

APRIL 17, 1950

A meeting of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held at the Burdick Junior High School on Monday, April 17, 1950. The meeting was called to order by the President, Samuel F. Pierson, at 8:15 P.M.

Rev. Stanley Hemsley gave the invocation.

Roll Call was taken with 29 present and 11 absent. The final roll call was 30 present, 10 absent (see roll call attached).

The president administered the oath of office to Edward C. Hogan, 19th District, who replaces Sherman Hoyt.

James M. Mulreed, 4th District, MOVED that the minutes be deferred for correction to our next meeting. It was duly seconded and CARRIED.

PETITIONS

1. Petition #58

From the Military Order of the Purple Heart requesting permission to display in Stamford one, and possibly two of their touring exhibits at different periods of time during the ensuing year.

Helen J. Bromley, 20th District, questioned if it was one of the trucks that are generally parked on Atlantic Square, and if so, she thought it would possibly hamper traffic.

George W. Lockwood MOVED that permission be granted, seconded by Ralph Nau, 19th District, and PASSED.

Babette S. Ransohoff, 15th District, suggested that we notify the Police Department of the permission granted, and that we request the organization to consult with Chief Brennan in order to avoid traffic hazard.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Lease for the Connecticut Power Company.

This item was deferred from the April 3rd meeting until approval was received from the Planning Board.

David Waterbury, 8th District, questioned the rental charge of \$300 a year since the Company was rendering increased service to the community.

John Cameron, 20th District, Noted the amount seemed to be satisfactory to both parties, and was not exorbitant.

It was MOVED by Daniel Miller, 16th District, and duly seconded that the lease be granted. The motion was CARRIED.

2. From the Mayor in which he enclosed correspondence with the Chemical Bank and Trust Company of New York concerning our bond issue. Referred to the Fiscal Committee.

3. Copy of a communication to the Mayor from Frederic S. Greene of 27 Meadowpark Ave., S., concerning ordinances. Referred to the Legislative and Rules Committee.

APRIL 17, 1950

4. From the Mayor regarding appointments made by his letter of March 27th in which there was included, in error, an appointee to the Town Housing Authority. Placed on file.

5. From the Stamford Community Council enclosing the following resolution:

WHEREAS a survey in 1948 showed an estimated need for 2400 additional dwelling units in Stamford, and

WHEREAS not more than 5% of the 2400 families could pay the prevailing average of \$75 a month or more for rent, and

WHEREAS the Housing Authority of the City of Stamford has evidence to support its belief that this situation is substantially the same now,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Stamford Community Council endorses the request for the Housing Authority for permission to construct additional low-cost dwelling units.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that member organizations of the Stamford Community Council be urged to adopt similar resolutions and implement them by appearing at public hearings on the subject on April 13, 1950.

Referred to the Planning and Zoning Committee.

6. Communication from Captain Edward W. Lockwood, Captain of Precinct #2 concerning the request before the Board for traffic lights at Hope Street and Scofield Avenue and at Glenbrook Road and Church Street.

James Mulreed MOVED that this matter should be brought before the Health and Safety Committee for further study. The motion was seconded and CARRIED.

7. From Corporation Counsel Wise giving a detailed opinion on the validity of Joseph Zdanowicz voting on matters brought before the Board. The entire communication was read to the Board and placed on file.

8. From the Planning Board in regard to a letter written them by the Board for an interpretation of those sections of the Charter pertaining to the acceptance of streets. Referred to the Planning and Zoning Committee and the legislative and Rules Committee, who will meet with the Planning Board regarding the acceptance of streets.

9. From Mr. Robert S. Frisbie regarding his application to fill the vacancy on the Board created by the resignation of Mrs. Bell.

From Helen J. Peatt, Secretary, 17th District Republican Club, regarding the recommendation of that organization for the appointment of Mrs. Hilda Clarke to fill the vacancy created by Mrs. Bell.

Referred to the Appointments Committee.

10. From the minutes of the Board of Finance meeting held on April 14 regarding the emergency transfer of \$350 from account #412G Snow Removal to 300.5 Telephone, Mayor's Office, as requested by the Mayor.

APRIL 17, 1950

John Cameron, 20th District, pointed out that this was a special meeting in which we are to discuss only matters on the call notice and the transfer could not, therefore, be put to a vote.

Mr. Wise, Corporation Counsel, was asked his opinion and he ruled that the call that went out was in the nature of a special meeting. Therefore, only those items that appear in the call would be the proper subject matter for the meeting. He also pointed out how Section 202.1 merely provides that "the Board may, by resolution, change the time for holding regular meetings, provided that such resolution calls for at least one regular meeting to be held each month".

Mr. Pierson brought out there is no limit to the number of meetings as long as there is one a month, but any additional meetings must be by resolution.

Transfer of funds was referred to Fiscal Committee.

Mr. Wise, Corporation Counsel, said that Section 202.1 may only authorize the Board to change the regular meeting day from the first Monday to some other day of the week.

Mr. Pierson asked that Mr. Wise give us an opinion on Section 202.1.

11. From John S. Marran, Secretary of the Hycliff Club, Inc., as written to Representative William A. Adriance regarding the straightening out of the roadway South and West of the Municipal Golf Course, facing Stillwater Avenue and Palmer Hill Road.

Referred to the Planning and Zoning Committee and the Planning Board.

Mr. Pierson then appointed Edward C. Hogan and John E. Charleson to the Planning and Zoning Committee to fill the vacancies created by Sherman Hoyt and Jeanette Bell, with the suggestion that the Vice-Chairman, Catherine Cleary, call a meeting of the entire Committee to elect a Chairman.

Patrick J. Hogan, 10th District, asked when Mr. Pierson intended to fill the vacancy on the Steering Committee. Mr. Pierson answered, at the next Steering Committee meeting.

Mr. Pierson then read a letter from the Glenbrook Business Association regarding the erection of a memorial flagpole on the Douglas Northrop Memorial Playground. He questioned whether permission of this request could be granted at this meeting, however he doubted that any member would have an objection to such a memorial. Referred to the Steering Committee.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Legislative and Rules Committee

The meeting was turned over to Michael Wofsey, Chairman of the Legislative and Rules Committee, to present the ordinances as outlined in the meeting call.

Michael Wofsey said that first he wanted to call attention to the Charter amendment distributed earlier to each member. The amendment was passed on April 11th and approved by the Governor on that same date. It extended the time to act on our ordinances to June 10, 1951. The Legislative and Rules Committee, however, has no intention of waiting until that date and propose to bring before the Board from time to time various ordinances as they have been processed through the

APRIL 17, 1950

Committee. Mr. Wofsey wanted placed on the record the cooperation from our Republican Representatives and Democratic Senator and the Democratic and Republican leaders in the legislature, a result of which made the ordinance the only local legislation passed by the General Assembly. Mr. Wofsey took the liberty of the Legislative and Rules Committee of writing to each of these people to express our gratitude for their cooperation.

Regarding the ordinances, Mr. Wofsey said that the basic procedure we will follow is the procedure outlined by the Corporation Counsel in adopting ordinances in volume and thought it would be desirable to follow the strict language of the Charter and to get the permission of the Board to advertise as required by the Charter. Since the ordinances to be presented are of a considerable volume, and since it may be felt that some are not worth acting on at this time, the Legislative and Rules Committee will introduce them with no recommendation on their part other than request that the Board authorize them to cause the ordinance to be advertised as required by law.

Ordinances

1. An ordinance concerning the description of the City flag.

It was MOVED by Michael Wofsey that the ordinance be permitted to be introduced, and asked for authority to advertise as provided in the Charter. Seconded by Babette Ransohoff and CARRIED.

Helen Bromley, 20th District, questioned, regarding the amendment as passed by the Assembly, if it was meant that we are going to go ahead and publish all of these ordinances.

Michael Wofsey said that briefly, the Legislative and Rules Committee will recommend, in accord with the amendment, that those ordinances which are substantially the same that heretofore existed in the town or city be reenacted. There are a very substantial number. The typewritten copy ran to some 300 pages. What is being presented at this meeting are those sections which are either different or new. All of the ordinances will be printed in a book and will be placed on file in various places and a public hearing will be called as noted. We will discover some errors and omissions and some ordinances we don't like, but we can then act on them separately.

William Adriance, 18th District, said a great many ordinances that were adopted in the City were not in the Town. He asked if we would see some sort of a list.

Michael Wofsey said that ordinances which are not controversial in character are not being brought before us.

Mr. Pierson asked if the bound copies will be available for the public hearing.

Michael Wofsey said he was not sure if they would meet the deadline. He asked Mr. Wise if they could anticipate the ordinances before us would be in the bound volume. Mr. Wise said "yes".

Mr. Pierson questioned the advantage in publishing the ordinances if they will be in the bound volume.

Michael Wofsey said that once in the volume it would be difficult to distinguish ordinances on a new subject matter.

APRIL 17, 1950

2. An ordinance providing for penalty for violation of any ordinance, rule or regulation where no penalty is provided for such violation.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that he be permitted to introduce the ordinance and asked for authority to advertise. Seconded by Leon Staples and CARRIED.

3. An ordinance providing for bonding of officers or employees before entering upon the duties of their respective offices or positions.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that he be permitted to introduce the ordinance and asked for authority to advertise. Seconded by Daniel Miller and CARRIED.

4. An ordinance providing single purchases in which the expenditure is estimated to exceed \$200 to be let by sealed bids.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that he be permitted to introduce the ordinance and asked for authority to advertise. Seconded by George Lockwood and CARRIED.

5. An ordinance concerning depositing of the body of any dead animal or fowl in any street or public place.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that he be permitted to introduce the ordinance and asked for authority to advertise. Seconded by Daniel Miller and CARRIED.

6. An ordinance concerning explosives.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that he be permitted to introduce the ordinance and asked for authority to advertise. Seconded by James Mulreed and CARRIED.

7. An ordinance concerning distribution of advertising matter.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that he be permitted to introduce the ordinance and asked for authority to advertise. Seconded by Ralph Nau and CARRIED.

8. An ordinance concerning loitering of any child under 15 years of age on streets, theaters or other public places after 9 P.M.

Helen Bromley asked if the Board could have some background on why such an ordinance was introduced.

Michael Wofsey read the entire ordinance. He said it was not one which was raised by the Committee, but suggested by the Michie Company as being a common ordinance which we might want to consider.

Leonard DeVita, 5th District, said he objected to a curfew law on principle. He noted that some of the members of the Committee seemed to think that "loitering" was something over and above just going out.

Hunt Sutherland, 17th District, said it was a good ruling if we could define "loitering".

Babette Ransohoff, 15th District, noted that if this was not a recommendation from the Legislative & Rules Committee, if published, it will look like something the Board is recommending the public.

Michael Wofsey pointed out that at our May 1st meeting will be a hearing on

APRIL 17, 1950

George W. Lockwood, 14th District, said he favored a curfew but he thought it should be moved up to 10:00 or 10:30 P.M. This was put into the form of a MOTION by Mr. Lockwood and seconded by Eugene Kaminski, 13th District.

Helen Bromley said she was speaking of the ordinance in general before it was amended. She said it was a waste of money to advertise this particular thing. She said further that the way the ordinance read it would leave a wide interpretation for any policeman to define loitering and just to change the time now in the ordinance wouldn't be satisfactory to her. She asked what good it was to put ordinances on our books if they cannot be effected. She thought we should have some expression of feeling now from the Board.

Michael Wofsey agreed with Mrs. Bromley regarding the expression of opinion since, he said, it would save a great deal of time at the hearing. He pointed out that he was making a motion for each ordinance to it and asked permission to advertise. Any of these motions can be defeated.

George Lockwood pointed out there are several children under 15 years of age who are breaking into stores.

Babette Ranshoff felt the ordinance was loosely drawn. She questioned the mechanics of opening the May 1st Board meeting for a public hearing and wondered if some other solution might be worked out.

James Mulreed spoke in favor of the ordinance. He said he didn't think there was anyone there ^{that} ~~wasn't~~ opposed to the loitering of a child ^{under} 15 years of age. He noted there is too much juvenile delinquency resulting from loitering.

Michael Laureno spoke in favor of the ordinance and against the amendment proposed. The ordinance does allow you to send your child to a late show and it does not say that they can't go to a drug store or restaurant before going home. It doesn't allow loitering up to 10:30, but the proposed motion does. You are to keep moving--that is the thought behind the ordinance. This was really to be a recommendation of the Legislative and Rules Committee, he thought.

Mr. Pierson summed it up as it shall be unlawful for any child under the age of 15 years to loiter--that means "hanging around".

John Cameron said that he thought this discussion shows we should be given some expert opinion and that would be a reason to advertise so we can get the public's opinion before we act.

Stephen Kelly spoke on the meaning of "loitering" and said he questioned the right of the policeman to define loitering.

Michael Wofsey said the term "loitering" definitely has legal significance. He said you actually have the same situation in your statutory laws for breach of the peace, unlawful assembly, disturbing the peace, etc.

George Connors, 10th District, asked, if this ordinance went through as it is, would it specify that they have to be under 15 years or could they be arrested for loitering if over 15 years.

William Adriance said he thought 9 o'clock was a little early, but he approved of the amendment extending the time to 10:30.

James Mulreed said he opposed the amendment. He said he thought 9 o'clock was a suitable hour for any child under 15 years of age.

Leonard DeVita said, since he was against the ordinance, he would like to raise the time, by motion, to 10:30 and further amend the ordinance for children

APRIL 17, 1950

under the age of 12.

The motion was not seconded.

Michael Wofsey said these curfew laws are not intended to moralize. This ordinance is designed primarily to protect the public. All of these curfews are upheld only to the extent that they are consistent with public safety and the need for control of these matters as they affect the entire public. They are not intended to make the children better or worse--that is the job of the family, churches, and schools. The public safety generally is involved rather than the morals of the child.

A vote was taken on the amendment to introduce the ordinance to read 10:30 p.m. instead of 9 p.m. It was CARRIED.

Michael Wofsey moved that the ordinance be permitted to be introduced and asked for authority to advertise. It was seconded and CARRIED.

9. An ordinance concerning taxi cabs.

Michael Wofsey moved for permission to introduce the ordinance and asked for authority to advertise. It was duly seconded. .

John Cameron said he objected to the entire ordinance--even to the posting of the rates. He wondered if anyone ran into a situation which made such an ordinance necessary.

William Adriance said that in Stamford he didn't feel we had enough cabs to warrant that section pertaining to doubling up. He cited instances where guests coming out to his home were charged different rates by different drivers.

George Lockwood said that all rates are on file with the Public Utilities Commission. If anyone feels he has been overcharged, he could write to the Commission.

Michael Laureno also cited instances where he was charged different rates by different drivers.

Edward Wojciechowski, 2nd District, said he thought if the Board would write to the Public Utilities Commission, they in turn would have the taxi companies post their rates.

A vote was taken on Mr. Wofsey's motion that the ordinance be permitted to be introduced and for authority to advertise. It was CARRIED.

10. An ordinance concerning bingo.

Michael Wofsey said that the Corporation Counsel advised him tonight that it is questionable if we have a right to pass such an ordinance tonight.

Corporation Counsel Wise said under the general statutes, before a municipality can accept the provisions to take advantage of the operational provision relative to playing bingo, there must be a petition submitted to the governing body which petition contains the names of at least 5 per cent of the electors. Upon such a petition the governing body can vote to accept the provision. That will entitle the municipality to permit the playing of bingo for one year. If the petition were submitted for two successive years, thereafter it would dispense with the necessity of voting each year on that question and it would remain until a similar petition of five per cent was presented revoking that. The former

APRIL 17, 1950

town of Stamford at one time voted on such a petition. He assumed the City did likewise. He didn't have the actual knowledge of whether or not each municipality voted on the question for two successive years. If it develops that that was not done, it is very possible that before this body could act on the provision it might have to have such a petition presented to it.

Babette Ranschoff asked if this had anything to do with the State's Attorney's ruling on gambling.

Mr. Wise said that if Bingo is used for the purpose of gambling, it is unlawful. The actual playing itself, without making it a gambling venture, makes it lawful.

Michael Wofsey suggested that until Mr. Wise can satisfy himself as to whether or not the bills were enacted a second time by the former town and city, we should let the matter lay over.

Mr. Pierson said inasmuch as there was no motion, he will take Mr. Wofsey's suggestion to DEFER the matter until we find out more about it.

11. An ordinance concerning issuances of licenses and permits generally.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that the ordinance be permitted to be introduced and asked for authority to advertise. It was seconded and CARRIED.

12. An ordinance concerning fumigators.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that the ordinance be permitted to be introduced and asked for authority to advertise. Seconded by Helen Bromley, and CARRIED.

13. An ordinance concerning noises.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that the ordinance be permitted to be introduced and asked for authority to advertise. It was seconded by Leon Staples and CARRIED.

14. An ordinance concerning smoke abatement.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that the ordinance be permitted to be introduced and asked for authority to advertise. Seconded by Leonard DeVita and CARRIED.

15. An ordinance concerning auctions and auctioneers.

Michael Wofsey MOVED that the ordinance be permitted to be introduced and asked for authority to advertise. It was seconded by Ralph Nau, and CARRIED.

16. An ordinance concerning Hunting within the limits of the City of Stamford.

Michael Wofsey said that in the minutes of a previous meeting Board members were sent the ordinance proposed by the Michie Company covering the question of hunting. Thereafter there were many expressions of approval and disapproval. The Committee reports from the Stamford Hills Association in that they approved the ordinance previously submitted. Subsequently the Committee received a letter from Mr. Cameron who went over this ordinance and wrote Mr. Wofsey a letter to be read by the entire Committee. Mr. Wofsey said, since this letter was received after the committee meeting, he wrote to all members of the committee and to other

APRIL 17, 1950

persons interested and suggested they bring up both ordinances--the one originally submitted and the new ordinance proposed by Mr. Cameron--before the Board and determine which they wish to advertise or, if it is the Board's wish, to defer the entire matter until it can be studied further.

Mr. Wofsey then read the new ordinance proposed by Mr. Cameron as well as Mr. Cameron's letter.

Mr. Pierson summed up the matter by saying the question before the Board was to vote first on whether or not we wish to introduce and advertise either of the ordinances, and if we agree then to vote on which of the two to have advertised and published.

Helen Bromley MOVED, seconded by William Adriance, that the proposed ordinance by Mr. Cameron be submitted. The ordinance by the Michie Company is inviting everyone to go north of the Merrit Parkway and hunt, she said. She also said that she talked to Captain Lockwood and Chief Brennan of the Police Department and they both agreed that 300 feet is not safe for a shotgun, and that the shots do spread over a wider area. It could be that we may want to compromise on 200 or 300 yards, but both Mr. Brennan and Mr. Lockwood agreed that 300 feet was not safe and 300 yards would be.

Mrs. Bromley said another thing they encountered last fall was the police said they had no power of enforcement, but Captain Lockwood assured her that was not so. She said they want the fish and game to be stocked with state birds and fish, and also they want to cooperate.

William Adriance spoke regarding the posting of property. He thought it might be advisable to include a clause giving some sort of penalty for hunters tearing down no-trespassing signs.

Michael Wofsey said that the general opinion seems to be that a hunter has a right to go on anyone's land to hunt unless it is posted. He went on to say that both he and Mr. Wise examined the law in some detail and that is not the law. You can always arrest the man whether the property is posted or not. That is the basic reason why police have never been right when they said they could not enforce the law. They could always enforce the law against trespassing.

To confirm this Mr. Pierson asked Mr. Wise in order to prevent people from hunting on your land, it is only necessary that you do not give them a permit.

Mr. Wise said it seems that under no circumstances can anyone trespass on another's land unless he has permission. A hunter has no right of any kind to hunt on land owned by an individual without the individual giving his consent, whether it is posted or not.

Michael Laureno said that at the meeting of the Legislative and Rules Committee on February 21, they had Mr. McKenna and he explained that he had written to Dr. Hunter and he said that he definitely wanted portions of this town open for hunting otherwise they would not stock game. Mr. Cameron's ordinance is perfect up to a point. To accept the ordinance entirely is to eliminate the stocking of the Stamford area. We have to set aside one area in order to have hunting at all. In Mr. Cameron's ordinance we wouldn't be able to replenish the game. Up to that point Mr. Laureno would be willing to go along with him. He said the original ordinance was a more well rounded ordinance and he thought we should agree as long as the people are protected through posting.

Mr. Pierson said he didn't see where this limits the area any more than the other ordinance. He could not conceive how the Fish and Game League could stock with-

APRIL 17, 1950

out the owners permission.

John Cameron then made a motion that Mr. McKenna be allowed to speak for five minutes, seconded by Mrs. Bromley. The motion was carried.

Mr. McKenna said from what he had read of Mr. Wofsey's letter and heard, he could see no objection to the other ordinance we originally drew up. What they wanted to do was to keep some area in Stamford open. If hunting is banned entirely in Stamford, the state will not come down and stock birds. They will give us no pheasant or whatever else they might have to release. They agreed that something ought to be done to eliminate the hunting accidents that have happened and the property owners complaints that have come up on opening day of the hunting season. Regarding the Merritt Parkway, with Mr. Cameron's objection to setting a boundary, that was put there to cut down on the complaints, more or less. The League is willing to have hunting all over Stamford. There are very good areas south of the Merritt Parkway.

Mr. Pierson: As far as stock is concerned, how big an area does the state require?

Mr. McKenna: They require the general area be open for hunting. We want the stocking here and we want the sport. It is enjoyed by hundreds of residents of Stamford and we don't want it cut out entirely.

Mr. Pierson: About the provision of 300 yards in Mr. Cameron's ordinance, would that in itself prohibit the stocking of the area?

Mr. McKenna: No, but 300 yards is excessive. A shotgun isn't effective outside 300 feet. We found from our examination and from other ordinances that they were all written for 300 feet except one for 200 feet.

Mr. Pierson: Do you agree that you can't hunt on any property unless you have permission?

Mr. McKenna: The Fish and Game Department stock birds in areas which are not posted.

Mr. Pierson: Have you had permission in the past years from land owners to enable you to stock their property?

Mr. McKenna: In some cases.

Mr. Wofsey: What is the range of a shotgun?

Mr. McKenna: The effective range of a shotgun is 150 feet for killing. Carrying range is from 200 feet to 300 feet.

William Adriance spoke on the posting of property. He asked if it would not be to the person's advantage to post his property for then it would be sufficient to warn the hunters that the property is not available.

Edward Wojciechowski pointed out that in some cities the lands where hunting is not available are reported to the town clerk who will give a list of such land to each hunter as he is issued a license.

John Cameron suggested the ordinance be changed to read 200 yards.

Mr. McKenna suggested that perhaps a good figure would be 500 feet.

Helen Bromley made the motion that the ordinance as submitted by Mr. Cameron be amended to read 500 feet, seconded by William Adriance, and CARRIED.

APRIL 17, 1950

A vote was taken on Mrs. Bromley's original motion to accept Mr. Cameron's proposed ordinance for introduction and advertising, as amended, and it was CARRIED.

Michael Wofsey said this will replace the present city ordinance.

17. An ordinance concerning itinerant vendors.

Michael Wofsey said that he still does not have all the material on this particular ordinance and since it is still in process we cannot act on it at this time.

Michael Wofsey then asked permission, which was granted, to introduce three additional ordinances to the agenda which came in after the meeting of the Legislative and Rules Committee.

18. An ordinance providing for filling in of abandoned openings.

Michael Wofsey moved that the ordinance be introduced and asked for permission to advertise. Seconded by Helen Peatt and CARRIED.

19. An ordinance prohibiting maintenance of mosquito breeding nuisances.

Mr. Pierson said that this ordinance is pretty broad and could be interpreted as bringing in a swamp area.

Michael Wofsey said it is intended only to cover openings which are man-created.

After a brief discussion on the possible interpretation of that point, Mr. Wofsey said the wording could be changed to "maintain any excavation or to create a condition upon such property."

Michael Wofsey moved for permission to introduce the ordinance as amended and for authority to advertise, seconded by William Adriance. It was CARRIED.

20. An ordinance prohibiting BB and air propelled rifles or pistols.

John Cameron and Catherine Cleary regretted the passage of such an ordinance.

George Lockwood pointed out that considerable money is spent to replace broken windows in school buildings, etc., caused by the use of BB guns.

Michael Wofsey then suggested we pass this ordinance as it is and if we find we need something more strenuous we can go into it further.

Michael Wofsey moved for permission to introduce the ordinance and permission to advertise, seconded by George Lockwood and CARRIED.

BUSINESS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. Pierson read the final operating budget of the Board of Representatives to the members and explained the total amount therein was \$4,225.

Michael Wofsey, 1st District, moved that the budget be accepted for submission seconded by Michael Laureno and CARRIED.

APRIL 17th 1950

George Lockwood said that under business on the calendar he brought up the matter of the promotion in the police and fire departments as brought out on Page 107 of the minutes.

Mr. Wise said he gave a detailed opinion of that subject by way of writing to Mr. Shepherd.

Mr. Pierson said that that letter was brought before the Steering Committee, placed on their report, and read to the members of the Board at the last regular meeting before it was filed. However, he would ask the clerk to send a copy of it to each member.

Mr. Pierson: "Since this is our first anniversary, I would like to take this occasion to thank all of you for the long hours and good work you have done and hope we will continue in the same manner throughout the coming year."

Michael Wofsey then spoke: "I think that the Board of Representatives ought to go on record in expressing itself in complete accord with the presiding officer's manner of conduct at these meetings. It has been an extremely difficult job and all of us owe a great deal to the presiding officer, and suggest we express it by standing."

The motion was seconded and CARRIED, with a rising vote of thanks.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
BABETTE S. RANSOHOFF, Clerk

NOTES

Fiscal Committee	1 Ltr from Mayor re Chemical Bank & Trust Company 2 Minutes of Board of Finance meeting
Legislative & Rules Comm.	Communication from Frederic S. Greene
Planning & Zoning Committee	1 Resolution from Stamford Community Council re housing. 2 Communication from Planning Board re acceptance of streets (also to Legislative & Rules) 3 Communication from Hycliff Club, Inc. (Also to Planning Board).
Appointments Committee	1 Communication from Robert S. Frisbie. 2 Communication from 17th District Republican Club re Mrs. Hilda Clarke.
Health & Safety Committee	Communication from Capt. Lockwood re traffic light at Hope St. and Scofield Avenue.
Corporation Counsel	Request for opinion on Section 202.1
Steering Committee	Communication from Glenbrook Business Association re erection of memorial flagpole.