

\$490.00 from account 501-D to an account to be created and entitled "Purchase of Trailer," Water fund.

Adopted as follows:

Yeas—Councilmen Broderick, Castator, Dingeman, Murphy, Nagel, Stevenson and the President Pro Tem—7.

Nays—None.

From the Public Library Commission.

To the Honorable the Common Council:

Gentlemen—In accordance with the agreement with the Controller as to the proper distribution and accounting of our funds the Detroit Library Commission respectfully requests the following transfers:

From Account 1-A.....	\$ 72.84
From Account 2-A.....	51.25
From Account 6-A.....	96.45

\$220.54

to account known as "Extra Service Account."

Respectfully yours,

ADAM STROHM,

Librarian.

General order for Tuesday, Feb. 26.

From the Recorder's Court.

To the Honorable the Common Council:

Gentlemen—I respectfully report to your Honorable Body that a Jury duly impanelled in the Recorder's Court, in the matter of opening "T" alley in the block bounded by Conant, Fenelon, Talbot and Eldridge avenues, where not already open, as a public alley, file 1355, rendered a verdict in favor of said opening, Wednesday, Feb. 6th, 1924, which was confirmed by the Court Wednesday, Feb. 13th, 1924.

In accordance with the statute, I herewith transmit a certified copy of said verdict, and of the judgment of confirmation.

Respectfully,

CHAS. W. CASGRAIN,

Clerk.

Accepted and placed on file.

From the Recorder's Court.

To the Honorable the Common Council:

Gentlemen—I respectfully report to your Honorable Body that a Jury duly impanelled in the Recorder's Court, in the matter of opening "T" alley in the block bounded by Conant, Fenelon, Casmere and Talbot avenues, where not already open, as a public alley, file 1354, rendered a verdict in favor of said opening, Friday, Feb. 8th, 1924, which was confirmed by the Court Wednesday, Feb. 13th, 1924.

In accordance with the statute, I herewith transmit a certified copy

of said verdict, and of the judgment of confirmation.

Respectfully,

CHAS. W. CASGRAIN,

Clerk.

Accepted and placed on file.

From the Rapid Transit Commission

To the Honorable the Common Council:

Gentlemen: In response to the request of your Committee of the Whole, transmitted by the City Clerk on January 26th, 1924, to report on a petition presented to your Honorable Body by the Michigan Elevated Railway Company under date of January 16th, 1924, the Rapid Transit Commission has the honor to offer the following observations:

In considering the question of rapid transit for Detroit, the Rapid Transit Commission has, under its instructions, dealt with the subject from the viewpoint of the requirements of the city of 1950, with a probable population of 2,500,000, as well as with the needs of the present city with its present population.

The capacity for mass transportation, practicability of operation, economy of construction and general desirability have been the governing considerations in its study.

On all points there is no question in the minds of the Commission as to the superiority of rapid transit on the surface, as opposed to any form of elevated or depressed or underground construction. It is possible to utilize this type over more than one-half of the area of the city of 1950, and over three-fourths of the area of the city as it will probably exist in the year 2000.

The equipment selected for the rapid transit lines on the surface is of the same type as that developed on existing rapid transit lines after a long period of operation under difficult conditions, and possess no unproven or doubtful features. The cost of equipment for any type of line, elevated, depressed or underground, does not greatly vary for the same service and capacity. The only difference in any type is in the cost of the structure, and in this respect the construction on the surface is undeniably the cheapest.

Within the built-up portions of the city the necessity of preserving the total width of streets for surface street railway and for motor traffic, as well as the requirements of location to best serve the highly developed business area, have impelled the Commission to choose underground construction in preference to elevated structures. When the change is made from surface rapid transit to underground or to elevated, it would be highly undesirable to compel a transfer of pas-