

CITY COUNCIL  
MINUTES

*Dr. Morton*

Council Chamber,  
City Hall,  
Halifax, N. S.  
January 14, 1960  
8:00 P. M.

A meeting of the City Council was held on the above date.

After the meeting was called to order by the Chairman, and before considering the regular order of business, the members of Council attending, led by the City Clerk, joined in repeating the Lord's Prayer.

There were present His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; Aldermen DeWolf, Abbott, Dunlop, Lane, Macdonald, Butler, Fox, Ferguson, Trainor, Lloyd, Connolly, O'Brien, and Greenwood.

Also present were Messrs. A. A. DeBard, Jr., R. H. Stoddard, W. J. Clancey, T. C. Doyle, L. M. Romkey, J. F. Thomson, G. F. West, J. L. Leitch, V. W. Mitchell, H. K. Randall, Miss Jean Drake, and Dr. A. R. Morton.

MINUTES

Moved by Alderman Ferguson, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the minutes of the meeting held on November 26, 1959, be approved. Motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING RE: ALTERING SOUTHEASTERN OFFICIAL STREET LINE OF DUFFUS STREET BETWEEN ISLEVILLE STREET AND AGRICOLA STREET

A Public Hearing into the matter of altering the southeastern Official Street Line of Duffus Street between Isleville Street and Agricola Street, as shown on Section 5-E of the Official City Plan, was held at this time.

The Plan showing the proposed alteration was displayed for the information of Council.

Mr. West gave an outline and said: "It was the idea to maintain the area and prevent any future building, which would not permit the City to widen the street at some future time."

Alderman Lloyd: "How would future building prevent us from widening the street? It would cost us more money to buy these buildings in the future. It would not prevent us. That is what you mean. If a building were built, you would have to acquire it."

His Worship the Mayor: "The laying down of a Street Line would prevent any new buildings going on that area beyond the new line."

Council,  
January 14, 1960

Mr. West: "If the Street Line were not laid down and a new building were permitted out beyond the line, it would cost the City more money to remove a new building."

Alderman Abbott: "It is not the intention to acquire any property at this time."

Alderman Lane: "Does the City own all the land at the rear of these properties?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Not all of it."

Alderman Lane: "Would it be possible to compensate, at present, owners in land rather than in dollars for their property?"

His Worship the Mayor: "It would be possible for the Council to get legislation to do so. Yes."

Alderman Lane: "Do you visualize in this instance, if there were compensation with land, would they be required to move their properties back?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman Lane: "At this time?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman Lane: "But at a future time they would?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes. If they were re-building or building a new home, they would have to move back of the new line."

Alderman Lane: "If they are compensated in property, it would not have the effect of depreciation on the present value if they are compensated 20 feet in the rear, for the 20 feet they would lose in the front?"

His Worship the Mayor: "I don't think you can put it just that neatly."

Alderman Lane: "I would like to put it that neatly. I would like to hear a reaction to the suggestion."

Alderman Lloyd: "Perhaps the hearing should proceed first."

His Worship the Mayor: "I want to present before the Council, before the hearing, just what we are attempting to do."

Alderman Dunlop: "What is the Building Line there?"

Mr. West: "Fifteen feet."



Council,  
January 14, 1960

Alderman Abbott: "You are going back 20 feet now. Are we laying down a Street Line or a Building Line? Is there a difference?"

City Solicitor: "Definitely. The Street Line is the street."

Alderman Abbott: "Could we not accomplish the same thing by laying down a Building Line?"

City Solicitor: "No."

Alderman Dunlop: "Could we have the overall picture. I say the street is much wider on the west."

Mr. West: "The street between Gottingen Street on the east and Isleville Street on the west is 80 feet. The width of Duffus Street between Isleville Street and Agricola Street is 60 feet. The proposal is to make it 80 feet to coincide."

Alderman Dunlop: "Is that a heavy traffic street?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Connolly: "Will it increase with the addition of the Bicentennial Highway? Won't that take a certain amount of traffic off that street?"

His Worship the Mayor: "It might do that but I am suggesting to you that where traffic has doubled in the last ten years, we will need all these major arteries."

Alderman Abbott: "What I am concerned about is this. A Street Line puts a flaw on the title of the people's property."

His Worship the Mayor: "We should have the hearing tonight and adjourn it until the next regular meeting of Council so that the members of Council will have an opportunity to think it over before they come to a decision. There is no rush for this."

Alderman Butler: "Eighty feet is the width of the street from Gottingen Street, west, to Isleville Street. What is the width of Duffus Street east of Gottingen Street, and what is the width west of Agricola Street?"

Mr. West: "East of it would be 60 feet. Actually you have two, sixty-foot streets. You have Duffus Street between Agricola Street and Robie Street, and you also have Lady Hammond Road so you would have traffic peeling off in either direction."

Council,  
January 14, 1960

Alderman Butler: "I want to point out that there is only one block 80 feet."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think you have to take Devonshire Avenue. It is the main artery into Duffus Street. It takes more traffic over it than Duffus Street."

His Worship the Mayor then asked if anyone wished to be heard against the proposal.

Mr. R. L. Rooney: "I represent six property owners whose properties would be affected by the proposal contemplated in the resolution. I represent: Mr. Samuel Dionne, 130 Duffus St.; Mrs. Muriel Martin, 132 Duffus St.; Mrs. Charles Lutz, 136 Duffus St.; Mr. George Marryatt, 140 Duffus St.; Mr. Vernon Kent, 142 Duffus St.; and Mrs. Viola Currie, 144 Duffus St. I wish to say that all these properties are owner-occupied. They are neat and well maintained. They all, in recent years, have been renovated, some extensively, and others not so. If the recommendation of the Committee on Works is confirmed tonight, then the Street Line will become the Official Street Line. It is quite true that the existing physical Street Line may remain in its present location for quite a number of years. Nevertheless, the Official Street Line will be running through the properties and will cast an adverse effect upon those properties.

"In this particular instance, it is quite possible that some alternative proposition or proposal could achieve the public interest and not affect them to the extent that this will do so. I do recall that some years ago, when I first came to work with the City, one of the first tasks assigned to me was in connection with the Official Street Line that existed on the north side of Morris Street. I searched several titles and I noticed that the homes at that time, although the Street Line had been in existence for a number of years, it had an adverse effect on the properties. The people were losing interest in their properties. This is a recent proposal coming before the Council and there is a possibility that some alternative proposal could achieve what the City has in mind without affecting them. I would respectfully request that the members of Council refer this back to the Town Planning Board for further



Council,  
January 14, 1960

consideration."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think that is a reasonable request."

Mr. Noble Driscoll: "Do I understand that, if this Street Line goes through, that you contemplate giving 20 feet of property off the Playgrounds?"

His Worship the Mayor: "It is possible that that would be considered by Council."

Mr. Driscoll: "If I want to build on my lot up there now, will you give me permission to build 35 feet back; or, would I have to wait five, ten or fifteen years?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No. As I understand it, your application is one calling for rezoning. My own view in laying down the Street Line, as Mr. Rooney has pointed out, is for the question of doing something for the public good. We don't want to injure or harm anybody's opportunity to carry out what is quite properly and legally the use of their land. I think we have one case where we have an opportunity to make compensation for a person like yourself in the form of additional land to achieve our purpose."

Mr. Driscoll: "What I had in mind was something like the Hydrostone houses where the City has taken in the boulevards. I understand the City has bought those houses after advertising; it picked them up; it also turned around and it is going to rent with the intention of doing so until it gets its money back before it starts to widen the street. Is that right?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No. It could happen next year. Certainly, at this moment, nobody would suggest that we tear the houses down that are in good condition, and deprive eight families of housing accommodation which is so badly needed."

Mr. Driscoll: "That is true. Now, let us look at the widening of the street. That is one of your main reasons for setting those houses back the 15 feet. There are several arteries out of the City without going to all that expense in setting those houses back 20 feet, even to take the ground from the Recreation Commission; because, you have one out Barrington Street, Lynch Street, Gottingen Street, Duffus Street, Robie Street and Kempt Road."

Council,  
January 14, 1960

Mr. A. A. Robertson: "It is felt that immediately this Street Line is put into effect it will certainly depreciate the value of the properties from a resale point of view. If the buildings are to be moved back, it would be quite an expense. There should be some compensation. There should be some tax concession given as long as they are there. These people should not have to suffer financially."

His Worship the Mayor: "The City did take similar action on MacDonald Street a few years ago and did what you suggest; also on Preston Street."

Mr. J. E. Ahern, M. L. A., agreed with Mr. Rooney. He pointed out that the buildings on Water Street are on a so-called Street Line and he felt that there was no need for the change; and, by disturbing the homes, they would be reduced to a slum area.

His Worship the Mayor: "I did not say slum area, Mr. Ahern. I am glad you did and not me. I did not describe this area as a slum area by any stretch of the imagination."

No persons appeared in favour of the proposal.

Alderman Dunlop: "Suppose a Street Line is laid down; when is the purchase price fixed for the land? Is it when the Street Line is laid down or does it revert back to the date the purchase is made? In this Council we have found that the things that were not done 10, 12 or 15 years ago, when we negotiate; I refer to sewer easements, we find that we have to pay present-day values. In many cases it is ten times for what we could have secured the property for when the sewer lines were through."

City Solicitor: "In laying down a Street Line you don't acquire the properties."

Alderman Dunlop: "When do you get the value?"

City Solicitor: "The date you acquire it."

Alderman Lloyd: "You say all we have the power to lay down is an Official Street Line, so that does affect the title for a person wishing to sell his property. Would you not think so, Mr. Doyle?"

City Solicitor: "In certain cases."



Council,  
January 14, 1960

Alderman Lloyd: "I can say this and I know from our past experience, and in particular in the last year or two when you have been struggling with settlements for damage claims in the Redevelopment Area, we have a great deal to learn about the subject of the real estate factor of value to the owner when you acquire it for any public purpose. To me, it seems in this particular matter, that the minute you lay down a Street Line; in fact, if you lay down a Building Line, you are stopping a person who had the right to rebuild a building out to the present street line from doing so and they thereby may suffer a damage, depending upon the circumstances of the particular case. If you lay down a Street Line, I think they suffer still more damage because if the building was destroyed by fire, they must, under both circumstances, go back; but, if the building was damaged partially and a person wanted to make some change only to the plan, it raises technical questions in the mind of some future purchaser. In any case, the title is faulty.

"There has been quite a bit of publicity about the values of property in the Redevelopment Areas. What I find exists in the minds of the people in this section who have called me about it, that they have a fear that they may be offered something like assessment plus a percentage. We settled many cases downtown at 5%. I am quite sure the Council would never want to deny these people their right to full and fair market value of the property at the time it is acquired. I then think if this goes back to the Committee, that some recommendation should come from it as to what should be the basis of determination. I would not like to see us again come to assessment plus a percentage. I think appraisals should be used and fair market values should be used for all these instances. Certainly that would be the only fair case to a man who has a vacant lot or an old building such as Mr. Driscoll's. He may want to tear it down and build an apartment house on it. Suddenly we come in after he has acquired this property, he has the land on his hands, and he can't use it for the purpose he planned for. You say to him that it is possible the City may have land at the rear to enable him to accomplish his purpose. That is a special case. That still does not answer the problem of the other people on the matter of full compensation should they wish to retire from that

Council,  
January 14, 1960

area, if the City is going to take it for street purposes. It seems to me that we have to think very carefully before we lay down a Building Line or a Street Line, what, if any, damage has been done to the existing property owners. We should bend over backwards to make sure that we provided machinery for a settlement of the full and fair market value of the properties, should it come about in the immediate or some distant future date."

The City Solicitor advised that the Street Line defines the limit of the street to which all of the public have a right to access. "A Building Line is on private property and it is the line beyond which a building cannot be erected. In other words, from the Street Line to the Building Line is owned by the individual."

His Worship the Mayor: "Mr. West, how many presently encroach on the Building Line?"

Mr. West: "The majority of them would be. I would think after the line has been laid down, they would not be allowed to build over it."

Alderman Dunlop: "If a Building Line is laid down, that does not interfere with buildings presently constructed."

Alderman Abbott: "I feel the City would accomplish the same thing with a Building Line. I guess it is the intention of the City to acquire the land for street widening, not right away, probably in ten years' time, and if the house should burn down or be destroyed some other way, and a person wanted to re-build, he would have to stay back beyond the Official Street Line. If there was a Building Line laid down and they wanted to build, they would also have to stay back beyond it. With a Building Line the title to the property is not faulty, but with an Official Street Line, it puts a flaw in the title of the property for resale value and mortgage purposes. The City can always, as I understand it, acquire land for street widening."

City Manager: "Only if you have an Official Street Line."

Alderman Abbott: "If and when they want to widen the street, we can always acquire land. A Building Line, at this time, would do the same thing to stop people from building beyond it."



Council,  
January 14, 1960

Alderman Lloyd: "If those who are opposed to it were confident that full and fair market value would be paid for the property, they may change their attitude."

He then stated that one person had indicated that street widening may be a desirable thing from the general public point of view but the main concern was what would be the approach to valuation. If it was assessed plus 5%, the property owner would feel he had lost something.

Alderman Lane: "There has been a good deal of emphasis tonight on the establishment of the Official Street Line and its effect on the depreciation of the property. I went up to call on one person who telephoned me about it. I am well aware of the condition up there. In my opinion, we do not have sufficient information before us tonight on the matter of compensation."

Moved by Alderman Lane, seconded by Alderman Lloyd, that the matter be referred back to the Town Planning Board with a request that it be forwarded to Council when there is a recommendation on definite compensation for every property affected.

Alderman Dunlop referred to a property on North Street where the owner wanted to erect an apartment building and asked if that matter had ever been settled.

His Worship the Mayor: "That has been settled by purchase by the Bridge Commission."

Alderman Dunlop: "Did we ever compensate those people?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman Dunlop: "Could we at this stage lay down a Building Line on this application?"

City Solicitor: "No. The Building Line is laid down under the Zoning By-Law."

Alderman Dunlop: "Can we put a 35 foot Building Line on there tonight?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman Lloyd: "I take it that Alderman Lane means that if there is to be compensation of some definite formula to be drafted, you are not tying the hands of the Committee to look at this whole question again?"

Council,  
January 14, 1960

Alderman Lane: "Not in any sense. As it has been pointed out, the public good is to be served and the people who are protesting tonight are in accord with the fact that the public good must be served but private interest must not suffer. What I want to know, as has been pointed out by Alderman Abbott, even if these people require mortgage money for improvement on their property, with a faulty title they cannot get it. Therefore, if we are imposing this on their property, some form of compensation should be worked out. If it is to be paid, then let us arrive at some figure which is reasonable and proper. To say to them, 'In lieu of what we are doing to your property, you will be compensated be it in land or cash', we will be in a position to deal with them and they will deal with us in a reasonable way. If we were to pass this tonight, none of us has any idea of the eventual effect on the properties which are included in this group. I would like to know that before I vote on it."

Alderman Butler: "I am not even convinced that we need to widen the street at this point. I am going to question it because as I look at that plan, the street, east or west of it, both spurs are only 60 feet wide. If we widen this particular section making it 80 feet, I don't think it is going to serve traffic flow any better unless you widen the street right through to Kempt Road."

For the purpose of information the proposal was then outlined for Alderman Butler.

Alderman DeWolf: "Does the Recreation field run behind all of those houses?"

His Worship the Mayor: "With the exception of 100 feet."

Alderman DeWolf: "The Committee might consider the same action on that as on MacDonald Street by buying one property on Isleville Street and moving all the other houses back and paying the owners whatever compensation is fair and reasonable. That might be cheaper for the City and it might not be too great a hardship on the owners."

Alderman Macdonald: "What would be the position of the property owners on this street, if a Street Line were established tonight and one of the owners came along and asked to have an extension built on his property? If he had



Council,  
January 14, 1960

sufficient land to do so, could he get a permit to extend it to the rear?"

City Solicitor: "I can see no impediment in that."

Alderman Macdonald: "Then it would be a matter, if he were given a permit to extend his property, of extra compensation if the time came that the City wanted to purchase. Could a permit be withheld?"

City Solicitor: "No. It is not violating anything."

Alderman Lloyd: "The motion then is basically to refer the matter back to the Committee for further consideration of the observations with respect to compensation, the alternative measures about the width of the street, the question of building permits and Building Line versus Street Line. All those things will be reviewed again as well as Alderman Butler's question whether it is wise to proceed with it at this time. I presume, when the matter is considered, that the owners will be notified and Mr. Rooney will have the opportunity to appear before the Committee."

The motion was then put and passed.

REPORT - SALARY COMMITTEE

January 14, 1960

His Worship the Mayor and  
Members of the City Council.

At a meeting of the Salary Committee held on January 12, 1960, consideration was given to the Majority Report of Judge Morrison.

As an interim report, your Committee recommends that Judge Morrison's Majority Report be approved and recommended to City Council.

Your Committee also wishes to advise that throughout the negotiations it has taken the attitude that the various increases that were proposed were not justified and that was the basis of its argument before the Conciliation Board. However, the Committee was prepared to enter into conciliation proceedings in good faith and therefore is prepared to recommend the findings of the Conciliation Board.

In recommending the increase, the Committee is convinced that it is being recommended in spite of the fact that present rates of pay at City Field are, in its opinion, in line with the changes that have occurred in wage rates throughout the area since 1949.

The Committee also feels that wages paid at City Field should not exceed the prevailing rates in this area for the equivalent types of work and it also recommends that further increases to these employees be not granted until rates paid throughout the area have caught up with the 1960 rates of pay.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.

Council,  
January 14, 1960

Alderman Lloyd: "I think the Committee may recommend that last paragraph but we can only act on the matter before us. We can't tie the hands of any future body."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think the Committee still feels that the wage increase has not been justified."

Alderman Ferguson: "That is, in essence, what it says. On the other hand, we point out that we are prepared to accept and recommend the Majority Report of the Conciliation Board. Unfortunately, the Report does not change our thinking but we are prepared to go along with it. In going along with it, we point out one or two other items which we believe should be part of our report."

His Worship the Mayor then read the last paragraph of the report for the benefit of Alderman Lloyd.

Alderman Lloyd: "It does not bind the Council."

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman Ferguson: "There was no intention to bind the Council nor future Councils. In Committee it was felt prudent to bring that in at this particular time."

Alderman DeWolf: "Does this affect both wages and salaries?"

Alderman Ferguson: "No. This pertains to the City Field Union."

Alderman DeWolf: "It is only for those working by the hour?"

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right. Only for those for whom the Union has power to bargain."

Moved by Alderman Ferguson, seconded by Alderman Fox, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

MAJORITY & MINORITY REPORT - CONCILIATION BOARD

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council.  
From: Committee on Works  
Date: January 5, 1960  
Subject: Majority and Minority Report of the Conciliation Board - Comments

The City Manager submitted to the Committee a copy of the Majority and Minority Report of the Conciliation Board and also comments made by the City Manager on the report.



Council,  
January 14, 1960

The Committee was informed that this report, along with a report from the Salary Committee would have to be considered by City Council before any action was taken on the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

The report from the City Manager entitled "Majority and Minority Report of the Conciliation Board - Comments" is attached to the original copy of these minutes.

Copies of the report were furnished to the members of Council for their information.

The City Manager stated that Council did not have to act on this matter because of the action taken on Item No. 2 (Report - Salary Committee) and the ~~action to be taken on~~ Item No. 4 (Job Evaluation).

JOB EVALUATION

January 14, 1960

His Worship the Mayor and  
Members of the City Council

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on January 7, 1960, a report was submitted from the City Manager advising that five outside consultants were requested to submit proposals for a job evaluation.

They were asked:

1. To determine tasks for each classification.
2. Establishment of salary steps and ranges.
3. Development of policy and administration of a salary plan.
4. Provision for further revision by City staff and Council.

The firms and fees are as follows:

Jerome Barnum Associates	\$ 38,400.00
Payne-Ross Limited	19,500.00
Stevenson & Kellogg Limited	10,600.00
Woods, Gordon & Company	7,500.00

The City Manager stated that although he has had limited practical experience in job evaluation, he has taught and used some of the techniques for over fifteen years. All of the four firms with whom he had contact seemed to be capable of doing the assigned task in a competent manner.

It is recommended that City Council approve in principle of the employing of a firm to carry out a job evaluation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.

Council,  
January 14, 1960

Alderman DeWolf: "Is serious consideration being given to the appointment of a Personnel Officer at this time?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Not by the Committee."

Alderman DeWolf: "I did hear some suggestion."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think one of the proposals did suggest that."

Alderman DeWolf: "The reason I ask that was that such a man would be a type that could possibly write the specifications that are suggested here."

City Manager: "I talked with the representative of that Company and he said, 'When we said a Personnel Officer, we were not saying that you had to appoint one'. As they describe it, the Personnel Officer would still be working under our direction. In other words, he would be a local man who would work with them and then carry on in that special field."

Moved by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that Council approve in principle of having such a task of job evaluation, described in the report of the Finance and Executive Committee, undertaken by the City and that the Committee be instructed to make a recommendation as to the terms and conditions as to how it should be carried out and by whom.

Alderman Lloyd: "That would include consideration of the question - should we have a Personnel Officer appointed concurrently with their appointment?"

Alderman O'Brien: "I would like to emphasize the importance I see in having a further job evaluation and continuing administration thereafter. We have had a tendency in recent years to refer back to the Griffenhagen figures when we were talking about possible salary changes. Although our Brief to the Conciliation Committee, and this report from the Salary Committee refers to the fact that under the Wages and Salaries Index, we have kept up with 1949, if we were to make a comparison with the time Griffenhagen did our study, we would find a different result and a different result from that which the Morrison Commission recommends."

His Worship the Mayor: "In what way?"



Council,  
January 14, 1960

Alderman O'Brien: "The percentage increase in the Wages and Salaries Index, since the time when the Griffenhagen study was done, amounts to something in excess of 20%. It is \$11.12 on \$49.30. Of course, there was the 10% increase, but if you were to follow this statistic, it would result in a 10% figure at this time. Of course, the Griffenhagen figures get out of date and this is the reason to me why we can't rely forever on one job evaluation. That was done at one time and we must have another one to bring it up to date. I suggest a Personnel Officer and personnel administration here will keep it up to date and not allow us to appear to be off the mark."

Alderman Lane: "Alderman O'Brien has brought up the topic of the Griffenhagen job. Is it possible that any of the information which they acquired is useable in a further survey?"

City Manager: "No. There are a good many job descriptions that should be changed. Whoever does the job would like to know what they (Griffenhagen) did. They have to do the job from scratch because it is almost five years since the Report was submitted...it was June of 1955. Their figures come from some time before that. The job descriptions should be done again because some positions have been changed and that is why we have come to you and asked you to change salaries - because of the changing nature of the work of certain jobs."

Alderman Butler: "I am not familiar with the Griffenhagen Report but the word 'evaluation' is used and it was an evaluation. I am curious to know why the data obtained at that time would not still apply. If a man is evaluated at 'X' dollars in Griffenhagen's time, all we would have to do now is to get someone to tell us how much of an increase has taken place and add that to it and we still have the same evaluation."

City Manager: "That would not be quite the case. The Griffenhagen evaluation was not actually a job evaluation. It was only partial. We told him to take our specifications as they then existed, and for a very modest sum of \$1,700.00, he had pay scales fitted to our classifications. What we are contemplating now is starting with classifications right down to something which would permit us to change that within our own organization with approval of Council. I suppose you could call it a formula, a plan or pattern which

Council,  
January 14, 1960

we could follow."

Alderman Lane: "A basic structure is what you want."

City Manager: "That is right."

Alderman Lloyd: "It is a foundation for a re-building of the whole job specifications of the City Government and it permits us to do that with proper analysis being made at this time, then we can re-examine our whole staffing of the personnel of the City Government on the basis of this; but you need it brought up to date in order to do it."

The motion was then put and passed.

RECOMMENDATIONS RE: TAXIS

January 14, 1960

To His Worship the Mayor and  
Members of the City Council.

At a meeting of the Safety Committee held on January 5, 1960, the report of the Taxi Sub-Committee was considered at length. Mr. R. Pugsley, Solicitor for the Taxi Association, addressed the Committee on its behalf.

Your Committee makes the following recommendations to Council:

(1) That two downtown taxi stands be given approval on a year to year basis provided the City of Halifax is compensated for the loss of income derived from the parking meters to be removed for such purpose on the basis of \$124.50 per meter per year (present income basis) the said stands to be located as follows:

1. west side of Barrington Street south of Spring Garden Road  
(3 parking meters)
2. south side of Cornwallis Street west of Gottingen Street  
(3 parking meters)

(2) That the Chief of Police and Inspector of Licenses continue to insist on the strict compliance of Ordinance No. 13 in respect to Taxi owners, operators and their vehicles, in order to further insure the public safety and convenience.

(3) That Ordinance No. 13 be amended to provide:

1. that the Chief of Police be empowered to refuse a license to any applicant, regardless of the fact that he is a fit and proper person, upon direction of the Safety Committee.
2. that the license fee for vehicles transporting passengers for hire be increased from ~~\$25.00 to~~ \$40.00.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.



Council,  
January 14, 1960

we could follow."

Alderman Lane: "A basic structure is what you want."

City Manager: "That is right."

Alderman Lloyd: "It is a foundation for a re-building of the whole job specifications of the City Government and it permits us to do that with proper analysis being made at this time, then we can re-examine our whole staffing of the personnel of the City Government on the basis of this; but you need it brought up to date in order to do it."

The motion was then put and passed.

RECOMMENDATIONS RE: TAXIS

January 14, 1960

To His Worship the Mayor and  
Members of the City Council.

At a meeting of the Safety Committee held on January 5, 1960, the report of the Taxi Sub-Committee was considered at length. Mr. R. Pugsley, Solicitor for the Taxi Association, addressed the Committee on its behalf.

Your Committee makes the following recommendations to Council:

(1) That two downtown taxi stands be given approval on a year to year basis provided the City of Halifax is compensated for the loss of income derived from the parking meters to be removed for such purpose on the basis of \$124.50 per meter per year (present income basis) the said stands to be located as follows:

1. west side of Barrington Street south of Spring Garden Road  
(3 parking meters)
2. south side of Cornwallis Street west of Gottingen Street  
(3 parking meters)

(2) That the Chief of Police and Inspector of Licenses continue to insist on the strict compliance of Ordinance No. 13 in respect to Taxi owners, operators and their vehicles, in order to further insure the public safety and convenience.

(3) That Ordinance No. 13 be amended to provide:

1. that the Chief of Police be empowered to refuse a license to any applicant, regardless of the fact that he is a fit and proper person, upon direction of the Safety Committee.
2. that the license fee for vehicles transporting passengers for hire be increased from ~~\$25.00 to \$40.00.~~

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.

Council,  
January 14, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "In checking over the recommendation of the Committee, and in checking with the Motor Vehicle Act, it was found that we cannot carry out the recommendations under the terms of that Act. Therefore, this matter should now go back to the Committee for a further recommendation."

Mr. R. Pugsley appeared on behalf of the Halifax Taxi Association and asked if Council would consider two recommendations; namely, the limitation of cabs and the installation of the downtown parking stands.

His Worship the Mayor: "One item is contingent upon the recommendation regarding fees and I think, in fairness to the Committee, it should go back to them for further study at which time you will be given an opportunity to appear."

Mr. Pugsley: "So far as the recommendation of cabs is concerned, I would suggest that the matter has been before the Safety Committee as well as a committee consisting of Aldermen Butler and Trainor. I fail to see why further time need be spent by the Committee to give it any more study. They have come up with a recommendation that a limitation be placed on the number of cabs."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think the items are related one to the other."

Alderman Butler: "In view of the fact that legal point has come up, and that the Motor Vehicle Act seems to supersede Ordinance No. 13, I fail to see how we could recommend to Council something that is not quite correct, legally. I sympathize with Mr. Pugsley. I believe I know what he has in mind. He is afraid of the fact that there may be applicants for licenses that would not otherwise occur by way of a censure from this Council to the Chief of Police, and there is also the question whether we can ask, request, or order the Chief to refuse to grant licenses that also has arisen."

Moved by Alderman Butler, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that this matter be referred back to the Safety Committee for further consideration.

Alderman Lane: "If this goes back, I would request that consideration be given to the establishment of the stands and increase in the license fee as two separate items. If they are allied, the compensation is out of all proportion to the number of meters which are being eliminated. That is a



Council,  
January 14, 1960

factor which should be brought into the picture. I would like to have at that time justification for the additional fifteen dollars per license which should be attributed to the increased cost and maintenance in the issuing of those licenses. I don't think it should be compensation for the elimination of six meters. I don't think they are related."

His Worship the Mayor: "In Committee you can deal with these separately."

Alderman Lane: "I would like to establish at this time that it should be broken down."

The motion was then put and passed.

RENTAL CONTROL BY-LAW - FIRST READING

January 14, 1960

His Worship the Mayor  
and Members of City Council.

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on January 7, 1960, the City Solicitor submitted a draft of the Rental Control By-Law, made under the authority of Chapter 8 of the Acts of Nova Scotia, 1959.

Your Committee recommends that the By-Law be forwarded to Council for first reading and referred back to this Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.

A By-Law respecting rentals, as prepared by the City Solicitor, was submitted.

Mr. H. A. Shea of the Halifax and District Trades and Labour Council addressed the Council as follows:

"I think you are very well aware that the Halifax and District Trades and Labour Council has taken an active part in endeavouring for the re-institution of rental control and has followed all the proceedings leading to the position where it presently is. In going through the discussions and the arguments presented before the Royal Commission, we had many people before the Commission both for and against rental control. During all those hearings everybody who wished to present a brief or to make any presentations on behalf of any group or even themselves, had the right and opportunity to do so before that Commission. It was well advertised. People were invited to be there and express their views. A great number of people did take advantage of that

Council,  
January 14, 1960

invitation and consequently did present their views to the Commission. The Commission, after hearing all the evidence presented to it, and studying all the briefs, then conducted a small investigation on its own and it found all these statements which had been presented on behalf of rent control were substantially proven by them as well as the people who presented them. We had been waiting very patiently for the bringing forth of the City By-Law which will provide for rental control. I might say, that after reading it in last Friday's paper, on behalf of the Council I can express the opinion that we are very much disappointed. In the opinion of Council, the By-Law itself is not, by any stretch of the imagination, even equal to the former By-Law. It does not provide for a great number of things which are contained in both the recommendation, conclusion and legislation passed by the House itself which, for the purpose of making the By-Law effective, would be necessary to be contained in it. There are only four or five items and I would like the Aldermen to take note of these because it might change the theme of discussion among yourselves when the realization that these things should be contained in it are not, that the By-Law might be declared inadequate and perhaps could be re-drafted.

"We find first: (1) that this By-Law does not contain any provision whatever for the safe-guarding of tenants who make application to a rental authority. This was provided for in the old By-Law. **I contend that that is the most important thing that could be contained in the By-Law.** (2) the By-Law does not, in any way, contain any provision for giving notice to a tenant or for a tenant giving notice to a landlord for any limited time in which they are required to give up the premises. The old By-Law provided for three months. The Bill from the House provided for three months. It is not contained in this. (3) There is nothing contained in the By-Law which would require a landlord to keep the premises in a condition which would provide health and sanitation. This is a recommendation of the Morrison Commission and is provided for by Ordinance No. 50. I am not going to put **forth anything to this Council that is not contained either in the legislation or recommendations of the Commission.** (4) There is a provision made in the By-Law where nobody