J.

In re Francis Russell, Thirtieth street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re John Dingledein, Third avenue paving, etc.—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Bemque L. Suarez, Twenty-third street crosswalk—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Helen M. Fiedler, West street crosswalks—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Erie Railway Company, West street curb, etc.—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Charles Sandford, Third avenue crosswalks—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Charles Sandford, Third avenue crosswalks—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

Peo. ex rel. Louisa M. Gerry vs. Tax Commissioners—Order entered affirming proceedings of Tax Commissioners after trial.

Peo. ex rel. John B. Golet vs. Tax Commissioners—Order entered affirming proceedings of Tax Commissioners after trial.

Peo. ex rel. John B. Golet vs. Tax Commissioners—Order entered affirming proceedings of Tax Commissioners after trial.

Peo. ex rel. John B. Golet vs. Tax Commissioners—Order entered affirming proceedings of Tax Commissioners after trial.

Peo. ex rel. Hannah G. Gerry vs. Tax Commissioners—Order entered affirming proceedings of Tax Commissioners after trial.

Peo. ex rel. Jean B. Golet vs. Tax Commissioners—Order entered affirming proceedings of the Commissioners after trial.

Peo. ex rel. Hannah G. Gerry vs. Tax Commissioners—Order entered affirming proceedings of Tax Commissioners after trial.

Peo. ex rel. Jean B. Golet vs. Tax Commissioners—Order entered affirming proceedings of Tax Commissioners after trial.

Peo. ex rel. Hannah G. Gerry vs. Tax Commissioners—Order entered affirming proceedings of Tax Commissioners after trial.

Peo. ex rel. Jean B. Golet vs. Tax Commissioners—Order entered affirming proceedings of Tax Commissioners after trial.

John Brady—Order entered opening judgment and allowing answer to be served within twenty days.

Mary Kerns vs. Robert A. Tighe—Order entered discontinuing action without costs by consent.

In re Thomas Auld, One Hundred and Thirty-fourth street regulating, etc.—Order entered reducing assessment.

The Mayor, etc., vs. John H. Starin and Independent Steamboat Company et al.—Judgment of affirmance entered in favor of the City and for \$69.26 costs, and for defendants other than the Steamboat Company for \$1,039.30 after trial.

The Mayor, etc., vs. John H. Starin and New Jersey Steamboat Company and others—Judgment of affirmance entered in favor of the City and for \$69.26 costs after trial.

Patrick Breslin vs. James Brark and ano.—Order entered discontinuing action without costs by consent.

In re Annie N. Alexander, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Mary Conklin, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Lemuel B. Clark and ano., St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Anna M. Deane, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Thomas Faye, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re M. and S. Gutman, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Nathaniel R. Hart, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Sasan A. King, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Nelson Newton, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Margaret McAvoy, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re William Rankin, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Jane Whiteman, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Simon Wormser, St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

In re Mary Jane Ward et al., executor, etc., St. Nicholas avenue sewers, One Hundred and Thirty-second and One Hundred and Fifty-fifth streets—Order entered vacating assessment pursuant to decision in re U. S. Trust Co.

Convent avenue opening—Order entered denying motion and discontinuing proceeding.

In re Benjamin C. Wandell, Eighty-third street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Margaret Ormiston, Eighteenth street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re A. W. Budlong, Eleventh avenue paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re The Lee Box and Lumber Company, Eleventh avenue paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Matthew A. Wilson, Eighty-third street curbing—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Emma J. McLay, Eighty-third street curbing—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Horatio Schermerhorn, Eighty-third street curbing—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re George R. Schieffelin, sewer, Cherry street—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Julia Barry, Eighty-third street curbing—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re William H. Lenkauf, Fifty-second street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Nicholas Betjamin, First avenue regulating, etc.—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re E. D. Brown, First avenue regulating, etc.—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re George H. Hoffman, Fifth avenue crosswalks—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re St. Patrick's Cathedral, Fifty-first street curbing—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re William C. Barrett, Fourth avenue paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Jane Morrell, Lewis street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Emilie Tabbot, Forty-eighth street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re H. A. Shannan, Forty-first street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re George Kempt, Fiftieth street flagging, etc.—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re D. and J. Jardine, Fifty-sixth street flagging, etc.—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re John Browning, Second avenue regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re H. H. Colgate, Seventy-seventh street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Thomas F. Ferris, Sixty-third street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re James Whitehead, Third avenue paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Ed. Brown, basin corner Second avenue and Ninety-first street—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re John Roach, Tenth avenue flagging—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re John Koch et al., Third avenue paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Joseph L. White et al., Thirty-seventh street flagging—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Congregation Chapel of Reconciliation, Thirty-first street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Henry S. Suarez, Twenty-third street crosswalks—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re John D. Philips, Corlears Slip flagging—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Margaret Stiles, paving Varick street—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re E. L. and C. Dixon, Front street flagging—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum, Fifty-second street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re William Collins, sale for opening Ninetieth to Ninety-third street—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Bridget Lane, sale for widening Lawrence street—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Cornelius Austin, sale for widening One Hundred and Twenty-first street—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Isaias Meyer, Fifty-seventh street flagging—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Emeline Crane, Eighth avenue paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re H. P. Gassin, Fifteenth street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re H. P. Gassin, Fifteenth street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Peter Brunges, Varick street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Mary G. Ragsdale, Thirty-third street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Thomas Rutter, Eighty-eighth street sewer—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re A. Haywood, Irving Place paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Peter Miltner, Seventy-fifth street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re James Lane, Seventy-fifth street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Bernard Cahill, Seventy-fifth street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re John McCabe, Seventy-fifth street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Levi Guskey, Fourteenth street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Ed. J. King, Seventy-fifth street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Henry Werner, Sixty-fourth street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re John Shirley, One Hundred and Ninth street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Michael Howe et al., One Hundred and Fifteenth and One Hundred and Twenty-first streets sewer—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re G. W. Poillon, Sixth avenue regulating, etc.—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Octavie Boyce, Ninth avenue regulating, etc.—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re H. A. Colgate, Ninth avenue regulating, etc.—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re S. S. Riker, One Hundred and Ninth street regulating, etc.—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re R. S. Clarke, Pearl street paving—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Hugh Cassidy, Sixty-first street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re M. Cavanaugh, Seventy-sixth street flagging—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re estate of D. F. Brinkman, Seventy-fourth street regulating—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Morris Littman et al., Seventh avenue sewer—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

In re Patrick Byrnes, Seventy-sixth street flagging—Order entered dismissing petition without costs by consent.

SCHEDULE "C."

SUITS AND SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS TRIED OR ARGUED.

Efingham H. Lawrence et al.—Motion to discontinue action without costs argued before Hall, J.; motion granted conditionally; W. T. Cox, for the City.

Peo. ex rel. Board of Education vs. William R. Grace et al., composing the Board of Estimate and Apportionment—Motion for mandamus argued before Barrett, J.; motion denied; D. J. Dean, for the City.

Matter of New Parks—Hearing proceeded and adjourned to January 4, 1887, at 2 P. M.; Franklin Bartlett, for the City.

N. Y. Harlem R. R. Co.—Hearing proceeded and adjourned to January 8, 1887, 3 P. M.

The Mayor, etc., vs. Peter H. Walsh—Motion to restore to calendar for January 3, made before Barrett, J.; motion granted.

The Mayor, etc., vs. James W. Boyle—Motion to restore to calendar for January 3, made before Barrett, J.; motion granted.

Convent avenue opening—Motion to appoint Commissioners made before Van Brunt, J.; motion denied; E. H. Lacombe for the City.

E. HENRY LACOMBE, Counsel to the Corporation.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, SANITARY BUREAU, SEVENTH DIVISION—VITAL STATISTICS.

REPORTED MORTALITY* for the week ending January 1, 1887, together with the ACTUAL MORTALITY for the week ending December 25, 1886.

W. DE F. DAY, M. D., Sanitary Superintendent and Register.

SIR—There were 767 deaths reported to have occurred in this city during the week ending Saturday, January 1, 1887, which is a decrease of 38, as compared with the number reported the preceding week, and 129 more than were reported during the corresponding week of the year 1886. The actual mortality for the week ending December 25, 1886, was 789, which is 136.4 above the average for the corresponding week for the past five years, and represents an annual death-rate of 28.10 per 1,000 persons living, the population estimated at 1,459,822.

Table showing the Reported Mortality for the week ending January 1, 1887, and the Actual Number of Deaths each day, from the Principal Causes, with the Ages of Decedents, for the week ending December 25, 1886.

Main table with columns for METEOROLOGY, CAUSES OF DEATH, DATE (Dec. 19-25), AGE BY YEARS (Under 1 year to 70 and over), SEX (Male, Female, Colored), and Total Actual Mortality during the week ending Dec. 25, 1886.

* Refers to the number of death certificates received.

DEATHS FROM ZYMOTIC DISEASES. NEW YORK.—DEATHS FROM SMALL-POX, MEASLES, SCARLATINA, DIPHtheria, CROUP, WHOOPING COUGH, TYPHOID FEVER, TYPHUS FEVER, MALARIAL FEVERS, PUERPERAL FEVER, DIARRHOEAL MALADIES, CEREBRO-SPINAL FEVER, AND OTHER ZYMOTIC DISEASES. Actual Mortality during the Week ending December 25, 1886. Table with columns for WARDS, AREA IN ACRES, various zymotic diseases, Total Deaths from all Causes, Total Deaths, exclusive of those in Public Institutions, Total Population (in Wards), Census of 1880, and REMARKS.

Very respectfully submitted,

JOHN T. NAGLE, M. D., Deputy Register of Records.

Births * reported during the week ending January 1, 1887.

Table with columns: COLOR (White, Colored), SEX (Male, Female, Not stated), NATIVITY OF PARENTS (Foreign, Native, Foreign Father only, Foreign Mother only), NAME OF CHILD (Stated, Not stated). Total: 636 births.

Marriages * reported during the week ending January 1, 1887.

Table with columns: COLOR (White, Colored), NATIVITY (Foreign, Native, Born at Sea, Not stated), CONDITION (First, Second, Third, Fourth Marriage, Not stated). Total: 244 marriages.

* The returns of births, marriages, and still-births are incomplete.

Nativity of those who were Married, and the Parents of the Births and Still-Births, for the week ending January 1, 1887, and those who Died (actual mortality), week ending December 25, 1886.

Table with columns: NATIVITY OF DECEASED, COUNTRY, DEATHS, BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, STILL-BIRTHS. Lists various countries like Austria, France, Germany, etc.

Still-Births reported during the week ending January 1, 1887.

Table with columns: SEX, COLOR, NATIVITY OF FATHER, NATIVITY OF MOTHER, PERIOD OF UTERO-GESTATION (MONTH 1-10). Total: 62 still-births.

Deaths reported during the week ending January 1, 1887.

Table with columns: PLACE OF DEATH (Institutions, Tenement-houses, etc.), FLOORS (Basement, First, Second, etc.), RESIDENCE (New York City, etc.), CONDITION (Single, Married, etc.). Total: 767 deaths.

† Principally children and deaths in Institutions.

BOARD OF EXCISE.

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF EXCISE, NEW YORK, Dec. 30, 1886.

Hon. WILLIAM R. GRACE, Mayor:

Having been selected by you for an important trust at a time when public attention was specially directed toward the Excise system, we deem it proper, at this time, to report to you regarding our work, with some suggestions which we hope you may consider of sufficient importance to transmit to your successor.

Not having had possession of the books and records of the office of the Board of Excise during the months of May and June, at a time when we were receiving an average of nearly fifty applications for license each day, contemplated changes in the methods of doing business were necessarily delayed.

The amount of labor devolving upon the office is very great, and is made greater by the fact that the hours usually devoted to business are largely occupied in listening to the personal statements of applicants, or those who come to speak in their behalf, and to hearings upon protests and complaints. The new law giving to applicants the right of appeal to the Courts has added very much to the work of the Counsel to the Board, making it necessary for him to have assistance, and also imposes additional labor upon the Commissioners.

During the year ending December 28, 1886, there were, as shown by the records of the office, 11,996 applications received altogether, and 8,879 licenses issued, for which \$635,930 was collected. Of the licenses issued within that time 3,553 were issued by our predecessors during the four months previous to May 1, for which they received \$255,615; 5,326 were issued by us during the eight months following, for which we have received \$380,315; and 641 were issued by Messrs. Haughton and Morris while they held possession of the office and assumed to act as Commissioners of Excise from May 1 to July 7, 1886, for which they received \$45,630.

Among the applications received a large number are for transfers of licenses already issued. The Commissioners being directly and personally responsible for the proper administration of their office, we have felt that we would not be justified in conferring discretionary powers upon our subordinates or in taking final action in any case without personal examination.

The Commissioners are necessarily compelled to rely upon the reports of their inspectors for most of the information upon which they must act. We have thought it desirable to make some changes in the system of inspections. To that end we have appointed special inspectors and have discontinued the practice of confiding a particular district or precinct to the exclusive supervision of one inspector. This gives the Board, in special cases where it is deemed advisable, the advantage of having separate reports from different officers, affording a safeguard for the Commissioners and relieving the inspectors from individual responsibility in doubtful cases.

The office of General Inspector has been abolished and a Chief Inspector appointed. It is made the duty of the inspectors to enter the reports of their inspections upon the records of the office.

In addition to their special reports upon applications, they are required, as far as possible, to be informed by personal inspection as to the number, location and character of all persons and places licensed, or subject to license; and to enter upon the maps and records of the office the information they obtain; the care and responsibility for the proper performance of this work being devolved upon the Special Inspectors.

We have in this way inaugurated a system of office records which will, when completed, contain the history of every place and person licensed. As a part of this record we have a set of maps designed to show each place licensed in the city. We also have preserved in scrap books, properly indexed, the published accounts of everything affecting the character of licenses, under the charge of Special Inspectors who are required to make inspection in all cases where the circumstances demand it.

The work of making these records is progressing as rapidly as is possible with the limited force at our disposal. We believe that when perfected they will enable us to readily determine the character and fitness of applicants regarding whom we would otherwise be uninformed.

We have increased the pay of our inspectors as far as the limits of our appropriation will permit. The highest salary now paid is \$1,500 per annum, and the lowest \$1,000. Formerly the pay was \$900 for all, excepting three general inspectors who received \$1,200.

The Inspectors of Excise should be men of character, integrity and self-respect. They are liable to the temptation of petty bribes, and there is evidence that custom has permitted their acceptance of gratuities. We are determined to break up this practice, and we have felt that where men who are subjected to such temptation are expected and required to resist it, they should receive an adequate compensation.

If the amount of money at our disposal were sufficient, we would pay our inspectors not less than \$1,500 per annum. We believe the service would be benefited and improved by doing so.

After careful consideration, the Commissioners have determined to change the rates and grades of license fees.

An expressed purpose of the law being "to suppress intemperance," it is believed that its intention can be carried out by encouraging the sale of beer and light wines.

The use of beer and light wines seldom leads to intoxication, and among those who drink them poverty and crime as the result of intemperance are rare. They are comparatively cheap, and form the customary drink of a very large portion of our population, with a great number of whom the use of beer is a habit of daily diet. Many of these cannot afford to purchase more expensive drinks.

The distribution and sale of beer is, to a very considerable extent, made by small dealers whose profits are not large.

We have, therefore, considered it wise to prescribe a special and comparatively cheap grade of license for this class of dealers. An ale and beer license has been heretofore fixed at \$30, the lowest rate allowed by law, but it has been of little practical benefit, because most of those who sell beer principally find it necessary to sell wine also, and in order to do that they have been compelled to take out a full saloon license, for which they pay \$75. We have determined to fix a new grade of license to sell ale, beer and wine, at a lower rate.

Among the first reforms determined upon were the restrictions regarding the licensing of new places. Under the rules adopted a large number of applications for license for new places have been refused. We have also been compelled, under the law, to refuse all applications for license whenever any musical or other entertainment was given, or intended to be given.

These compulsory refusals included reputable places to which, we may assume, the law was not intended to apply, but which come within the limits of its strict interpretation as construed by the Court of Appeals. Among these may be cited the American Institute Fair and Neuendorf's Central Park Garden.

The result has been the loss of several thousand dollars to the Excise Fund that would otherwise have been collected, with the certainty of corresponding losses in the future.

While it may be held that the revenue for license fees is not the chief purpose of the law and is only incidental to its enforcement, we have believed it to be our duty to increase the revenue, if possible to do so without injustice, rather than to permit its decrease.

That being so, we have determined upon an increase of the fee for a license to sell spirituous liquors with ale, beer and wine, which will, we believe, result in a larger revenue without injuriously affecting those who will be compelled to pay the increased amount.

This action has not been taken hastily. We have sought the opinion and advice of those interested in the traffic as well as of others, and while it may be regarded as in some degree a concession to the very general sentiment in favor of high licenses, we have good reason to believe that our action in this respect will meet the approval of the better and more reputable persons engaged in the wholesale and retail trade.

We have also under consideration the question establishing several grades of licenses for store keepers (those who sell by the bottle or case—not to be drank on the premises).

In determining upon the proposed changes we have considered the fact that some dealers who intend to sell spirituous liquors may take out licenses for ale, beer and wine only, depending upon their ability to escape detection. That this may be attempted is very probable, but we believe it to be entirely within our power to so enforce the law as to render its successful accomplishment very difficult. We do not anticipate any serious loss of revenue from this cause.

An inability or failure to compel obedience to the laws regarding excise licenses, will involve a serious loss of revenue under the increased fees, as many dealers will not apply for license if they find they can carry on their business without one.

This difficulty could, we think, be almost wholly overcome if we had a force sufficient to enable us to make a business of obtaining evidence upon which to procure arrests.

It may be necessary for us to employ a larger force of inspectors than that now at our command. The certainty of an increased revenue under the new system will far more than justify the granting of such additional appropriation as we may ask for that purpose.

There is a matter of the greatest importance, bearing directly upon a proper execution of the excise law, to which we think it to be our duty to allude. There is no power conferred upon Commissioners of Excise to compel obedience to the law. Their power is confined wholly to the granting of licenses, and their revocation. We cannot compel a man to take out a license, or prevent his selling without one. The law makes it our duty to take possession of the certificate of license in case of revocation, but we have no power to compel its surrender. The power to enforce the law rests wholly with the police.

We have been treated with uniform courtesy and consideration by the Commissioners of Police, and have to acknowledge the cordial co-operation and aid of the Superintendent of Police in every instance where we have had occasion to require it. It is, nevertheless, a fact that in numerous instances those who have been refused licenses, and in some cases those whose licenses have been revoked, have gone right on selling openly in defiance of law.

To a great extent the difficulty in enforcing the law arises, doubtless, from the fact that in some respects the law is deemed by a large number to be unjust and absurd. This is especially true as to the law prohibiting the sale of beer or wine where there is a musical or other entertainment. All the

