

Council,
February 25, 1960

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

PROGRESS ESTIMATE #13 - MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT - NEW INCINERATOR

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council
From: Committee on Works
Date: February 16, 1960
Subject: Progress Estimate #13 - Material and Equipment - New Incinerator

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Commissioner of Works recommending payment of Progress Estimate #13, re material and equipment for the New Incinerator.

On motion of Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Macdonald, the Committee recommended to City Council payment of Progress Estimate #13, re material and equipment for the New Incinerator, in the amount of \$4,500.00, to Francis Hankin and Company Limited.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Lane, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

PROGRESS ESTIMATES #24, 25 and 26 - FAIRVIEW OVERPASS

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council
From: Committee on Works
Date: February 16, 1960
Subject: Progress Estimates #24, 25 and 26 - Fairview Overpass

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Commissioner of Works recommending payment of Progress Estimates #24, 25 and 26, re Fairview Overpass.

On motion of Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Lane, the Committee recommended to City Council payment of Progress Estimates #24, 25 and 26, re Fairview Overpass in the amounts of \$345.28, \$347.63 and \$4,742.40 respectively, to the Department of Highways, Province of Nova Scotia.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

Council,
February 25, 1960

MOTION -- ALDERMAN LLOYD RE: SUB-POLICE STATION

Alderman Lloyd submitted and read the following motion:

"RESOLVED that the City expropriate from the present owners the lands lying within the following boundaries:
Commencing at the north-east corner of George and Water Streets, thence proceeding along the east side of Water Street to the Franklin Herschorn property, thence along the south line of the Franklin Herschorn property to the harbor, thence southerly along the harbor shoreline to the Dartmouth Ferry property, thence following the Dartmouth Ferry property line to its junction with the north line of George Street, thence westerly along George Street to the place of beginning;

That the said lands be acquired for slum clearance and redevelopment such as a waterfront plaza similar in design to that recommended by Professor Stephenson, or as part of a general redevelopment scheme ultimately linking with the Jacob Street Redevelopment Area;

That the City instruct its Planning Staff to prepare general plans for the redevelopment in the area to be acquired and those adjacent thereto."

Alderman Lloyd: "This is the suggestion which came out of the last meeting and if we are going to do anything with it, we should make the broad move to cover our redevelopment plan."

The motion was seconded by Alderman O'Brien.

Alderman Dunlop: "This is a piece of land which I understand has been the subject of a great deal of controversy. I understand the Committee on Works has granted a permit for a service station. If the matter had come before the Council, I would have voted against the proposal. It came to us from a regularly constituted Committee of this Council which passed it. I am not saying that this is the wrong way to deal with it but I think it should go back to the Redevelopment Committee. Things like this should come to us

Council,
February 25, 1960

from the Redevelopment Committee with some idea of the use it is going to be put to. I see the use is very broad. We should have some idea of the cost. I would like to know a little more about what this may lead us into in terms of dollars. I am going to move that this matter be referred to the Redevelopment Committee for study and report."

Alderman Lloyd: "If my seconder will agree with that, we have no objection to all the facts being brought to the Council. I think you will recall that there was a divided vote in the Committee on Works on the matter and if it is to be redevelopment, then it should come to the Council. I have no objection whatsoever having this reported on by the Redevelopment Committee."

His Worship the Mayor to Alderman Dunlop: "Would you add to your motion that it be reported back to Council within a month? I think one month is sufficient time to give the Council an answer."

Alderman Dunlop: "I am not willing to add that to my motion because I have confidence in the Committee. I am not going to criticize the Committee on Works or anybody else for what happened in the past because I think they gave their honest and best judgment in the matter, but changes have arisen now. The Redevelopment Committee is all here now and I have confidence that they will not delay it."

His Worship the Mayor stated that he, as Chairman of the Redevelopment Committee, would try to report back to Council within a month on the matter.

Alderman Lloyd asked what the Charter provision was with respect to Committees reporting and was advised that the period of time was two weeks.

His Worship the Mayor: "All standing Committees only."

Alderman Lloyd: "Is the Redevelopment Committee a standing Committee?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Dunlop: "I think it will require an extension of the fortnight so I will say 'two months'."

Alderman Lloyd: "I must point out to the Council that unwittingly you may be incurring cost to yourself. Supposing you were disposed to proceed

Council,
February 25, 1960

with this acquisition, if you leave this open it is conceivable that the person who now holds a permit will go ahead and proceed to work. It is going to cost you a great deal more money to acquire that area."

Alderman Dunlop: "The Committee knows that."

Alderman Lloyd: "I am sure the Committee knows it now."

Alderman O'Brien: "As one member of the Committee, surely we will take it into account as soon as it is on our agenda, the urgency from the point of view of time factor. We will report our recommendation in accordance with our judgment on that."

Alderman Butler: "Does this not point up the fact that there is something wrong with our procedure inasmuch as the Committee on Works, if it passes something such as it did here, that there should be some means for the Council to deal more directly with it?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Not so much here. What was lacking here was the fact that a Committee of Council had no right to stay this kind of development. It could twist the law to suit its own purpose. We should have something in our laws to enable us to recommend to Council that this be declared a redevelopment area or rezone it such as we did on Clyde Street to hold the zone against contrary development which would be against the good interest of the City at large. You will have it before you shortly to pass on for permissive legislation to enable us to hold an area."

Alderman Butler: "Are we going to refine or amend our regulations on procedure within the Council that a Committee such as the Committee on Works will not have the ultimate decision?"

His Worship the Mayor: "If you wish to change the Charter with respect to granting a license for filling stations, which is the power of the Committee on Works to do so now, then by all means let us have a motion."

Alderman Lloyd: "With the Manager system all matters of policy should come to Council. I think that was one of the things we did not deal with and overlooked in our re-organization under the Manager plan. I think that is a matter that should be the subject of legislation and might very well be

Council,
February 25, 1960

referred to the Finance and Executive Committee. I would suggest that the powers of the Committee on Works and the granting of licenses and permits be examined and reported on by the Finance and Executive Committee."

This matter was referred to the Finance and Executive Committee for consideration and report.

Alderman Lloyd: "On the other matter, the seconder to this motion is a member of the Redevelopment Committee. I am sure that he will remind them of the urgency of the matter."

The Resolution was then referred to the Redevelopment Committee for consideration and report.

RECEPTION PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS

No petitions were submitted and no persons wished to be heard at this time.

REPLOTTING LAND - PRESCOTT STREET

A letter was submitted from Mr. R. A. Kanigsberg, Q. C. requesting a replotting of land on Prescott Street for the purpose of an extension to the Canadian Admiral Corporation Limited building. Two lots would become one lot under this proposal.

The matter was referred to the Town Planning Board for consideration and report.

ZONING - C. N. R. LAND - NORTHEAST CORNER BARRINGTON AND NORTH STREETS TO C-2 ZONE

An application was submitted from Industrial Estates Limited to put up an extension to the existing warehouse of Swift Canadian Company Limited on C. N. R. Land at the above location. In order to proceed with this proposal, it is necessary to zone the land to C-2 zone.

The matter was referred to the Town Planning Board for consideration and report.

Council,
February 25, 1960

COUNSEL FOR CITY - MATTAR CASE

His Worship the Mayor requested the approval of Council for the engaging of Mr. R. M. Fielding, Q. C. as counsel for the City in the Mattar case.

MOVED by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the appointment of Mr. Fielding be approved. Motion passed.

9:30 p.m. Council adjourned for a short recess.

9:50 p.m. Council reconvened, the following members being present:

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

REPLOTTING LAND - PRESCOTT STREET

At a meeting of the Town Planning Board, held on February 25, 1960, a letter was submitted from Mr. R. A. Kanigsberg, Q. C. requesting a replotting of land on Prescott Street for the purpose of an extension to the Canadian Admiral Corporation Limited building.

It is proposed that two lots would become one lot by the replotting procedure.

The Board granted the request and recommended same to City Council.

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Lane, that the report of the Town Planning Board be approved. Motion passed.

ZONING - C. N. R. LAND - NORTHEAST CORNER BARRINGTON AND NORTH STREETS TO C-2 ZONE

At a meeting of the Town Planning Board, held on February 25, 1960, an application was received from Industrial Estates Limited to put up an extension to the existing warehouse of Swift Canadian Company Limited on C. N. R. land at the northeast corner of Barrington and North Streets.

In order to proceed with this proposal, it is necessary to zone the land to C-2 zone.

The Board recommended that the application be approved and that a date be fixed for a Public Hearing into this matter.

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Lane, that the report

Council,
February 25, 1960

of the Town Planning Board be approved and that Council fix March 31, 1960, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, City Hall, Halifax, Nova Scotia, as the time and place for a Public Hearing into this matter. Motion passed.

REPORT - GRANTS COMMITTEE

The Special Committee on Additional Grants reports as follows:

1. That the grant to The Children's Aid Society be increased by \$2,500.00.
2. That the grant to the Canadian Paraplegic Association be increased from \$500.00 to \$1,000.00.
3. That the Y. M. C. A. be given a grant of \$1,000.00 for underprivileged boys' work in central City area.
4. That the Salvation Army be given a grant of \$500.00 for the Seymour Street Home for unmarried mothers.
5. That the grant to the Maritime Museum be increased to \$5,000.00.
6. The Committee does not recommend any increase in the grant to the Nova Scotia College of Art of \$3,000.00.
7. The Committee does not recommend the application of the Choral Society or the Halifax Rifles Armoury Association for a grant to an educational fund to be raised by the Association.

William C. Dunlop, Alderman
R. W. Ferguson, Alderman
R. J. Butler, Alderman

The Chairman of the Committee advised that the total of these grants was \$6,000.00 but there was a decrease of \$2,250.00 in the grant to the Halifax Infants' Home.

These grants and increases in grants were for the year 1960 only.

MOVED by Alderman Dunlop, seconded by Alderman Butler, that the report be approved and any necessary legislation obtained. Motion passed.

FUNDS - JOB EVALUATION

The City Manager advised that nothing had been included in the budget to cover the cost of a proposed job evaluation and suggested that some figure be placed therein and named \$10,000.00 which was agreed to by Council.

Council,
February 25, 1960

FINANCIAL STATEMENT - WALTER CALLOW FUND

Alderman Macdonald referred to the above fund and asked if it were true that there was a surplus of \$40,000.00.

His Worship the Mayor, reading from the statement, advised there was a reserve of \$45,000.00 for extension and maintenance.

The City Manager stated that the City's grant was \$500.00 and that same should be left at that figure.

It was his thought that the fund was being built up for a specific use later on.

GRANTS LISTED IN ESTIMATES

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that the grants listed in the estimates for 1960 be approved, less the sum of \$2,250.00 formerly paid to the Halifax Infants' Home. Motion passed.

RESOLUTION RE: GRANTS

WHEREAS by Subsection (7) of Section 310 of the Halifax City Charter, as that subsection is enacted by Section 14 of Chapter 54 of the Acts of 1953, the Council is authorized to include in the annual estimates of expenditures of the City a sum not exceeding one hundred thousand dollars.

AND WHEREAS said subsection (7) of Section 310 further provides that such sum shall not be so included until the Council has passed a resolution to submit to the session of the General Assembly next to be held following the passing of such resolution, a Bill authorizing the City to expend such sum for the purpose or purposes set out in the said resolution.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Council submit to the session of the General Assembly next to be held following the passing of this resolution a Bill granting to the City authority to expend the sums set out in Schedule "A" to this resolution for the respective purposes therein set out.

SCHEDULE "A"

To pay as a grant to the Family Service
Bureau of Halifax the sum of.....\$1,000.00

To pay as a grant to the Salvation Army
(Red Shield Campaign) the sum of..... 2,000.00

Council,
February 25, 1960

To pay as a grant to the Salvation Army (Girls' Home, Seymour Street, Halifax, N. S.) the sum of	\$ 500.00
To pay as a grant to the Canadian Cancer Society the sum of.....	1,000.00
To pay as a grant to the Halifax-Dartmouth United Appeal the sum of.....	13,650.00
To pay as a grant to the Canadian Red Cross (N. S. Division) the sum of.....	2,000.00
To pay as a grant to the St. John Ambulance Association the sum of.....	750.00
To pay as a grant to the Board of the Maritime Museum (Citadel Hill) the sum of.....	5,000.00
To pay as a grant to the Maritime School for Social Work the sum of.....	500.00
To pay as a grant to the John Howard Society the sum of.....	1,500.00
To pay as a grant to the Board of the Army Museum (Citadel Hill) the sum of.....	3,500.00
To pay as a grant to the Halifax Symphony Society the sum of.....	2,500.00
To pay as a grant to the Canadian Paraplegic Association (Maritime Division) the sum of.....	1,000.00
To pay as a grant to the Nova Scotia Talent Trust the sum of.....	500.00
To pay as a grant to the Halifax Junior Bengal Lancers the sum of.....	1,000.00
To pay as a grant to the Halifax Musical Festival the sum of.....	750.00
To pay as a grant to the Walter Callow Wheelchair Coach Fund the sum of.....	500.00
To pay as a grant to the Maritime Conservatory of Music the sum of.....	5,000.00
To pay as a grant to the Children's Aid Society the sum of.....	2,500.00
To pay as a grant to the Young Men's Christian Association the sum of.....	1,000.00
	<hr/>
Total.....	46,150.00
	<hr/>

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Macdonald, that the
Resolution as submitted be approved. Motion passed.

Council,
February 25, 1960

FIRE PROTECTION RATE

To: His Worship the Mayor, Chairman and Members of City Council
From: G. F. West, Commissioner of Works
Date: February 25, 1960
Subject: Fire Protection Rate.

Dear Sir:

Based on the amount as calculated by the Public Service Commission for Fire Protection, and on the valuation of properties assessable for this taxation, I would recommend the rate of Nine Cents (0.09) per One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00) of valuation for the year 1960.

G. F. West, Commissioner of Works.

Moved by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

SALARY - SUPERVISOR - BASINVIEW HOME

To: His Worship, C. A. Vaughan and Members of the City Council
From: A. A. DeBard, Jr., City Manager
Date: February 24, 1960
Subject: Basinview Home - Salary Adjustment - Supervisor

At direction of the Committee of the Whole Dr. Morton and the writer have examined the salary of the supervisor of the Basinview Home. We do not feel that it is particularly out of line at the level of S-10 but suggest that the position be raised to S-11. Mr. Ettinger and Governor Grant are in Grade S-12 with \$1,200.00 deducted for Housing and Subsistence.

The various grades and steps are:

S-12	\$4,678.00	\$4,967.00	\$5,260.00	\$5,563.00	\$5,882.00
S-11	4,158.00	4,412.00	4,678.00	4,967.00	5,260.00
S-10	3,927.00	4,158.00	4,412.00	4,678.00	4,967.00
Matron	3,960.00	4,080.00	4,260.00	4,440.00	4,620.00

These figures include the 5% increase for the grades S-10 and S-12 and the Matron's scale reflects the latest changes approved by Council. Mr. French would be at the \$4,412.00 step.

No provision need be made in the budget for this increase.

A. A. DEBARD, JR.,
CITY MANAGER.

Alderman Wyman: "I don't understand the City Manager's thinking on that. If the Superintendent of the Mental Hospital and the Governor of the

Council,
February 25, 1960

City Prison are in S-12, why is there a difference? If we are going to correct it at all, it should be corrected to its right place. If it should not be on the same level as both, why is Basinview Home a different category to the other institutions?"

City Manager: "Because of its size and character. I think you have a much more difficult situation in the Mental Hospital. I would rather be Superintendent of Basinview Home than of the Mental Hospital. The Mental Hospital is two and one-half times the size of Basinview. At the Prison you have work which is probably more disagreeable and hazardous than Basinview Home. Dr. Morton and I were going to leave it right where it was but there was a feeling expressed in Council that something should be done with respect to this salary. It will correct itself presumably when the job evaluation comes. It might go higher; it might stay where it is; or it might be recommended lower. We felt this would take care of it to some measure at least and we don't need any extra money for this particular item. It is only \$254.00."

MOVED by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Connolly, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

10:05 p.m. Council convened as a Committee of the Whole.

11:50 p.m. Council reconvened, the following members being present:

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

RESOLUTION RE: ESTIMATES - 1960

RESOLVED that the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole Council be approved viz: that the estimates for the Civic Year 1960 be set at a total amount of \$14,060,142.11 less revenue of \$5,077,513.47; that the Residential Tax Rate be determined at \$2.06 per \$100.00 of assessment and that the Commissioner of Finance be authorized to withdraw from the Current Surplus Account the approximate sum of \$237,851.14 to produce a Business Tax Rate of \$4.86 per \$100.00 of assessment.

Council,
February 25, 1960

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Dunlop, that the Resolution as submitted be approved. Motion passed.

RESOLUTION RE: SCHOOL BOARD ESTIMATES

RESOLVED that the estimates as submitted by the Board of School Commissioners for the Civic Year 1960 amounting to \$4,210,620.38 be amended as follows:

	<u>INCREASE</u>	<u>DECREASE</u>
Research Work by Staff or outside Assistance-----	\$10,000.00	
5% Increase Officials & Staff, Maintenance Staff and Janitors-----	22,679.26	
Clerk and Filing Room-----	3,000.00	
City's share Superannuation-----	1,451.47	
Contingent Account-----		\$3,000.00
Conventions and Entertainment-----		175.00

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of the estimates as so amended be forwarded to the Board of School Commissioners for its information.

MOVED by Alderman Ferguson, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that the Resolution as submitted be approved. Motion passed.

RESOLUTION RE: INTEREST ON TAXES

WHEREAS by subsection (2) of Section 425 of the City Charter of the City of Halifax, as that Section is enacted by Section 7 of Charter 63 of the Acts of 1957, the Council may by resolution passed on or before the first day of March in any year, provide that on all rates and taxes remaining unpaid on the day to be named therein, interest shall be payable thereon until the same are paid at such rate as Council may from time to time by resolution determine, and such rate so determined shall continue in effect to such time as Council shall otherwise determine.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that on all rates and taxes unpaid to the Collector on or before the first day of June in the year in respect of which such rates and taxes were assessed, interest at the rate of seven per centum per annum shall be payable.

MOVED by Alderman Ferguson, seconded by Alderman Greenwood, that the Resolution as submitted be approved. Motion passed.

Council,
February 25, 1960

Meeting adjourned

11:55 p.m.

LIST OF HEADLINES

Public Hearing Re: Rezoning Block Land Bounded by Chebucto Road, Willow Street and Dublin Street from C-2 Zone to R-2 Zone	143
Public Hearing Re: Amendment Zoning By-Law to Permit Multiple Housing Units - Westwood Area	144
Property Acquisitions	145
Payment of Interest to Owners of Expropriated Properties	146
Legislation	153
Contract Provisions - Works	160
Local #108 - Membership Sub-Foremen	162
Incinerator Material and Equipment Contract - Change Orders 3 and 4	163
Compensation Procedure	163
Rezoning - Drummond Court Area (R-2 to R-1). Date for Hearing March 31, 1960	164
Zoning - Remaining Portion of Dudley Street to R-2. Date for Hearing March 31, 1960	164
Set Date - Laying Street Lines - Willow Tree - Date for Hearing - March 17, 1960	165
Erection of Tower - Robie Street (C.J.C.H.) Date for Hearing - March 17, 1960	165
Progress Estimate #15 - Incinerator Construction	166
Progress Estimate #13 - Material and Equipment - New Incinerator	167
Progress Estimates #24, 25 and 26 - Fairview Overpass	167
Motion - Alderman Lloyd Re: Sub-Police Station	168
Reception Petitions and Delegations	171
Replotting Land - Prescott Street	171
Zoning - C. N. R. Land - Northeast Corner Barrington & North Sts. to C-2 Zone	171
Counsel for City - Mattar Case	172
Replotting Land - Prescott Street	172
Zoning - C. N. R. Land - Northeast Corner of Barrington & North Streets to C-2 Zone	172
Report - Grants Committee	173
Funds - Job Evaluation	173
Financial Statement - Walter Callow Fund	174
Grants Listed in Estimates	174
Resolution Re: Grants	174
Fire Protection Rate	176
Salary - Supervisor - Basinview Home	176
Resolution Re: Estimates - 1960	
Resolution Re: School Board Estimates	178
Resolution Re: Interest on Taxes	178

C. A. VAUGHAN,
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN.

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

R. H. Martin

CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES

Council Chamber,
City Hall,
Halifax, N. S.
March 17, 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, 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, Butler, Fox, Trainor, Lloyd, Wyman, Connolly and O'Brien.

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

MINUTES

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Fox, that the minutes of January 28, 1960, be approved. Motion passed.

DISTRIBUTION OF MINUTES

Alderman Trainor: "Your Worship, before you get into the first item, I wonder if it is possible to get the minutes somewhat earlier or rearrange the schedule. I don't want to cast any reference upon the City Clerk or his staff as I think they do a good job in putting out the minutes; but it was sometime after 9:00 p.m. last night that the minutes were delivered to my house. There are a lot of items I would like to take time out to go through. I wonder if something could be done about that for the future."

Alderman Lloyd: "May I suggest that we proceed with the hearings and if there are comments made similar to those of the Alderman, that a motion to adjourn and continue the hearing would be in order if Council so desires. We could take the trolley coach schedules. It might be useful to carry on with the hearings tonight and then there may be some explanations given by the Company officials which may clarify matters or raise other questions."

Council,
March 17, 1960

PUBLIC HEARING RE: TROLLEY COACH SCHEDULES

March 17, 1960

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

At a meeting of the Finance & Executive Committee, held on March 10, 1960, proposed changes in Trolley Coach Headways, effective as of March 25th, were submitted by Officials of the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company Limited, with reference to Routes 3, 7, 8 and 10.

After hearing from Mr. A. R. Harrington, General Manager of the Company, it was agreed to recommend that the changes requested be approved and that a hearing be held so that the public may have an opportunity to be heard on the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

NOVA SCOTIA LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY, LIMITED

TRANSIT DIVISION

PROPOSED CHANGES IN HEADWAYS ON THE FOLLOWING ROUTES EFFECTIVE MARCH 25, 1960

ROUTE 3

From 6:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.	10 minutes instead of 9½ minutes
9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon	11 minutes instead of 9 minutes
12:00 noon to 5:00 p.m.	10 minutes instead of 9 minutes
5:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.	11 minutes instead of 9 minutes
8:30 p.m. to 11:15 p.m.	13 minutes instead of 9 minutes
11:15 p.m. to 12:00 midnight	15 minutes - same.

ROUTE 7

From 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon	11 minutes instead of 9 minutes
6:15 p.m. to 12:00 midnight	15 minutes instead of 11 minutes

NOTE 1

Regular service retained from approximately 6:30 to 9:00 a.m. at headway of 9 minutes.

NOTE 2

From 12:00 noon to 6:00 p.m. headway retained at 8 minutes.

ROUTE 8

From 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon	11 minutes instead of 9 minutes
6:15 p.m. to 12:00 midnight	15 minutes instead of 11 minutes

NOTE 1

Regular service retained from approximately 6:30 to 9:00 a.m. at headway of 9 minutes.

NOTE 2 From 12:00 noon to 6:00 p.m. headway retained at 8 minutes.

Council,
March 17, 1960

ROUTE 10 - Saturdays only

From 6:48 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.)
12:00 noon to 2:00 p.m.) 20 minutes instead of 10 minutes
5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.)

The routes affected were considered as follows:

Petitions originating with Mrs. Florence S. Gilbert and signed by approximately 500 persons was submitted as follows:

To the Public Utilities, The N. S. Tram. Co., the Mayor and City Council of Halifax, N. S.

We the citizens of Halifax City, N. S. do hereby present this petition for your immediate consideration.

Whereas that we have been inconvenienced by long waiting in bad weather, making us late for church, business and social engagements since the elimination of the Belt Lines at certain hours and days.

Therefore, we would like the Belt Lines back, shorter waiting periods between busses and if possible, lower rates.

Please heed our plea and alleviate this grave situation speedily.

The following letter was also submitted:

5 Leeds Street,
Halifax, N. S.
March 16, 1960

Mr. R. H. Stoddard,
City Clerk,
City Hall,
Halifax, N. S.

Dear Sir:

As it may not be possible for me to attend Thursday's meeting on proposed trolley coach schedule changes, I am submitting my views in this letter.

It is unfortunate that curtailment of service has to be considered, but if changes are necessary I suggest this only emphasizes the necessity of clearing streets for public transit. Coaches are unnecessarily hampered on many streets by parked cars, and if service is to be maintained it seems only fair that the utility should be freed from this frustration.

Two instances of this, only a short distance from City Hall, are Granville Street, and Barrington St. just north of Buckingham. Delays in these areas, and no doubt in many others for the same reason, are a daily occurrence.

It seems to me the utility is resigned to putting up with these hindrances rather than attempting to have them eliminated. Perhaps this is the time to consider how they may be enabled to provide a better service

Council,
March 17, 1960

rather than cut down what is now offered.

Very truly yours,

(Sgd.) J. K. Stanley.

The routes affected were considered separately.

Route No. 7 Headways were then read for the information of those present.

Mr. J. J. Campbell addressed Council with respect to Routes 7 and 8. He suggested rather than a curtailment of service on these routes, that Council give some consideration to the north end of Windsor Street. People living on Claremont Street have approximately a mile to walk to either the No. 7 or No. 8 coaches. He suggested an extension or a feeder line to service the area mentioned.

8:10 p.m. Alderman Macdonald arrives.

Mrs. William Aspray, 83 Claremont Street, urged that service be provided in the same area mentioned by Mr. Campbell. She stated that young boys could not join the Scouts or Cubs and that young girls would like to join the Guides or Brownies. They would also like to visit the Library as well as go skating, but they could not because of the lack of service. She also spoke on behalf of the elderly people living in the area. She said a petition had been prepared and submitted to the Public Utility Board some time ago but nothing was heard from it. She requested the help of City Council to bring about results in this matter.

Reverend Father Colin Campbell of St. Catherine's Parish, Bayers Road, addressed Council and stated that about 150 families of his Parish were not served with trolley service. Many of the homes in the area were built since the No. 4 and No. 10 routes were extended out Bayers Road. He suggested that the No. 4 coach loop around Connaught Avenue and Windsor Street instead of travelling the present route, so that the persons he represented would be served.

Mr. Raymond Harvey, 15 Windcrest Terrace, addressed Council as follows:

"I came to the corner of Windcrest Terrace and Windsor Street at 6:00 p.m.

Council,
March 17, 1960

and the No. 7 coach had gone by. I waited until 23 minutes past 6:00 o'clock before the next trolley came. I had to go to North Street to get a No. 4. Everything else was going back to the Terminal."

His Worship the Mayor asked if Mr. Harrington cared to comment on the matter of coach service extension in the north Windsor Street area.

Mr. Harrington referred to the Cosgrove, Monti Report which contained several recommendations with regard to re-routing; but it also said, that there should not be any extensions at the present time. He also advised that the Public Utilities Board had ruled that the Transit Division of the Company had to be operated as a separate entity and that it must stand on its own feet financially. As the Company suffered a loss of \$28,000.00 last year, it was not prepared to make any extensions to the service unless it could find some means of revenue to cover the additional expense of the extensions.

His Worship the Mayor: "You mentioned earlier that the transit system had to stand apart from the light utility in its bookkeeping. How did that come about?"

Mr. Harrington: "That came as a motion by the City."

His Worship the Mayor: "When?"

Mr. Harrington: "About 1942. At that time the Company operated a gas utility, transit utility and an electric utility. It reported on those three utilities as one and its earnings were judged on the overall operation. At that time, the City made representation that those three divisions should be separated. At the hearing before the Public Utilities Board where it was suggested that they should be separated, the Company objected but immediately the Legislature put through an amendment to the Public Utilities Act where the Statute now says that each utility must be kept separate. As a result of that, the gas utility could not stand on its own feet and in 1953, I believe, the Company sought to abandon it."

Alderman Lloyd: "It seems to be a very important question. If the law provided for separation of your operations into three distinct utilities, should you be unable to continue the trolley coach system because it is not profitable and you can't provide the service the public or the Council wishes,

Council,
March 17, 1960

then without financial assistance or inducement from the City, you face an abandonment of your operations."

Mr. Harrington: "There is no question about that. That is right."

Alderman Lane: "Do you think that conditions have changed in that it might be a feasible suggestion that the arrangement whereby the profits from your power operation could be applied to the transit? In other words, a joint operation?"

Mr. Harrington: "I think it would be much more difficult to have it returned to that stage at this time where now the electric division services an area from Digby County to Halifax, the areas of Cumberland County above Truro along the Fundy shore to Economy Mountain; along the Northumberland Strait Shore to Pugwash. I feel that any move that is made now to combine the electric and transit divisions of the Company would terrifically react from those outlying areas outside of the City of Halifax."

Alderman Lane: "What you are suggesting is that the rates they are paying would be applied to the transit problem in the City of Halifax. Is that what you are suggesting?"

Mr. Harrington: "That is what would happen if they were combined as one utility."

Alderman Lane: "I am not an expert accountant but can't such things be pro-rated?"

Mr. Harrington: "To Halifax alone?"

Alderman Lane: "Yes."

Mr. Harrington: "That would be possible. At the moment we separate the electric revenue from Halifax City alone and we pay a gross revenue tax to the City from the electric operations of 5%. We can separate the Halifax revenue to that extent."

Alderman Lane: "Then, it would not reflect on the rates in the other parts of the province."

Mr. Harrington: "We can separate the revenue accounting-wise. Whether the Public Utilities Board would, under the terms of the Public Utilities Act, feel that there should be one set of electric rates in the City of Halifax

Council,
March 17, 1960

to support transit by an indirect taxation is something I cannot comment on. It would be something for their judgment."

Alderman Lloyd: "When do we reach the point in our consideration of the Cosgrove, Monti Report where the feasibility of some public inducement to extend the service might be considered? I believe Mr. Harrington said it would be mid-summer."

Mr. Harrington: "I would suggest that at that meeting in line with the Cosgrove, Monti Report, we should strive to get the transit system with services designed to meet the demands of what the people themselves are willing to pay."

Alderman Lloyd: "Cosgrove, Monti have made a series of recommendations and the end result of which is to restore the Company's operation to an economic and possible position. Before you have knowledge and experience with these changes, it is rather difficult for the City to talk to you about the extension of service on a subsidized basis. On the other hand, I think it is correct that we would like to talk to you about it and we want to get there as quickly as we can. We are just trying to find out if June or July would be a probable date?"

Mr. Harrington: "I would hope that we would get to it by then. As I mentioned, at the Finance and Executive Committee, we would like to get to a brief we have before the City with regard to traffic recommendations. There are some suggestions in the Cosgrove, Monti Report where we may be able to save expenses if we can run our coaches more quickly and we can't judge how quickly we can run them until we have the answer on the traffic brief."

Alderman Lloyd: "The door is not closed to the City making some arrangement where we think public service at public expense is desirable."

Mr. Harrington: "Oh, no."

His Worship the Mayor: "Why could not your Board be engaged in the study of possible extensions cost-wise and have them come to us as soon as possible. There is no reason why we should wait for all these things to be processed."

Council,
March 17, 1960

Mr. Harrington: "I would think if we could have some idea on the traffic recommendations within a month, then I would think within six weeks' time that we would be in a position to be able to talk in much more finite terms. At the moment, I hesitate to talk too much because I don't know where we are going until some of these other moves are made."

His Worship the Mayor: "The only area really suffering from the lack of trolley coach service is the northwest end of the City: Windsor Street-Connaught Avenue area and also the outer end of Bayers Road where they are only served by No. 10 on a transfer point at the corner of Bayers Road and Connaught Avenue. Would your Company undertake now to study proposals to improve the service in these areas and have the report ready for us when we are ready to give you an answer on the traffic?"

Mr. Harrington: "I hate to talk on the subject when I have not all the facts with me. On the part of the Company, we are interested in knowing the greatest wish of the people. We have not been sitting back refusing to look at any possible extensions. The one mentioned here tonight with regard to industry, we have looked at it and the possible way we might do it. We have also looked at the problem that has been suggested with respect to route No. 4 where it should go out Bayers Road. One reason we held back on that is that it would cost \$600.00 per day extra. We said maybe there is a compromise which is still going to cost something extra and that is to extend No. 4 along Connolly Street from Bayers Road to Windsor Street and at that time, cease to turn the No. 4 at the corner of Bayers Road and Connaught Avenue but to run every second No. 4 along Connolly Street to Windsor Street, with the alternate coach going out Bayers Road to Howe Avenue. We have always hesitated replacing the No. 10 with a No. 4 because in our traffic study, about half the people travelling on the No. 10 go straight across town to the Shipyards. With this alternate that I suggest here tonight for study, I suggest we leave No. 10 on Bayers Road and have additional service with every second coach from route No. 4 with the alternate coach getting into this Windsor Street area which has been evidenced here tonight by these people. That may be something worthwhile

Council,
March 17, 1960

to leave with the Public Hearing tonight because it may bring further comment and help us in our study at a later date. The other difficulty we have in looking at extensions in that area is the question of Bicentennial Drive. We do not know yet and I do not believe you know yet, as to how that is going to come in. If it comes in the Bayers Road area, it is going to cause, during a period of construction, traffic disruption; therefore, we would be very hesitant to make a route change in that area. Trying to point up traffic on that route, if we were going to do it just before a possible construction project which would cause traffic disruption on the route, itself, when we could not give good service on it and the people we are trying to attract to a new route, would become fed up with it in the early stages and never patronize it properly. I think that timing must be considered as very important when we discuss this with respect to Bicentennial Drive."

His Worship the Mayor: "What thought has your Company given to the known fact that there is going to be a major shopping centre built on the old St. Patrick's Home property?"

Mr. Harrington: "Something will have to be done. We have talked to some of the interests that are concerned with it and they are interested in coach service. At the present time our No. 4 and No. 5 coaches turn in front of Simpson's on private property. Those two routes, with the position of this new shopping centre could be re-routed, provided we could get certain rights-of-way over private property, in such a way that they could serve the new shopping centre. Mumford Road, I don't believe, would handle trolley coach operations in its present width."

Alderman Lloyd: "The Company says, in essence, that guided by the Cosgrove, Monti Report, it is not economical to consider any extensions at the moment; however, with these changes they want to study the effect of these changes on their operations; then, they also indicate that if public authority is willing to offer some inducement, the Company is willing to look at it to extend services where public necessity and convenience may warrant it."

Mr. Harrington: "The present contract with the City is a partnership and you share the profit with the Company, if there is any. We feel now that

Council,
March 17, 1960

we are into a loss operation, that we should investigate whether we should look at sharing the loss or whether we should drive rates up to the point where diminishing returns are going to abandon the transit system."

His Worship the Mayor: "This year you are paying in taxes \$60,000.00 more than you did last year. Some of the light utility the City shares in it. In this way the general citizens share in the benefits insofar as the Company is concerned. I see, myself, no reason why, in part, we should not turn the benefits back to the citizens in the form of better service."

Alderman Lloyd: "The relationship with the Corporation, tax-wise, will have to be reviewed as quickly as possible."

His Worship the Mayor: "The travelling public is not using the coaches in the evening hours and one of the recommendations in the Cosgrove, Monti Report is that the Company should reduce the number of coaches travelling the streets after these hours and in this way, tighten up and make it possible for the City and the Company to agree upon an extension of routes."

Mr. Harrington: "I would suggest that the recommendations we have brought forth with respect to the Belt Line and these, are certainly much less in curtailment as compared to their recommendations."

ROUTE NO. 8

Headways were then read.

No persons wished to be heard on this route.

ROUTE NO. 10

Headways were then read.

Mr. Eric Murray, representing the Pinehurst Civic Improvement Association, addressed Council with respect to the No. 10 route as follows: "The service was originally a 40-minute service in that area but through the co-operation of the Company, it has developed the No. 10 route to a point where we have 10-minute service during rush hours daily, including Saturdays; 40-minute service on Sunday and 20-minute service through the rest of the week other than the rush hours. We are opposed to any cutting down of the service in that area. There are more shopping people and children travelling

Council,
March 17, 1960

in and out of the City on Saturday. It is just as vital and necessary as it is during the rest of the week. We would like to see the No. 4 coach come down from Connaught Avenue to Howe Avenue. The Cosgrove, Monti Report specifically recommends that the No. 4 be brought down Bayers Road to the turning point at Howe Avenue where the No. 10 now makes its turn. There is one suggestion we have made on previous occasions to the Company which has never been considered as far as I know by Cosgrove, Monti, and that is to take the No. 10 instead of running it north on Barrington Street and up to Highland Park and turning it at the corner of Robie Street, would be to turn the No. 10 south on Barrington Street from Russell Street which will still serve the Shipyard people and then turn at George Street somewhat in the manner of the No. 11. That would give the people in the northwest area direct service from the Bayers Road area right to the heart of the City on George Street. I believe the running time would be about the same. It can be done without additional coaches or personnel. It is most maddening to reach the corner of Connaught Avenue on a No. 4 and be told you have to transfer to a No. 10, to find one No. 4 with the operator sitting and waiting for instructions as to what he is going to do, not one minute but up to 15 and 20 minutes. During the rush hours, you will find as many as 2 and 3 No. 4's waiting there. At least, they could send them down during the rush hours and during the evening hours, perhaps every second one. These are some suggestions which I think could be given thought by the Company officials in considering the service today. With respect to the service itself, I have listened to various questions from the Aldermen and the replies from Mr. Harrington. It strikes me that basically, it is very close to the old question of will the Public Utility be operated for the benefit of the public at large or for profit only and the benefit of the shareholders. I submit that the transit system is badly needed and serves the public. I think that is the motive that should predominate when considering the operation of the Company. By extension of the route, you are going to serve the primary purpose and that is service to the public. It is true that has to be paid for. I know I don't have an answer as to how

Council,
March 17, 1960

it can be paid for. I was never aware of the background as to why the profits from the light and power division could not be applied to the transit division. I never knew why; it is quite interesting. I may say that every time we approach the Company, we have always received courteous replies and have had a measure of co-operation."

Mr. Jack Kane, 239½ Almon Street, President of the Trolley Coach Operators Union, addressed Council as follows: "The first thing we find insofar as transit is concerned, is the traffic. The downtown streets, the avenues leading in and out of the City of Halifax are so crammed with parking that it is almost impossible, at times, to make the headways as recommended by the Company. I feel if we were given freer access to the City streets, we could come up with a much better service than we have been giving in the past couple of years. I speak on behalf of the operators as a whole. We have a good transit system and we are proud of it. It has been deteriorating to a point where our passengers are leaving us through one curse and that is the pooling of cars which means that transit must suffer a loss. We should consider the matter of subsidization. I know it is not a nice word to use but if we are going to look after the people in the City of Halifax; if we are going to give them the extensions they need and we know that they should have, the only way they can get it is to pay for it and through subsidization. We know that the service in the northwest end, although not up to a par with the downtown area, could be improved if the people will stand behind us and the City Council will give us some support, and share the loss program or give us subsidization."

He then said that the housewives would prefer to do their shopping at the shopping centre where under one roof there are approximately twenty to twenty-five stores, rather than the downtown area. As far as the trolley coach operators were concerned, they urged that the City strongly look after traffic conditions to the best of its ability; and if necessary, they felt the transit system should be subsidized.

Council,
March 17, 1960

Alderman O'Brien: "The question comes to my mind when listening to Mr. Harrington as to whether it is necessary to postpone any extensions of service until all the so-called superfluous parts of the service are cut out. The recommendations of the Cosgrove, Monti Report suggest sufficient cutting in service to eliminate quite a number of operators. It would be foolish to get to the point where you are eliminating operators temporarily and then extend the service and have to bring them back. The whole thing could be co-ordinated with some extensions going into effect at the same time as some of the curtailments of the unnecessary parts of the service take place. About three years ago I talked to an official of the transit service about the possibility of serving this north Windsor Street area and his answer, at that time, was that it would not be an efficient route then, although if they could go up Oxford Street through the Army Property to Windsor Street and back, that that might be a sufficiently efficient service from the physical viewpoint that perhaps could be economical. I see the School Board is looking for property in that area and I am just wondering whether it still isn't possible for the City, in the interests of the partnership, to press upon the Federal authorities the possibility of extending that street. The transit authorities may prefer Connolly Street; but in any case, I am prompted to ask whether Mr. Harrington has given any consideration to the possibility of a route that would go out Bayers Road and along Howe Avenue to the Overpass, in Kempt Road and Windsor Street to Oxford Street, or Connolly Street, as a northwest loop on the No. 4 line? I would think my position as being in favor of providing what service we can afford, I accept the basic concept that Mr. Murray has put forward, that a public utility has to provide service; but there is a limit as to how much subsidization one way or another can be made possible. I would like to see further consideration of the tax, if you like, on the power rates as a means of supplying additional funds to the transit authority. I think this has been done in at least one other Canadian city within the last year or so. I think we should be exploring all these possibilities in order

Council,
March 17, 1960

to make this thing work without putting a burden on the property tax rate because I don't think that kind of a tax rate can afford subsidization of a transit system."

Alderman Lloyd referred to the wording of the Public Utilities Act and stated: "Public finance is complicated enough. The issue is simple. If we feel that a public service cannot survive in private hands under the conditions that exist; and if we are faced, in a temporary period of subsidizing, then let us go to it and use the facilities of the Company and work with them. They have the knowledge, experience and a trained staff. It may be with a subsidized system, an extension of the service which we can do by helping them out, you might recapture the riders in time."

Mr. Kenneth Butler, representing the Bayers Road Shopping Centre Limited and the merchants in the Association, addressed Council as follows:

"Actually, we are very concerned with our transportation because it does represent business to us. The survival of our shopping centre represents a large income to the City in the form of taxes in their annual revenue. We are young in the Bayers Road Shopping Centre and we need every assistance possible to bring us through the growing years. At present, we survive mainly on our Friday night and Saturday business. Our week day business is actually very low. Downtown, is enjoying the office worker and the downtown workers' business, City Hall people, etc., during which time we are very quietly standing out there on the outskirts of Halifax. We're happy about this situation and we're not complaining to any great extent; but we wish to point out that we are providing to the City of Halifax a tax revenue and we're turning over, you might say, a packaged unit. In other words, we are a community within a community; we are providing our own parking, as business rates would be in the City; we are removing our own snow; we are maintaining our own lighting system; and I understand, our own Police protection during certain periods of time when we have maximum business. All in all, we would ask City Council to consider it this way: that we're young; we're growing; and we need help and we would ask City Council in the same manner that they are looking forward to helping the downtown merchants by providing them with

Council,
March 17, 1960

the necessity of downtown parking, which we are not opposing, if they would consider that in the same manner and provide us with other privileges such as the proper transit service."

ROUTE NO. 3

Headways were then read.

Alderman Lloyd: "I think we should be fair that we are expressing the opinions of Council but we still have to go before the Board of Public Utilities. What it means, if we approve of it, the Council, as such, will not be making representation against the proposal before the Board, although any citizen or group of citizens still have the right to do so if they wish."

No persons wished to be heard with respect to Route No. 3 and it was agreed to accept the proposed changes in the headways.

ROUTE NO. 7

Headways were then read.

No persons wished to be heard.

The proposed changes were then approved.

ROUTE NO. 8

Headways were then read.

No persons wished to be heard.

The proposed changes were then approved.

ROUTE NO. 10

His Worship the Mayor: "With respect to No. 10 route, I think the observations made by Mr. Murray are correct. In the Cosgrove, Monti Report, they recommend that the No. 10 route terminate at the Highland Park loop during business hours and terminate at Richmond loop during the remaining portion of the day. The section from Connaught Avenue to Howe Avenue could transfer to route No. 4. With respect to route No. 4, they recommend that it be extended to the Howe Avenue loop - the present terminus of route No. 10. This is not an extension of the physical plant but merely the extension of service by the trolley coaches because the overhead wires are presently in this location west of Connaught Avenue on Bayers Road. This item might well be deferred for

Council,
March 17, 1960

further discussion.

"Mr. Harrington, in the light of the representations made here tonight and in the light of the fact that the Cosgrove, Monti Report does recommend some changes there, would you be prepared to withdraw the No. 10 changes at this time?"

Mr. Harrington: "No, sir, because I think there is one thing that has been missed in the Cosgrove, Monti recommendations. We presently run approximately 95 runs on the No. 4 route. He suggested that the No. 4 route be cut down, I believe, to 68 runs. He says in this extension that we cut 30 runs off the No. 4 which would affect the whole of that No. 4 route and give much less service than is presently being given. I don't think we can take 30 runs off the present No. 4 route for the sake of running it out to Howe Avenue. I think that would be too great a curtailment on the No. 4 route as a whole."

His Worship the Mayor: "The present run is 98. In the Cosgrove, Monti Report they proposed 65 - a difference of 33. You did make changes in the No. 4 route, did you not?"

Mr. Harrington: "Yes, we increased the No. 4."

His Worship the Mayor: "In that case then, you're making more than 98 rounds."

Mr. Harrington: "That is right; 20 more runs which would be 118."

His Worship the Mayor: "Sixty-five was recommended by Cosgrove, Monti."

Mr. Harrington: "You can see the effect that if we do that, we'll have to go back into the whole thing and start afresh."

Alderman O'Brien: "I would like to ask Mr. Harrington if he can tell us the anticipated savings from this Saturday curtailment of the No. 10?"

Mr. Harrington: "I don't know that exactly but I would say the anticipated savings from this whole group we have brought in tonight is in the vicinity of \$30,000.00. I gave \$600.00 a day to run the No. 4's out to Howe Avenue and that amounts to \$180,000.00 in a year. You can see the weight of these figures and why we are so hesitant. Our present cash loss and when I

Council,
March 17, 1960

say a cash loss of \$28,000.00 in 1959, that means to put it in one term; in order to pay our operators' wages, we had to obtain \$28,000.00 from some other source. We did not have any return on the capital employed in the Transit Division at all. We were short by \$28,000.00 which had to come from the Company. It has been suggested by the Company that we have talked not on subsidy but of a share of the loss - a partnership. We are still willing, hoping that this transit situation will clear up, to maintain our position as a corporate citizen and to take responsibility even though we are not getting the return on the capital that people have loaned us to buy the trolley coaches and so on, and must have the interest on their money."

Alderman O'Brien: "Can you tell us the number of passengers on Saturday compared to the other days to substantiate this recommendation?"

Mr. Harrington: "I don't have these figures with me but when it is mentioned about peak hours and shopping, I do have one figure in my mind. On a normal traffic check 250 people, that would be 125 people or 250 total rides, have been counted as an average day's riding into the shopping centre. We have noticed that it's a very definite thing and anybody can notice that during the peak hours on a Saturday, there is not a 'peak' on that system. The coaches are not crowded to any extent. For instance, if you look out the window tonight at this time and look at the No. 3 coaches or any coaches going along Barrington Street, those coaches may have three people on them. That's a lot of equipment and a lot of expense to carry three people. It would be cheaper for us to pay those three people to send them in a taxi than to run coaches on the street."

Alderman Lloyd: "I'm afraid that when we get into this type of discussion, we're going perhaps beyond the function of the City Council. I think the first thing is to find out what public views were held on solid grounds with respect to these proposals; to provide this opportunity for a Public Hearing so that citizens affected may prepare themselves, if they feel they have a case, after hearing this, to present themselves to the Board of Public Utilities. We may have this responsibility, in that our Legal branch might be instructed to assist any group of citizens in the presentation of their case to make sure that all the evidence is fully presented before the Board on any change which may be in