

A regular meeting of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Conn. was held in the Cafeteria of the Dolan Jr. High School, Toms Road, Stamford, on Monday, February 1, 1960.

The meeting was called to order by the President, John R. Nolan, at 8:10 P.M.

INVOCATION was given by Rev. Alfred Sienkiewicz of the Holy Name of Jesus Church

ROLL CALL was taken by the Clerk. There were 32 present and 8 absent. The absent members were: Thomas Cassidy, George Georgoulis, Allen Shanen, James Mulreed, Stephen Kelly, Edward Wynn, Henry Nolan and Rutherford Huizinga.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of January 11, 1960

The Minutes of the above meeting were APPROVED.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

MR. NOLAN, Chairman, presented the following report of the Steering Committee:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT
Meeting held January 25, 1960

A meeting of the Steering Committee of the Board of Representatives was held in the Mayor's office, City Hall, on Monday, January 25, 1960.

The meeting was called to order at 8:10 P.M. by the President, John R. Nolan. All members were present, with the exception of Mr. Huizinga (on vacation) and Mr. Kelly.

The following matters were discussed and referred to committee:

Appointments Committee:

Mayor's letter of Jan. 7, 1960, submitting the names of Robert B. Nolan, and John A. Scalzi, Jr., as members of the Park Commission.

Fiscal Committee: (All items over \$2,000 referred to an additional committee)

7 letters from the Mayor, requesting additional appropriations, which have not yet been approved by the Board of Finance, were ordered on the Agenda, pending prior approval by the Board of Finance. Those requests \$2,000 or over, were referred to other committees having jurisdiction over same.

Planning & Zoning Committee:

- (1) Proposed Ordinance re change of street name: Stanwich Road to Taconic Road.
- (2) Ordinance, for final adoption, amending previous Ordinance #59 Supplemental, relating to the acceptance of roads as city streets.

(Note: Adopted for publication on Nov. 9, 1959 and published on November 27, 1959)

The following communications were presented:

Parking Authority - Balance sheet and statement as of Dec. 31, 1959 - PLACED ON AGENDA UNDER COMMUNICATIONS.

League of Women Voters - Letter dated Jan. 16, 1960 regarding planning for additional park space. Referred to PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE; also to PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE, as far as the acquisition of land for park purposes is concerned.

Commuter railroad transportation problem:

This matter was brought up by Mr. DeForest, 19th District Representative. It was discussed at some length and referred to the LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE

Charters:

The President announced that copies of the Charter are now available and anyone who wishes to have a copy should pick one up in the office of the Board of Representatives in City Hall.

Re: Letter dated 1/18/60 from Peter C. Sileo, 1st District Representative, regarding inadequate street lighting in his district.

Mr. Nolan read a letter which was sent to the Commissioner of Public Works, calling his attention to the above matter and requesting that he investigate and report to Mr. Sileo.

Next meeting date:

It was decided to hold the next Steering Committee meeting on Tuesday, February 23, 1960 because of Washington's birthday falling on a Monday this year.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Nolan, Chairman
Steering Committee

vf

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE:

MR. SHAPERO, Chairman, presented his committee report. He said a meeting was held on Friday, January 29, 1960. Present were: Paul Shapero, Paul Callahan, John DeForest and Mrs. Eleanore Austin. Mr. Georgoulis was absent. He said the Committee unanimously approved the appointments as contained in the Mayor's letter of January 7, 1960, to the Park Commission. (As set forth below)

ROBERT B. NOLAN (Democrat) 110 Hope Street - Reappointment to the PARK COMMISSION - Term expiring December 1, 1964

The Tellers distributed the ballots on the above appointment, and CARRIED with the following result:

VOTE 26 in favor
6 opposed

JOHN A. SCALZI, JR. (Ind.) 21 Ralsey Road, replacing J. Walter Kennedy, Democrat, who resigned to become Mayor. As a member of the PARK COMMISSION
Term expiring December 1, 1961

The Tellers distributed the ballots on the above appointment, which was CARRIED with the following vote:

VOTE: 29 in favor
3 opposed

FISCAL COMMITTEE:

MR. REBACK, Chairman, presented his committee report. He said a meeting had been held on January 28, 1960. Present were: Mr. Reback, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Ivler, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Sileo and Miss Farina. Absent were Mr. Huizinga and Mr. Wynn.

MR. REBACK presented the following and MOVED for approval. Seconded by Mr. Connors and CARRIED: (Also approved by the Personnel Committee)

- (1) \$15,999.00 - Salary Increases - Approved by Personnel Commission, being
(As listed in attachment to some 17 positions affecting 58 employees
Mayor's letter of 12/11/59) who were reclassified as a result of
appeals from the Griffenhagen Survey.

MR. REBACK MOVED for approval of the following. Mr. Ivler said the Education, Welfare & Government Committee concurred in the approval. Mr. Murphy seconded the motion and CARRIED:

- (2) \$38,000 - Welfare Department (As outlined in Mayor's letter of 1/21/60)
(REDUCED by Board of Finance 1/27/60)

Code 460-61 - Cash Relief -----	\$23,000.00
Code 461-A - General Hospitals -----	<u>15,000.00</u>
	\$38,000.00

MR. REBACK MOVED for approval of the following, which approval was concurred in by the Public Works Committee. Mr. Connors seconded the motion. CARRIED:

- (3) \$12,500 - Snow Removal - Public Works Dept. Code 412A.6A (As outlined
in Mayor's letter of 1/21/60) REDUCED by Board
of Finance 1/27/60

MR. REBACK introduced the following requested appropriation:

- (4) \$250,000 for Plan #1 or \$280,00 for Plan #2 - For new Circuit Court
House construction
(As outlined in Mayor's letter of 1/25/60)

MR. REBACK MOVED for approval of the following resolution on the above matter:

RESOLUTION NO. 315AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR 1959-1960
BY ADDITION OF ITEM IN AMOUNT OF \$250,000 FOR A NEW
CIRCUIT COURT HOUSE, TO BE LOCATED ON CITY-OWNED
PROPERTY ON HOYT STREET

BE AND IT HEREBY IS RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, pursuant to Section 611.5 of the Stamford Charter, to approve an amendment to the Capital Projects Budget for the year 1959-1960 by including therein an item in the amount of \$250,000 for the construction of a new Circuit Court House, to be located on City-owned property on Hoyt Street, between the County Court House and the Police Building, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED to approve the appropriation of \$250,000 for said new Circuit Court House, which said sum is to be financed by the issue of bonds.

MR. SILEO seconded Mr. Reback's motion.

MR. REBACK explained the original request was for \$280,000 which included \$30,000 for the construction of a maintenance garage for the Police Department, which would be a saving of some \$40,000 over plans for a separate garage for the Police Department. He said the committee discussed this with the Architect, and upon investigation the committee unanimously approved that the \$30,000 for the garage be tabled temporarily for further discussion between the Architect and the Police Department. He said: "We were assured that this would not hold up the Court House, nor the garage because we believe that this can be straightened out by the next meeting and it will therefore follow without any change in the original plan." Mr. Reback explained the action of the Committee at some length.

MR. BAKER said this had also been referred to the Health & Protection Committee. He said: "We concur in the recommendations made by the Chairman of the Fiscal Committee."

MR. IVLER said the Education, Welfare & Government Committee also concurred in the action taken by the Fiscal Committee.

MR. SCARELLA inquired through the Chairman what would result if the \$30,000 for the Police Department garage is not included at this time. He said: "I think that a new procedure has to be initiated through the Board of Finance."

MR. NOLAN, President, inquired of Mr. Reback if he wished to explain this to Mr. Scarella.

MR. REBACK: "Yes, that is exactly our plan, because it should follow that same procedure. We have been assured, however, by all parties who are interested, that action will be taken immediately to clear up this slight mechanical difficulty and we will receive -- and -- I will read a resolution at our next meeting, approving the additional \$30,000 in the event that they are able to clear up this particular bit of difficulty."

MR. SCARELLA: "The point I am trying to make, Mr. President, is if the Board of Finance has a change of heart, this \$30,000 will not be included again. That's the point I'm making. I say that we should approve it now, whether there is a mechanical change or ANY change. If it turns out that the \$30,000 should prove to be in excess of what is needed, it will automatically go back into Surplus. I can see

no harm in passing it now, if Mr. Reback will only explain to us what this 'mechanical difficulty' is."

There was no answer to Mr. Scarella's question and he withdrew the question. He said: "I would just like to point out to this Board that if the \$30,000 is denied tonight, there is no guarantee that it will be added."

MR. CONNORS agreed with Mr. Scarella.

MR. MURPHY MOVED the question.

A rising vote was taken on Resolution No. 315 and CARRIED by a vote of 31 in FAVOR and 1 opposed. (Mr. Scarella)

MR. REBACK MOVED that: the Board send back to the Planning Board and to the Board of Finance, for further study, within the next 30 days, of the mechanical necessity of improving the present plans and requirements for a maintenance garage, so that they may be properly acted upon and referred back to this Board within a month, so that action may be taken to include the Garage in the new Circuit Court Building.

MR. SHAFERO seconded Mr. Reback's motion. CARRIED by a voice vote.

MR. REBACK: "May I say at this point that I believe that the Planning Board and the Board of Finance will act in good faith and there will be no question that we will get the \$30,000 appropriation."

(5) \$13,729 - Corporation Counsel (As requested in Mayor's letter of 1/25/60)

Code 450.60 - Settlement of non-contract claims-----	\$10,000
Code 450.9 - Professional and other services -----	1,000
Code 450.3 - Stationery & Postage -----	200
Code 450.1 - Salaries, Secretarial -----	2,178
Code 450.16 - Ice, Drinking Water, Paper Cups, etc. -----	60
Code 450.5 - Telephone & Telegraph -----	291
	<u>\$13,729</u>

MR. REBACK MOVED for approval of the above request. Mr. Ivler said the Education, Welfare & Government Committee concurred in the approval. Mr. Sileo seconded the motion. CARRIED

(6) \$3,500 for Mosquito (Pest) Control - Code 500.24A - Health Department & Supt.
(As requested in Mayor's letter of 1/25/60) Parks & Trees

MR. REBACK MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Connors. Mr. Baker, said the Health & Protection Committee concurred in the approval of this item.

MR. POMPADUR spoke in favor of this appropriation, reading a quote from the New York Times in regard to an expected outbreak of encephalitis caused by ticks, mosquitoes and other pests and the need for prevention of the spread of this disease by a controlled program to try and eliminate the spread of carriers of the disease.

MR. CONNORS questioned whether the appropriation would be enough to provide the proper controls, in the face of the much larger amounts being appropriated by other towns and cities.

MR. REBACK explained that Dr. Costanzo thought this would be enough to get started on the proposed control program and that the Park Department and the Health Department would work together closely to assure proper protection would be provided.

VOTE taken on item #6 above. CARRIED unanimously.

MR. REBACK: "Now, that completes the business that was on our Agenda. However, we received four other requests, following the Board of Finance meeting."

MR. REBACK MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to report on these matters.

The President informed Mr. Reback that it would be necessary to suspend the rules to consider each item separately.

MR. REBACK MOVED for suspension of the rules to consider the following. Seconded and CARRIED unanimously:

- (7) \$14,578.96 - Corporation Counsel - Tax Appeals (Requested in Mayor's letter of 1/26/60)

MR. REBACK said this was unanimously approved by the Fiscal Committee and he MOVED for approval of the above item. Mr. Baker spoke in favor. Mr. Scarella seconded the motion. CARRIED.

MR. REBACK MOVED for suspension of the rules to consider the following. Seconded and CARRIED unanimously:

- (8) \$3,000 - Corporation Counsel - Appraiser's fees (Mayor's letter 1/27/60)

MR. BAKER MOVED for approval of the above item. Mr. Ivler said the Education, Welfare & Government Committee concurred in the approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ivler and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. REBACK MOVED for suspension of the rules to consider the following. Seconded and CARRIED:

- (9) \$1,092.63 - Hubbard Heights Golf Commission - (Mayor's letter 12/14/59)
Code 413A.1 Salary Account - To establish permanent position
of Laborer II, Grade W9

MR. REBACK MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Scarella and CARRIED unanimously.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE:

MR. RUSSELL, Chairman, presented the Committee report. He said a meeting was held, but did not give the date of the meeting, nor the members who attended.

- (1) Ordinance for final adoption (adopted for publication at the January 11, 1960 Board Meeting) re change of name of Old Logging Road to GARY ROAD Note: See page 2715-16 of Nov. 9, 1959 Minutes)

MR. RUSSELL MOVED for approval for adoption of the following Ordinance. Seconded by Mr. McLaughlin and CARRIED unanimously:

ORDINANCE NO. 89

CHANGING THE NAME OF A PORTION OF OLD LOGGING
ROAD TO GARY ROAD

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

A portion of the following street shall have the name changed as shown below:

Change that portion of Old Logging Road, from the now existing Gary Road and continuing northerly for a distance of 140 feet to intersection, to GARY ROAD.

This Ordinance shall take effect upon the date of its enactment.

(2) Proposed Ordinance - Change of name, Stanwich Road to TACONIC ROAD

MR. RUSSELL MOVED for approval of the following proposed Ordinance for publication (final adoption to take place at the March meeting).

Mr. Philpotts seconded Mr. Russell's motion and CARRIED unanimously:

PROPOSED ORDINANCE - CHANGING THE NAME
OF A CITY STREET

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

The following street shall have the name changed as shown below:

Change Stanwich Road, which starts at Taconic Road on the Greenwich Town line and runs northerly to the New York State line, to TACONIC ROAD.

This Ordinance shall take effect upon the date of its enactment.

(3) Proposed Ordinance for final adoption, amending previous Ordinance No. 59 relating to the acceptance of roads at City streets (Adopted for publication Nov. 9, 1959 and published on Nov. 27, 1959)

MR. RUSSELL: "The Committee was prepared to move for final adoption of this Ordinance at this meeting, but due to some sudden information that has come to the attention of the Committee, the Committee, as well as the Legislative & Rules Committee, to whom this was also referred, have decided to wait one more month and move for final adoption at that time.

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE:

In the absence of Mr. Kelly, the Committee Chairman, Mr. Connors gave the report. He said the Committee met with the Park Commission on January 26, 1960. Present were: George Connors, William Murphy, Benjamin Kozlowski and Stephen Kelly.

Re: Acquisition of Park land, in accordance with designed land use

MR. CONNORS said the Committee was heartily in favor of the implementation of a plan whereby the city would be in a position to acquire a large tract of land somewhere in the vicinity of the Merritt Parkway for use as a park for the City, to provide picnic areas, botanical gardens and recreational facilities, such as baseball, tennis, lawn bowling and a children's playground. He said such a park should be large enough to accommodate people from all sections of the City.

MR. CONNORS MOVED that the Board approve a letter being addressed to the Mayor, Planning Board, Park Commission, Board of Recreation and the City Engineer, and any other interested Boards or Commissions, requesting that they please take this under consideration for implementation. Seconded by Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY explained that the P. k Commission had requested some \$70,000 in the Capital Projects Budget for the acquisition of new park land, which would require approval by the Planning Board, Board of Finance and final action by the Board of Representatives before it could be done.

MR. IVLER offered an amendment to Mr. Connors' motion which was later withdrawn. He called the attention of the Board to Section 7, Special Act No. 47 which reads as follows:

"The Park Commission shall determine all park policies for the City of Stamford except as may otherwise be determined by the Board of Representatives."

(Note: This amends the Charter by adding Section 595 on page 66)

After further discussion by Mr. Connors, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Ivler, it was pointed out that although this \$70,000 had been requested by the Park Commission, when the Budget is cut, this item might be taken out, or reduced before it reached the Board of Representatives, so therefore no prior action could be taken.

MR. BAKER asked if the Master Plan provided certain areas for park purposes.

MR. MURPHY replied that there were some areas in the northern section of the city, and also in various places throughout the city.

MR. CONNORS: "There are cases in certain sub-divisions where they may have a large plot of land suitable for park use. They feel that perhaps in the meantime we could acquire some land from the builder. But, then you get into other difficulties. If they should set aside a large acreage, they might want to take care of that themselves and maintain it as a private park and private recreational area, which would naturally eliminate its use by people from outside that area. There is a piece of land that they have been considering and hoping that someone might be generous enough to donate it to the City."

VOTE taken on Mr. Connors' motion to send a letter to the Mayor, etc. (See above) CARRIED unanimously.

EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE:

MR. IVLER, Chairman, presented his committee report. He said a meeting was held on January 28, 1960, with Messrs. Ivler, Carey and DeForest present. Absen'

were Messrs. Palmer and Truglia. Mr. Provost, the Architect who designed the proposed new Circuit Court House and Police Garage, was also present at this meeting and brought the plans for the proposed structure.

Re: Circuit Court House

MR. IVLER stated this matter was brought before the Board under Fiscal Committee and has already been acted upon.

Re: Fiscal matters - appropriations referred to Fiscal Committee as well as above committee

MR. IVLER stated that these matters had already been discussed under the Fiscal Committee report.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS:

(1) Parking Authority - Balance sheet and statement as of Dec. 31, 1959

MR. NOLAN (President): "We are in receipt of a balance sheet from the Parking Authority." He noted that this would be kept on file in the office of the Board if any of the Board members wished to look at it.

(2) Public Utilities Commission - Dated 1/26/60 - Petition of West Fordham Transportation Corp. to Increase fares

MR. NOLAN: "We have a notice from the PUC. They would like to increase motor bus fares between the Port Chester line and Greenwich Station, between Greenwich Station and Cos Cob Post Office and between Cos Cob Post Office and Stamford, each from the present fare of 15 cents to 20 cents, which would increase the fare for riding in two zones from 30 cents to 40 cents and the fare for riding in three zones from 45 cents to 60 cents.

"The petitioner proposed that the fares become effective Oct. 12, 1959, but these increases were suspended, pending further order of the Commission."

(3) Letter from Town and City Clerk, Joseph Toner concerning the re-districting of the City of Stamford (dated 1/28/60)

MR. NOLAN presented the following letter and said it would be brought up at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

CITY AND TOWN CLERK

CITY OF STAMFORD CONNECTICUT

January 28th, 1960

Board of Representatives
Stamford, Connecticut

Attention: John R. Nolan, President

Dear Sirs:

I am writing you concerning a very grave problem existing in Stamford at this time, and which definitely warrants, to my way of thinking, immediate action.

In the 1941 Session of the General Assembly, a Special Act was passed, establishing a Commission to define voting districts in the Town of Stamford. This Election Commission established district lines which at the time proved adequate for our needs.

It is a well established fact, however, that at the present date these district lines are totally inadequate and some action should be taken immediately to rectify a condition which is not only awkward in many respects, but, more important affords improper representation to many of the citizens of this City.

The size and population of many of our districts in relation to others is very noticeable. The physical boundaries of these same districts need simplifying. Whether or not, we would be better off by either increasing or decreasing the number of districts is a question to be resolved. All these questions must be given due consideration in attaining a solution to this problem.

I am sure that the Board of Representatives, with the cooperation of the present Administration and both major political parties, will institute immediate study of this matter.

If there is any way in which you feel I may be of help concerning this situation, I will be only too willing to co-operate.

Very truly yours,

City and Town Clerk

OLD BUSINESS:

Re: Pension Study

MR. REBACK: "I have a communication from the Commissioner of Finance, asking that a member of the Board of Representatives be appointed to appear with the Commissioner of Finance, the Mayor and the Chairman of the Board of Finance as a Committee, to study the proper procedure for selecting a firm to do a pension study."

MR. MURPHY questioned Mr. Reback as to whether or not this was urgent or could it wait for the Steering Committee meeting and be properly referred to a Committee.

MR. REBACK: "I don't think that --- this is an Administration request. I don't believe this is something that would have to be voted upon."

MR. SCARELLA: "If I may be so bold at this time to suggest that the Chairman of the Fiscal Committee be the member of this Board selected to sit down-----"

MR. NOLAN: "You took the words right out of my mouth. I will appoint Mr. Reback, the Chairman of the Fiscal Committee, to represent this Board in the matter of the discussion of the proper procedure to be followed for selecting a firm to do a pension study."

NEW BUSINESS:

Re: Members of the Board of Representatives appearing before sessions of the Planning and Zoning Boards

MR. BAKER brought the above matter on the floor. He said he had appeared before the Zoning Board and wished to address that Board on a certain matter concerning the 18th District and was told that if the matter under discussion were to be appealed to the Board of Representatives that he might possibly find himself in a position where he would be reviewing, in a judiciary capacity, the action on which he had already taken a position as an advocate, speaking in behalf of his constituents.

MR. BAKER: "However, I said to the Board (Zoning Board) at that time that I was of the opinion that the Board had raised a major question and I thought that this question ought to be referred to the Board. I now refer it to the Board, with the suggestion that perhaps we ought to consult the Corporation Counsel, for his opinion as to whether or not an appearance by any member of the Board in his capacity as a Representative on any matter pending before that Board which might be subsequently appealed to this Board for consideration, would necessarily have the effect of disqualifying that member from consideration of that subject matter before this Board at a time when it came before this Board on an appeal, and I do make the request that we solicit the opinion of the Corporation Counsel in this regard, because I do know that it has been a practice of members of the Board of Representatives to appear before the Boards in the interests of their constituents. I am seriously concerned, because I have pledged myself to appear before the Boards in the interests of my constituents wherever it may be necessary, and it might be that there would be an instance where I would have a definite view and in support of the position to be taken in the interests of my constituents."

MR. NOLAN: "Thank you, Mr. Baker. You have heard the proposal that this matter be sent to the Corporation Counsel."

MR. IVLER seconded Mr. Baker's proposal.

MR. SCARELLA spoke against the motion. He said it should be up to the individual Board member as to whether or not he wishes to take the chance of any particular matter on which he appears before the Zoning Board, ever coming before this Board as an appeal and he believed in "letting sleeping dogs lie".

MR. RUSSELL: "I would like to say that this question has come up before our Board in the past. One of the members of this Board appeared before the Planning Board on a very important change and I know that in that one case the question of the validity of the so-called hearing was by the opponents who raised the question that the Board member had appeared and that he had no right to do so.

"Our Committee (Planning & Zoning) has looked into the statutes on this subject - I forget the exact wording, but the implications were that a body which is concerned with planning and zoning - that the members cannot speak on the matter if they are a so-called member of a planning or zoning body. At the time that we discussed it in committee, it was felt that when we have these appeals before us, we are, in a way, as the Charter states - we are put in the position of acting as a Planning and Zoning Board. In fact, we are, at the time, actually acting in the capacity of a planning and zoning body and would therefore have to disqualify ourselves if we had previously appeared before the Planning or Zoning Board.

"On two separate occasions, it has come up before the Board and each time it was felt that it was not proper for a member of this Board to address a Planning and Zoning Board, and if he should do so, then he should disqualify himself if and when the appeal comes before this Board."

MR. POMPADUR: "It would seem then that this is the third time that this question has come before this Board. May I suggest that you vote in favor of Mr. Baker's motion that Mr. Mackler, the Corporation Counsel, have the final determination of this? Otherwise, it will be coming up every two years."

MR. CONNORS said he thought if a member of the Board of Representatives appeared before the Planning or Zoning Boards as a citizen and taxpayer and not in his official capacity as a member of the Board, that he had a right to do so. But, if this was ever brought before the Board of Representatives as an appeal to this Board, there might then be the question raised as to whether or not he had the right to vote on the matter.

MR. BAKER said he thought the matter should be resolved once and for all by getting an opinion from the Corporation Counsel.

MR. MACRI MOVED to amend that the findings of the Corporation Counsel be inserted in the rules of the Board of Representatives to make sure this question would never again arise. (No seconder)

M R. SCARELLA said he concurred with Mr. Baker and hoped his remarks had not been misunderstood.

VOTE taken on Mr. Baker's motion to ask for an opinion of the Corporation Counsel on this matter. CARRIED unanimously.

MR. BAKER stated his colleague, Mr. Henry Nolan, was also "muzzled" in absentia. He said: "I was prepared to talk for him as well as for myself and I think he would like that to be known."

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon motion, duly seconded and CARRIED, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

APPROVED:


John R. Nolan
President


Velma Farrell
Administrative Assistant

Note: A verbatim record is not made of Board meetings. However, any member wishing to listen to the Audograph recordings of the above meeting, which are filed in the office of this Board, is welcome to do so.

John R. Nolan, President