

Council,
March 17, 1960

doubt. I don't know whether we can do that or not. I am a little confused about the role of the Board of Public Utilities and our own role. It is conceivable that there would be differences of opinion between the Council and the Company on some matters. If we're going to resolve them, then we're supplanting the Board of Public Utilities' function. I think all we can do is to give ample opportunity for publicity and for citizens to express themselves, and then see what we can do to assist them to have their case fully and properly presented to the Board of Public Utilities. I think that may be our function. I don't know and I'd be happy if I could be corrected on it if I am wrong."

His Worship the Mayor: "I would be reluctant for the City to provide legal assistance or counsel to any particular group of citizens. I think that when we go representing the City to the Board, we're properly discharging the function of the Corporation of the City of Halifax; but when we offer to lend the services of any one of our staff for submission to the Board, I think it is a misuse."

Alderman O'Brien: "It seems to me that we should at least defer this item until the Company produces the figures which would show the amount of saving that is involved in this particular item, and the relative passenger load on week days and Saturday. Surely, these are figures that they must have to be making a recommendation like this. I would prefer to reserve judgment about what our position should be before the Board of Public Utilities until I have seen those figures."

His Worship the Mayor: "Mr. Harrington, can you tell us how many coaches are engaged in providing the 10-minute service on the No. 10 route during rush hours?"

Mr. Jack Kane: "I think I can answer that. Four coaches are required with a 40-minute round trip and a 10-minute headway."

His Worship the Mayor: "What is the minimum time a man is required to be paid when he is called out to do that type of work? How many hours?"

Mr. Jack Kane: "I'm not sure but it is somewhere in the vicinity of eight hours a day. For example, they go out for $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours in the morning, $2\frac{1}{2}$

Council,
March 17, 1960

at noon, and 2 hours in the evening."

His Worship the Mayor: "So there would be three extra men engaged in this run."

Mr. Kane: "Two extra."

His Worship the Mayor: "There are two men presently on the run?"

Mr. Kane: "Two regular coaches and two extra go out."

His Worship the Mayor: "That means sixteen man hours a day."

Mr. Harrington: "I could give you an approximate figure. It would be in the vicinity of \$60.00 a day that we would save on route No. 10; if you take 52 weeks in a year, you're up over \$3,000.00."

Alderman O'Brien: "What about the figures on passenger riding on Saturday?"

Mr. Harrington: "No, sir. It's most difficult under our system to get actual passengers on a particular route on the way statistics on the whole service are maintained. It has been from an observation of our Inspectors who advise us that the coaches in that area are lightly loaded, just the same as our mention of the route No. 3."

His Worship the Mayor: "Certainly, the claim of Mr. Butler with respect to the No. 10 route on the hours of 6:48 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. would not apply. Surely, people are not travelling to your shopping centre before 9:00 in the morning."

Mr. Butler: "The workers are."

His Worship the Mayor: "To your shopping centre?"

Mr. Butler: "Yes, the employees are suffering badly."

His Worship the Mayor: "On Saturday?"

Mr. Butler: "Yes, Northern Electric, G. & M. Murphy Limited, General Electric, etc."

His Worship the Mayor: "They are on a five-day week, aren't they? These proposed changes affect Saturday only."

Mr. Butler: "That would affect only the employees of the shopping centre."

Council,
March 17, 1960

Alderman Macdonald: "One question occurred to me. One or two persons spoke tonight about having to wait considerable time for trolley coaches to come along and I gathered from that that the coaches were late in arriving at a designated point. I was wondering how much the downtown area, which during the week days is mostly congested with traffic; does that contribute to the slowing-up of the trolley coach operations and what it would possibly be on the whole financial picture? That might be a difficult question to answer; but if there is a considerable slowing up in the downtown area, I suppose it would be quite evident by the officials and they could possibly check that, or know just about how much."

His Worship the Mayor: "The Company makes this claim, that with our present traffic regulations, allowing parking on many streets in the downtown area, that it is unlikely that the Company will be able to maintain this schedule as laid down even now, without some change in our traffic laws."

Alderman Lloyd: "I suppose we could agree to disagree and say to the Company that 'We, from the evidence we have here tonight, we would have some doubts and would suggest that you take your case to the Board and that the City will have its legal representation examining the evidence that is put before it on these two matters - routes No. 4 and No. 10'. Even if we attempt to unravel it tonight and have another meeting, we're still faced with going into the whole problem of transportation and all the related matters. It seems to me that if we can't reach an agreement here, the best thing for us to do is to say to the Company 'We have a disagreement on these two; you present them to the Board but the City will have legal representation there to see that the matter is fully and properly examined'. Otherwise, I'm afraid we're getting into a function which is not ours."

MOVED by Alderman Dunlop, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the City Council make no recommendations with respect to the No. 10 route.

His Worship the Mayor: "Will we instruct our Solicitor to appear on behalf of the City?"

Council,
March 17, 1960

Alderman Dunlop: "I think at this Public Hearing you can't really decide the issue. It's a good thing to give the people a chance to express their opinions but actually, this is a matter for a great deal of detailed study with figures, facts and everything. My observation, and I'm a trolley coach rider; a great many people in this room are not, I see people going by Coburg Road every day, hundreds of cars with only one person. I am satisfied that the Company is making every effort to continue and provide good service. I think the Company gets full value from its operators from the good will they build up for the Company perhaps in other fields. I think they are doing a good job; but I don't think here, tonight, that we can judge whether or not we should say to the Company 'For 125 people going to the shopping centre one way, and 125 coming back, you should spend the sum of \$60.00 a day'. I think it's a matter for the Board. I don't think we should instruct our Solicitor either way. The Board of Public Utilities is a Board that is set up to deal with this type of thing. They don't take sides, either for the Company or with the Court, and they have to be satisfied. That's the reason I feel that we should make no recommendations about the No. 10 route at this time."

Alderman Lloyd: "Has the Board of Public Utilities changed its function? Does it initiate action on its own as it conducts all its investigations? Does it not use any longer any Solicitors from the Attorney-General's Department in rate hearing cases? Does the Company not have its Solicitors present at Public Hearings? I think they do. The suggestion that they function as a Court indicates, I think, that if we feel from what has been presented to us tonight as citizens, our responsibility first and last is to the citizens. We are the representatives of the citizens in the partnership. We are not the partnership; the citizens are the partnership with the Company, and we represent them. If we have a facility at our command to assist them in presenting their case, we should decide to do so. As I see it, there is sufficient doubt on this matter tonight, and to expedite it, I think, that we should instruct our Solicitor to attend at the hearing."

Council,
March 17, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "When does the Board meet, Mr. Harrington?"

Mr. Harrington: "If I might be able to clarify an item for you, sir. With respect to the changes we made in the Belt Line, etc. we then appeared before the Board of Public Utilities and suggested to them that there would be further changes coming. Normally, the Board had not laid down the headways on the coaches because with traffic and everything, they are not an exact thing in any case, and they had rather in the past given the Company the flexibility; they have determined the routes, they determined the stops and they determined the fares, and under the terms of the Public Utility Act, require us to give adequate service. We went to the Board of Public Utilities on the Belt Line change suggesting to them that we were making a change in headways and, in that case, actually the abandonment of a route during certain periods of the day, which we are not doing in this particular case, but just changing headways, suggesting that there would be further changes coming, we would like to consider all the changes as being experimental. We have evidence on the existing headways. We would gather evidence on the travel that would occur with these changes being made mainly on an experimental measure. At some time when we get into route changes such as will come on the No. 4 in question, then we will have one grand hearing to confirm the changes that are experimental or change them back again and go into the whole matter at that time. At this time, that would be the Company's motion to the Board of Public Utilities that we would once again be making some headway changes on an experimental basis and it would be subject to review at a later date when we have further evidence to support the changes. We, in coming to the City, are not asking you at this moment to make any representation to anyone; but, because we have joined in the discussion of the Cosgrove, Monti Report, we have said that any changes we propose to make, we will bring to you and find out whether you agree that they're in line with the Report and what we should do. Then, when it comes a time that is proper to hear the whole thing in a proper manner before the Board of Public Utilities, we suggested that we would not, on the basis of evidence, probably take anything to the Board in disagreement as we

Council,
March 17, 1960

would hope as this is a partnership, that on the final analysis and roundup of this thing, that we could go jointly. I hope that we may still reach that point but our present submission to the Board will be that we will suggest to them that we intend to make amendments in our headways on an experimental basis, on headways that have not been laid down by them as yet in factual form, and when we have information as to the result of these changes, at some time, we will ask for a Public Hearing on our motion to clear up the whole thing. Whether the Board will accept that or not, I cannot speak for them."

Alderman Lloyd: "In other words, Mr. Harrington, you, on your own motion and I think on your own action, will go before the Board and there, Mr. Mayor, the Company asks that this matter be treated as a temporary matter only."

Mr. Harrington: "That is right. We're not going to take any wires down with this and we're not going to sell any coaches; so if it doesn't work, we can put it right back again."

Alderman Lloyd: "That's all the more reason why I think the matter should go to the Board on any questions that are in doubt."

His Worship the Mayor: "There appears to be some doubt about this matter here tonight in the minds of some Aldermen and some members of the Council, that the motion of Alderman Dunlop would be to the effect that the City take no action with respect to route No. 10."

Alderman Lloyd: "What is our responsibility to citizens who ask for action? I think that we must go on the principle that we are representing the citizens as a partnership Corporation."

Alderman Wyman: "I want to ask, in the first place, if the proposed headways on the No. 10 route are those as proposed in the Cosgrove, Monti Report? In other words, is this, so far as it applies to the No. 10 route, a direct implementation of the recommendations set in it?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, it is not."

Alderman Wyman: "Did they make any recommendations with regard to changing headways on that route?"

Council,
March 17, 1960

Mr. Harrington: "One of the main changes in the Cosgrove, Monti Report with respect to the No. 10 route was the suggestion of the turning at the Richmond loop. They suggested with that turning that the people in Duffus Street and north Barrington Street can use the No. 3's. To turn at the Richmond loop does not actually save money because you would leave the coach there sitting for the time to hit the headway in there. Therefore, we felt that we would be doing a disservice to that group of people in the north end of Barrington Street and on Duffus Street, and we felt it was too strict a curtailment. This is a compromise on our part."

Alderman Wyman: "That was a part of what I wanted to come to. The other part was the representations which were made with regard to the No. 10 route here tonight; they have been largely, although not entirely, with regard to an extension of the No. 4 route service to areas which are not now served and so on, which actually do not apply directly to the matter which will be presented to the Board of Public Utilities and which, to me, appear to be a separate question which, either we might make an application to the Board of Public Utilities on behalf of the citizens, or we might deal with the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company Limited to have them, as quickly as possible, make representation along those lines. In any case, the great weight of the Public Hearing has been concerned, not with the matter of the No. 10 route having slightly less service through certain hours of Saturdays, as they have had to do with other matters which are not included in this. I'm wondering if we're not sort of confusing the thinking by not sticking strictly to what is going to appear before the Board of Public Utilities in the way of an application from the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company Limited."

His Worship the Mayor: "In the first three routes - Nos. 3, 7, and 8, the City will not appear nor make any representations. The only matter under discussion is the No. 10."

Alderman Lloyd: "We make no recommendations; does that mean that we don't approve of the proposal?"

Council,
March 17, 1960

Alderman Trainor: "I think we should agree with the Company proposal or be against it."

His Worship the Mayor: "As we were in the first three items."

Alderman Trainor: "That is right."

His Worship the Mayor: "The only way to do that is to vote down this motion and to have another motion come up."

MOVED IN AMENDMENT by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that City Council recommend to the Board of Public Utilities against the proposed changes on route Nos. 4 and 10 and that the City Solicitor be instructed to so convey the reasons as expressed here tonight to the Board.

Alderman Wyman: "Does this include No. 4 in the proposals?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No. 10 only."

Alderman Lloyd: "Alright, No. 10."

His Worship the Mayor stated that the amendment was contrary to the motion. He therefore ruled it out of order.

The motion was then put and lost, four voting for the same and eight against it as follows:

FOR THE MOTION - Aldermen DeWolf, Dunlop, Wyman and O'Brien.

AGAINST IT - Aldermen Abbott, Lane, Macdonald, Butler, Fox, Trainor, Lloyd, Connolly.

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that City Council advise the Board of Public Utilities that we are against any changes as proposed with respect to route No. 10 and that we instruct our Solicitor to attend the hearing and express the City's opposition to the proposed changes.

His Worship the Mayor: "What grounds do you propose to give to the Solicitor?"

Alderman Trainor: "We may not oppose the proposal by the Company at some future date when they come in with increased services in the north and

Council,
March 17, 1960

northwest ends of the City. We may be in complete agreement with their proposals."

Alderman Dunlop: "As I heard Mr. Harrington speak, he said that they would make no application to the Board of Public Utilities at this time unless the City was in agreement."

Alderman Lloyd: "As I understood Mr. Harrington, when I asked him the question, the Company would make a motion to have a temporary change in service. All we're asking our Solicitor is to oppose this proposal to make a temporary change in the service. The Board will decide the matter."

Alderman Lane: "I would like to suggest that perhaps with Aldermen Lloyd's and Trainor's permission, that they temper their motion - instead of making it 'against', which sounds as if we're militantly opposed, to phrase it 'that the City is not in agreement with the application of the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company Limited for changes in headways on this route at this time'."

The suggestion of Alderman Lane was agreed to by mover and seconder.

The motion then read as follows:

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that City Council advise the Board of Public Utilities that the City is not in agreement with the application of the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company Limited for changes in headways on this route, at this time, and that City Council instruct the City Solicitor to attend the hearing and express the City's opposition to the proposed changes.

His Worship the Mayor: "Mr. Harrington, as I recall on several occasions here, that you said you would treat the City as a partner in this operation, and that you would not be inclined to go to the Board with anything unless the Council provided full approval. In light of this, would you not consider tonight the withdrawal of the proposal as far as No. 10 is concerned, to allow the City to further discuss the matter with you and perhaps reach some other conclusion?"

Mr. Harrington: "Yes, sir, we will do that."

Council,
March 17, 1960

The application was then withdrawn by the Company.

The motion was then withdrawn.

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

9:40 p.m. Council reconvened, the following members being present:

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

PUBLIC HEARING RE: TO LAY DOWN THE OFFICIAL STREET LINES OF CLYDE STREET FROM DRESDEN ROW TO BRENTON STREET AS SHOWN ON SECTION 17-C OF THE OFFICIAL CITY PLAN

A Public Hearing into the matter of laying down the Official Street Lines of Clyde Street from Dresden Row to Brenton Street, as shown on Section 17-C of the Official City Plan was held at this time.

No persons appeared for or against the proposal.

A formal Resolution as prepared by the City Solicitor was submitted.

A lady asked if Birmingham Street was included in this proposal.

His Worship the Mayor: "This proposal is an extension of Clyde Street through to Brenton Street. That is all that is before us tonight."

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

PUBLIC HEARING RE: TO RELOCATE THE WESTERN OFFICIAL STREET LINE OF ROBIE STREET BETWEEN YOUNG STREET AND LIVINGSTONE STREET AS SHOWN ON SECTION 6-E OF THE OFFICIAL CITY PLAN

A Public Hearing into the matter of relocating the Western Official Street Line of Robie Street between Young Street and Livingstone Street, as shown on Section 6-E of the Official City Plan, was held at this time.

No persons appeared for or against the proposal.

A formal Resolution as prepared by the City Solicitor was submitted.

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

PUBLIC HEARING RE: TO LAY DOWN AND REMOVE A PORTION OF THE OFFICIAL STREET LINE AT THE NORTHWESTERN CORNER OF QUINPOOL ROAD AND ROBIE STREET AS SHOWN ON SECTION 14-B OF THE OFFICIAL CITY PLAN

A Public Hearing into the matter of laying down and removing a portion of the Official Street Line at the Northwestern corner of Quinpool Road and

Council,
March 17, 1960

Robie Street, as shown on Section 14-B of the Official City Plan, was held at this time.

A formal Resolution as prepared by the City Solicitor was submitted.

The Planning Officer explained the proposal for the information of the Council and pointed out the corner as shown on a plan submitted.

Mr. B. A. Gaffen addressed Council as follows:

"Some two years ago we acquired a portion of Robie Street and it is zoned commercial. At the time we bought it, it was bought for the purpose of erecting an office building. We checked with the City, I think it was with the Town Planner at the time, and we were assured we could build on the whole lot as commercial. The question arose later, within the last few months, when we decided to go ahead with the construction. If we have to go back ten feet on Robie Street, we will be losing that whole portion of Robie Street in construction, which would cover considerable territory; in fact, it would make it not practical to go ahead with the building."

His Worship the Mayor: "Your plan was to build right to the street line on Robie Street?"

Mr. Gaffen: "Yes, right to the street line on Robie Street, as we are entitled to do normally with commercial properties."

His Worship the Mayor: "Quinpool Road would be the same way?"

Mr. Gaffen: "Yes, it would be. On Robie Street, in that particular block, there are two non-conforming uses: (1) a funeral parlor; and a grocery store."

His Worship the Mayor: "Do you mean in the whole block from Quinpool Road to Cunard Street?"

Mr. Gaffen: "Yes. In that block there are two non-conforming uses and two very substantial buildings. If we came back ten feet from the street, we would be back with a portion with a dark corner, where the street line comes now. These houses are not ten feet from the street and I don't think any on that street are ten feet from the street. We would have a dark corner there which would create a considerable nuisance."

Council,
March 17, 1960

Alderman Trainor: "I wonder if we could have the size of that particular lot in question. I'm more interested in the figure from east to west on the north boundary line of that property."

Mr. Munnich: "The depth of the lot is 65 feet to the street line."

Alderman Trainor: "Our proposal then is that we are going to cut 10 feet off the 65-foot part to give the 55-foot depth or width for construction purposes."

Mr. Munnich: "That is right."

Mr. Gaffen: "At that stage, we would have a piece of land-10 feet-which would be absolutely of no use to us whatsoever in a commercial undertaking. As I said before, when we bought this our plans were to cover the complete land with a building. So far as Robie Street is concerned, I'm not sure exactly how much is to be taken in on our land on Robie Street. I checked with the Engineers' Department today and I think it is 20 feet."

Mr. Munnich: "There is a triangular piece involved."

His Worship the Mayor: "Do you mean square feet?"

Mr. Gaffen: "No, 20 feet off the frontage."

Mr. Munnich: "Yes, it would be 20 feet."

Mr. Gaffen: "So we would be losing 20 feet frontage on Robie Street. We would then have a very odd-shaped building if we tried to put anything on that by losing 20 feet from that piece of land as it is now. At present, our plans were to cover the vacant piece of land that is there, plus a small ell on the old building; and, if this plan is approved, we can't go ahead with that at all."

His Worship the Mayor: "How big is the vacant land you refer to?"

Mr. Munnich: "20 feet wide."

His Worship the Mayor: "Along Quinpool Road, and it narrows down to what?"

Mr. Munnich: "It goes up to the narrowest corner."

His Worship the Mayor: "What is the widest point then?"

Mr. Munnich: "30 feet on the vacant land."

Council,
March 17, 1960

Mr. Gaffen: "As it is now, I understand the plan is to come right to the corner of the building."

Mr. Munnich: "Yes, to the corner of the existing building."

Alderman Lloyd: "The existing building on your land."

Mr. Gaffen: "Yes, on our land, so that we would have nothing left on the frontage except the ell that we planned on using. There is a small ell of about 10 feet."

His Worship the Mayor: "Isn't a lot of this coming about because you're maintaining an existing residence on the property in a commercial zone, and you want to build a building using the vacant land only and maintaining the house as a residence?"

Mr. Gaffen: "Yes."

His Worship the Mayor: "Part of this problem you are creating yourself by the continued use of the house as a residence."

Mr. Gaffen: "Yes. Otherwise, we'd have to tear the whole thing down because we have a street line of 10 feet. We'd have to build a zig-zag building."

City Manager: "If he is going to have one as a residence, plus this other building, he's going to have two buildings."

His Worship the Mayor: "You would have to acquire permission to subdivide before you got a permit to build."

Alderman O'Brien: "Are they separate buildings?"

Mr. Gaffen: "We'd extend the present building to the corner."

Alderman O'Brien: "It would have two uses."

City Manager: "It's not an addition; it's a new building. It's two buildings on one lot."

His Worship the Mayor: "That is not legal."

City Manager: "I didn't know that. I thought they were going to tear the whole thing down. Weren't you going to tear that down at one time, Mr. Gaffen?"

Mr. Gaffen: "Yes, one time we were going to tear that down but not when we last spoke to you. However, there was no objection to continuing on

Council,
March 17, 1960

with the present building but the objection was the use of the land. In any event, we would not like to lose that land. If we have to build a new building, we'll tear down the old one and build a new one."

Alderman Lloyd: "You mean, if you can't sub-divide."

Mr. Gaffen: "If we can't sub-divide and use that portion of land, we'll build a whole new building."

Alderman Macdonald: "That was the understanding I had when it was considered by the Committee on Works. I thought the old building was coming down."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, not at the present time."

Alderman Lane: "That was the way it was presented first. I agree with Alderman Macdonald because I remember that myself. I'm very familiar with that area and I know the present building that's standing there. It is a fairly old, wooden house and as it was presented to the Committee on Works originally, it was that that house would be demolished to build a building which was intended to be an office building. Is that correct?"

Mr. Gaffen: "Yes."

Alderman Trainor: "That was my impression, too."

City Manager: "I don't think it's been before the Committee on Works since that time and I think they've probably changed their plans, perhaps because of this situation."

Mr. Gaffen: "No, we've never changed our plans. It was only within the last few months that we have decided to proceed to build on this land."

City Manager: "Yes, but the plans to leave the old house have never been presented to the Committee on Works. At the time this was discussed, that building was coming down. If you now propose to leave it standing, that's something of which I didn't know anything about until tonight."

Mr. Gaffen: "No plans of the building were ever presented. When we got into the stage where we started planning to build a building on this lot, and we had the architects working on it, at that state, we were informed that there was no street line on Quinpool Road. The surveyor came up with the plan showing

Council,
March 17, 1960

no definite street line on Quinpool Road. When we tried to lay down the street line on Quinpool Road, is when this trouble arose. Up to that stage, we have never presented a complete plan."

Alderman Dunlop: "The question is, are we going to put down or change the street line. I'd like to hear the City's side why they want to take the 10 feet."

Mr. Gaffen: "In the matter of widening the street on Quinpool Road, I can't see any use in widening the street. At the present time, there are three taxis parked there. I would humbly suggest that if there were any plans on widening the street, that it come from the other side of the street, from the boulevard side."

His Worship the Mayor: "You're talking about Robie Street?"

Mr. Gaffen: "Yes. The only thing I can understand as to why they would be taking a piece off Quinpool Road would be to widen that corner. Twenty feet off our land would practically ruin the vacant part for whatever purpose we might use it".

His Worship the Mayor asked if any other persons wished to be heard but no persons appeared.

Alderman Macdonald: "I know this is a Public Hearing and I'm just wondering whether or not it could be referred back to the Town Planning Board because there was some misunderstanding. I certainly was one of those who misunderstood it. The fact that there was going to be a building there, and allowing the other building to remain, that never came to my mind. I thought the building was going to be demolished to make room for a new office building. I think it might be well for the applicant, as well as this Council, to have this matter brought before us properly and be considered by the Town Planning Board in the proper light."

Alderman Trainor: "I think that it was properly considered in the Town Planning Board. The proposal by the staff is very clear. They want a 10-foot Building Line on Robie Street and I think there is no problem. I think we should go ahead and put a 10-foot Building Line on that property on Robie Street.

Council,
March 17, 1960

We're going to have to do it some day. Let's face the problem now."

Mr. Munnich's report was then read for the information of Council.

Alderman Abbott: "What is the existing Building Line on Bilby Street to the north, as a residential part of Robie Street?"

Mr. Munnich: "Ten feet. This line isn't observed by the present buildings."

His Worship the Mayor: "Supposing some buildings were torn down and apartments erected; would they build on a new line?"

Mr. Munnich: "Yes."

His Worship the Mayor: "This is to make it uniform."

Mr. Munnich: "Yes, this is the remaining 43 feet."

Alderman DeWolf: "Does that 10-foot Building Line extend right up to Welsford Street? Is this only applying to the corner?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No. It goes right up to Cunard Street."

Alderman DeWolf: "When they lay down a new Official Street Line, why not make it a Building Line? If we lay down a new Official Line over an existing property, you have to buy the property, isn't that right?"

Alderman Lloyd: "This better go back to the Board."

Alderman DeWolf: "Is this 10-foot Building Line on Robie Street essential?"

Mr. Munnich: "There is no Building Line in the Commercial zone."

City Manager: "The only reason he is bringing this up is because the corner wasn't finished and he wants to bring the Building Line to where the commercial land begins. There are two problems. The land that we need for street purposes is zoned commercial and the Building Line is something different which arises out of the fact that there wasn't a street line there before."

Alderman DeWolf: "Why not make it a Building Line rather than an Official Street Line?"

City Manager: "Where we are putting the Official Street Line is where that corner would be improved. If it's going to be used for street purposes, we should buy it. The corner is for street purposes and the Building Line is to tidy up another situation."

Council,
March 17, 1960

Alderman DeWolf: "I didn't like to see the City get into Official Street Lines just for one spot because it does mean that if you put in the Official Line, you take away something from the owner."

City Manager: "What Mr. Gaffen is saying, in effect, is 'Don't take that commercial land for street purposes; I want to keep it for a building'. He's also saying 'Don't lay the Building Line on the residential portion because I want to use that for a building, too'."

Alderman DeWolf: "I think it's only fair, where there is a Building Line in existence in a commercial area, to have it extended in line with the others where there is one portion used commercially. In all cases, I think that should be done."

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right. It should be uniform."

Alderman Lloyd: "Is the funeral home back beyond the Building Line? It's a new construction. It's not conforming to the Building Line."

Mr. Munnich: "It's about five feet back."

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the Public Hearing be adjourned until the next regular meeting at which time Council will consider the report from the Town Planning Board. Motion passed with Aldermen Trainor and Connolly wishing to be recorded against.

PUBLIC HEARING RE: TO LAY DOWN A 10-FOOT BUILDING LINE ON THE WEST SIDE OF ROBIE STREET FROM QUINPOOL ROAD TO 46 FEET NORTHWARDLY OR TO THE EXISTING R-3 ZONE

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Fox, that the Public Hearing be adjourned until the next regular meeting at which time Council will consider the report from the Town Planning Board. Motion passed with Aldermen Trainor and O'Brien wishing to be recorded against.

Council,
March 17, 1960.

ACCOUNTS OVER \$500.00

To: His Worship, C. A. Vaughan, and Members of the City Council.

From: A. A. DeBard, Jr., City Manager.

Date: March 15, 1960.

Subject: Accounts over \$500.00.

In accordance with Section 119F of the City Charter, the following accounts are submitted for Council's approval. These accounts have been certified and audited.

| <u>Department</u> | <u>Vendor</u> | <u>Purpose</u> | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Finance | Eastern Trust Company | Superannuation Fund | \$ 3,430.38 |
| | Hillis & Sons, Limited | Manhole Frames & Covers | 2,316.33 |
| | National Cash Register Company | Maintenance Work | 1,015.70 |
| | Nova Scotia Housing Commission | City's share of cost of Mulgrave Park & Westwood Park | 2,084.74 |
| | Province of Nova Scotia | Share of capital costs, Re: Halifax Vocational School | 12,991.40 |
| Works | George Curtis | Firewood | 1,250.00 |
| | Northern Electric Company Limited | Fire Alarm Equipment | 1,020.71 |
| | Quebec & Maritimes Trading Company | Parts for Works Dept. | 513.02 |
| Health | Ralph H. Connor | Sanding floors, supply & install linoleum | 619.00 |
| Port Commission | Stevenson & Scott | Advertising & Productions | 533.56 |
| | | | <u>\$25,774.84</u> |

A. A. DeBard,
CITY MANAGER.

In answer to a question by Alderman Macdonald, the City Manager advised that the firewood was used for trying out the incinerator.

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

SETTLEMENT - ACCOUNT - R. C. A. F. BENEVOLENT FUND

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee, held on March 10,

Council,
March 17, 1960.

1960, the City Manager advised that an offer had been received from the R. C. A. F. Benevolent Fund to pay 60% of the outstanding Emergency Shelter Rental Account to February 29, 1960, amounting to \$504.00 against Mr. Roy A. Legere which amounts to \$302.40.

The Fund also offered to pay the sum of \$143.00 in settlement of the outstanding rental and hospital accounts against Emergency Shelter tenant Mr. John S. Tucker made up as follows:

1. \$117.60 on the rental account of \$196.00;
2. \$25.40 on a hospital account of \$64.00.

The City Manager recommended that these offers be accepted.

Your Committee concurs in this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman Dunlop, seconded by Alderman Wyman, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

ACCOUNT - CONCILIATION SERVICES - \$940.00 - 316 "C"

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee, held on March 10, 1960, an account amounting to \$940.00 was submitted by Mr. Allan M. Butler for services on the Board of Conciliation established to deal with the recent dispute with the Halifax Civic Workers' Union No. 108.

Your Committee recommends that the account be approved for payment and the funds provided by Section 316 "C" of the City Charter.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman DeWolf, seconded by Alderman Fox, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

FEDERAL HEALTH BURSARY - DR. JOHN TAINSH

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Public Health and Welfare Committee held on March 10, 1960, a report was submitted from the Commissioner of Health advising that Dr. John Tainsh of the Halifax Convalescent Hospital staff is applying for a correspondence course from the Canadian Hospital Association on "Hospital Organization and Management."

The fees for same can be obtained through a Federal Health Bursary and the usual forms for the guaranteeing of this type of training are required to be signed on behalf of the City.

Council,
March 17, 1960.

Your Committee recommends that the Doctor be permitted to take this course and that the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to execute the documents on behalf of the City.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

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

REHABILITATION CENTRE PAYMENTS

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Public Health and Welfare Committee, held on March 10, 1960, a report was submitted from the Commissioner of Health recommending that the following rates be charged the Rehabilitation Centre:

Per Diem Charge for In-Patients -- \$3.00
Rent for Out-Patient Section ----- \$500.00 per month.

Your Committee concurs in this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

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

SWIFT CANADIAN COMPANY LIMITED - TAX CONCESSION

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960 a report was submitted from the City Manager advising that the Swift Canadian Company Limited are arranging with Industrial Estates Limited for a new plant to make adhesives. They are interested in a tax concession similar to one granted to Puritan Cannery Limited. They quote Clause 3.07 of the Puritan Agreement which reads as follows:

*THE CITY will levy no taxes whatsoever against INDUSTRIAL or PURITAN in respect of the original lot, the adjoining lot or the fire station lot or any real or personal property thereon for the period commencing with the date of this Agreement and terminating June 30, 1970, OTHER THAN, for the period commencing July 1, 1960, and terminating June 30, 1970, a real property tax at the rate of two dollars and seventy-five cents per one hundred dollars of valuation (\$2.75 per \$100.00) on the buildings on such land valued at their cost of construction. For the purpose of this clause the cost of construction of any such building means the cost actually incurred by INDUSTRIAL or PURITAN in erecting the buildings and equipping it with the plumbing, heating and electrical facilities and the sprinkler system normal for a building of comparable

Council,
March 17, 1960.

size. It does not include the cost of any additional installations necessary or desirable to make the building suitable for the operations of a meat canning plant. Any dispute between THE CITY and INDUSTRIAL and/or PURITAN concerning the determination of such cost of construction for any such building will be settled by arbitration under the provisions of the Arbitration Act of Nova Scotia."

The building is expected to cost approximately \$75,000.00 and will employ an average of ten men.

Since the present merged rate is \$3.09, he recommended that the rate for the Agreement be set at \$3.10.

Your Committee recommends that the concession be granted and that a provision be inserted in the Agreement to the effect that should the Company cease operations that the normal tax rate will apply and that the necessary legislation be obtained.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

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

ANNUAL INCREMENTS - NURSES

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Public Health and Welfare Committee held on March 10, 1960, a report was submitted from the Commissioner of Health recommending that two nurses with Public Health Certificates and three Registered Nurses doing Public Health work receive their annual increments six months from the time the new scale came into effect, and one year from that time in future.

Your Committee concurs in this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman DeWolf, seconded by Alderman Wyman, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

WRITE-OFF - TAX CERTIFICATE - 76 STANLEY STREET - LEGISLATION

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960 a report was submitted from the Commissioner of Finance advising that a tax certificate had been issued in error in that it stated that no work was in progress; and as a result, he suggested the following write-off:

76 Stanley Street Paving \$132.00

Council,
March 17, 1960.

It was agreed to forward this matter to Council without recommendation at which time a further report would be submitted from the Commissioner concerning the matter of the work being started on August 18th and being completed on August 27th while the certificate was dated August 24th.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

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

From: L. M. Romkey, Commissioner of Finance.

Date: March 16, 1960.

Subject: Tax Certificate - No. 76 Stanley Street.

Your Worship and Aldermen:

At the Finance and Executive Committee meeting on March 10th, when we were discussing the issuing of a Tax Certificate on the property, No. 76 Stanley Street, the question was raised by one of the Aldermen, concerning the work started on August 18th and completed on August 27th, and the Tax Certificate in question which was issued on August 24th. The point the Alderman raised was, whether the work in progress from August 24th to August 27th should not be a liability of the new owner. However, in checking the wording of the Tax Certificate it states "I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT AT THE DATE OF THIS CERTIFICATE THERE IS IN PROGRESS, OR THERE HAS BEEN RECENTLY COMPLETED, THE FOLLOWING LOCAL IMPROVEMENT WORKS" and the Certificate in this particular case states "NONE" and it is signed by the proper signing officer.

There may possibly be another legal interpretation to the wording "WORK IN PROGRESS". However, may I refer you to Section 283, Sub-section 7 of the City Charter which states as follows:

"ANY CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE COLLECTOR UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THIS SECTION SHALL BE BINDING UPON THE CITY ACCORDING TO ITS TERMS, IN FAVOUR OF THE PERSON TO WHOM THE SAME WAS ISSUED AND HIS HEIRS, EXECUTORS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND HIS OR THEIR SUCCESSORS IN TITLE TO THE PROPERTY IN RESPECT OF WHICH THE CERTIFICATE WAS ISSUED".

My personal opinion is that the account should be written off.

Respectfully submitted,

L. M. Romkey,
COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE.

His Worship the Mayor: "The Commissioner of Finance did not answer the question as to whether or not the actual paving for which people are assessed was in progress at that time."

Commissioner of Finance: "Yes, the actual paving was in progress at that time."

City Manager: "By use of the dates he answered the question."

His Worship the Mayor: "It only takes one day to lay down the hot mix asphalt. The paving work was not in progress when this certificate was issued."

Council,
March 17, 1960.

Alderman Lloyd stated that there was no legal definition of the term, "Work in Progress".

His Worship the Mayor: "If there is no legal opinion, we should be set right on it."

City Solicitor: "Putting it in the tax certificate is a notice that there is work, whether it is preliminary or so on, and that there is going to be an assessment. If you don't put it in and there is a change of ownership, that part never gets apportioned, but they apportion the other taxes. It was because of these various charges turning up at different times after the property was transferred and the tax certificate was drawn to give some protection to the purchaser and vendor."

His Worship the Mayor: "Is the tax certificate signed by some responsible official in the Works Department?"

Commissioner of Works: "You can't delineate between the base for the asphalt and the asphalt. I think it is all part of the job which is assessed. The job was in progress."

His Worship the Mayor: "Someone in your office or perhaps you signed the certificate saying there was no work in progress."

Commissioner of Works: "That is true."

Alderman DeWolf: "Was the certificate given to the vendor or the purchaser?"

City Solicitor: "I don't know."

Alderman Wyman: "It seems to me that the question here of whether or not something within our internal works has gone wrong in connection with the issuance of tax certificates, is one question; but the question that is before us is whether or not this charge should be written off because of the fact that the certificate was issued. It seems to me that it is quite clear that a certificate was issued indicating to the receiver thereof that there was nothing happening at that time that was going to bring a charge against that property. The account is not an extremely large one and the charge for these certificates is intended to cover the occasional time when we lose a little bit of money by such an error."

MOVED by Alderman Wyman, seconded by Alderman DeWolf, that the account be written off and the necessary legislation obtained. Motion passed.

Council,
March 17, 1960.

WRITE OFF - TAX CERTIFICATE - 105 CHEBUCTO ROAD - LEGISLATION

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960 a report was submitted from the Commissioner of Finance advising that a tax certificate had been issued in error in that it stated that no work was in progress; and as a result, he suggested the following write-off:

105 Chebucto Road Tree \$6.00.

Your Committee recommends that the suggestion be approved and the necessary legislation be obtained.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman Wyman, seconded by Alderman DeWolf, that the account be written off and the necessary legislation obtained. Motion passed.

TENDERS - BROOM STEEL

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

From: Committee on Works.

Date: March 8, 1960.

Subject: Tenders - Broom Steel.

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date considered a tabulation of tenders for Broom Steel from the City Manager and Commissioner of Works.

Acceptance of the following tender was recommended:

Duder and Company, Limited - \$3,682.25 (lowest tender)

On motion of Alderman Macdonald, seconded by Alderman Trainor, the Committee approved the recommendation of the City Manager and Commissioner of Works and recommended it to City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. Mantin,
CLERK OF WORKS.

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

BORROWING AUTHORIZATIONS - CANCELLATIONS

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960

Council,
March 17, 1960.

a report was submitted from the City Manager recommending approval from the Department of Municipal Affairs to revoke the following borrowing balances:

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| St. Catherine's School | \$30,043.52 |
| Retaining Wall - Mulgrave | \$ 5,000.00 |
| St. Thomas Aquinas | \$ 2,566.53 |
| Oxford Street School | \$20,014.50 |
| Alex McKay School | \$ 6,459.62 |
| Alterations - Edgewood School | \$ 8.60 |
| | <u>\$64,092.77</u> |

Your Committee concurs in this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman Wyman, seconded by Alderman Fox, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

MUNICIPAL BUILDING AND LOAN FUND

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960 a report was submitted from the City Manager advising that the City has permission from the Department of Municipal Affairs to charge against the Municipal Building and Loan Fund the following projects:

| | |
|------------------------|--------------|
| St. Catherine's School | \$ 69,956.48 |
| St. Thomas Aquinas | \$210,433.47 |

He requested Council approval for these charges against the Fund.

Your Committee recommends that the request be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman Dunlop, seconded by Alderman DeWolf, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

BOND ISSUE - \$1,500,000.00

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960 a report was submitted from the City Manager listing twenty-one Borrowing Authorizations to be included in a proposed bond issue of \$1,500,000.00.

Council,
March 17, 1960.

Your Committee recommends that tenders be called for an issue in this amount.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

Alderman Trainor: "When will we be putting this bond issue out?"

Commissioner of Finance: "The first of April. The tender forms will be going out next week."

Alderman Trainor said he didn't favor a bond issue now and he suggested waiting until September.

His Worship the Mayor: "We can, but this is a calculated risk. We don't know whether the market will be any better in September than it is at the present time."

Alderman Trainor: "That is true."

City Manager: "We thought of that, but if we don't do it by the first of June, we have to wait for the first of September or even later. The trouble is that even with this \$1,500,000.00 we have other expenditures after we take care of this school figure we just approved. It would be roughly \$1,500,000.00. You would be having a capital budget quite soon. Whatever will be in that we will be spending that money during the summer, and a large part of it, so that if we don't issue bonds now, we may find ourselves in October with possibly \$2,500,000.00 or more to spend. We are told by all bankers, unanimously, that we should not float more than \$1,500,000.00 at one time because they don't move as well. In other words, we would be better off even if we had to get another \$1,500,000.00 to clean things up again this year. We would be better off to float \$1,500,000.00 in April and another \$1,500,000.00 in November. I don't say that we will because I don't know when the Capital Budget will be approved."

MOVED by Alderman Wyman, seconded by Alderman Dunlop, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

RETIREMENT - HOSEMAN EARL W. EISAN

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960

Council,
March 17, 1960.

a report was submitted from the Commissioner of Finance advising that Hoseman Earl W. Eisan was recommended for retirement by the Fire Chief as of March 31, 1960 and is eligible to retire under Section 866 of the City Charter.

He served the City for 39 years and 9 months and is entitled to 30/50ths of his average salary for the last three years which amounts to \$2,202.91 as of April 1, 1960.

Your Committee recommends that Mr. Eisan be retired at an annual allowance of \$2,202.91 as of April 1, 1960.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

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

WIDOW'S PENSION - MRS. R. H. GASS

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960 a report was submitted from the Commissioner of Finance advising that Mrs. R. H. Gass has applied for financial assistance under Section 310-H of the City Charter. She may receive one-half the amount of her late husband's pension under the Superannuation Plan which amounts to \$408.26 effective as of May 1, 1960. He, therefore, recommended that she be paid this amount as he had investigated the late Mr. Gass' estate and found it to be very small.

Your Committee concurs in this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman DeWolf, seconded by Alderman Dunlop, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

TAX CONCESSION - OCEAN STEEL AND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960, a report was submitted from the City Manager advising that a request has been received from the Solicitors for the Ocean Steel and Construction Company for a tax concession which would run for ten years. The request is for exemption from business tax with payment on the regularly assessed value at the regular rate on realty.

This is a new industry which will initially employ about 60 men and eventually a total of several hundred.

This application has been endorsed by the Industrial Commission with the suggestion that the agreement terminate as of December 15, 1970.

Council,
March 17, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor advised that this is a concession for a building to be erected on the property owned by Irving Oil Limited, between Barrington Street and Lady Hammond Road, immediately east of the Highway Garage.

Your Committee recommends that the report be approved and that the City Solicitor prepare an agreement containing terms and conditions and that the necessary legislation be obtained.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

Alderman Trainor: "If we give J. & M. Murphy Limited a concession on business tax, say right across the road in the County there was another clothing manufacturer similar in nature to J. & M. Murphy, would we still be in a position to give Murphy's a tax concession?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Trainor: "Part of my thinking was that across in Tufts Cove we have quite a steel fabricating plant and I don't think that they are enjoying any tax concession from the County."

His Worship the Mayor: "Similar commercial ones are getting quite a substantial tax concession and I refer you to Phillips Wire and Steel going up in Woodside, as well as Cossor Limited and Regent Aluminum Company. I don't think we should be concerned with the tax policies in the County. I think we should be concerned right now with our own tax policy."

Alderman Trainor: "I am not concerned with the tax policy of the County. I am just concerned about getting taxation for the City of Halifax and whether it would be wise to start giving taxation money away."

His Worship the Mayor: "We are not giving taxation money away. This land has been standing idle for many years. It is owned by a company which is not too prone to sell land. It is only the remission of the business tax for a period of ten years."

Alderman Macdonald: "I think we considered in the Industrial Commission meeting that if construction did not start until 1962 or 1961 that the concession would not go beyond 1970. Is that right?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes. It is for a fixed time."

Alderman Wyman: "The agreement provides for this concession only for the purpose indicated and no other use."

Council,
March 17, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

MOVED by Alderman Macdonald, seconded by Alderman Dunlop that the report be approved. Motion passed.

JOB EVALUATION

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Wyman, that this matter be deferred until the next meeting of Council and a further report from the Finance and Executive Committee be submitted, if necessary. Motion passed.

PURCHASE - CATHEDRAL BARRACKS LAND

March 17, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960, a report was submitted from the City Manager advising that the Dean and Chapter of All Saints Cathedral had agreed to accept without prejudice the sum of \$35,000.00 in payment for 25,100 square feet of Cathedral Barracks Land.

Your Committee recommends that the purchase be proceeded with at the above figure and that the funds be provided by Capital Borrowing.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

Alderman Trainor: "What is the land going to be used for? If I had had the minutes, I would have had a chance to be informed on the matter."

His Worship the Mayor: "It is being gathered together for hospital and institutional use. Another purchaser wanted it for other purposes and we feel it would be desirable for the City to buy it at this time."

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

WORK LOAD AND STAFF - CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT

Alderman Lloyd: "There have been a couple of references made to the minutes. I happen to know that our Clerk has been working overtime to produce these minutes and they are rather voluminous. I wonder if the City Manager might take a look at the staff position and work load in that Department. They are working a considerable amount of extra time to get these minutes out."

His Worship the Mayor: "There are a lot of minutes going out. For instance, there have been sixty pages of minutes in the last couple of days in

Council,
March 17, 1960.

addition to all the other clerical duties."

Alderman Trainor: "I think they are doing an excellent job."

Alderman O'Brien: "Could we have a report showing how many hours a week they have been working in recent weeks? Do they keep a record of that?"

City Manager: "Oh, yes because they get paid for overtime, but the Clerk and the Deputy don't."

His Worship the Mayor: "It is an administrative matter insofar as work load and staff requirements are concerned."

Alderman O'Brien: "All right, then let such a report be given to the City Manager and let him act on it."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think your question is properly asked here tonight because of the question earlier this evening about the lateness of the Finance Committee minutes."

Alderman Lloyd: "I know they are working overtime and they had quite a job to get these minutes out."

His Worship the Mayor: "As far as actual examination of the work load by this Council, I think that is a City Manager problem."

Alderman Lloyd: "The City Manager will give us a report."

City Manager: "Finance minutes this time contain sixty pages, but normally they run about twenty-five or thirty pages. This happened to be a long meeting and a lot of discussion."

Alderman Trainor: "And a lot of important items."

City Manager: "Incidentally, this time of year seems to be just about the heaviest time for Council. You rarely have sixty-six items and not as many important ones as we have tonight."

DEED WITH COVENANTS TO IDEAL ALUMINUM COMPANY LIMITED

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

From: T. C. Doyle, City Solicitor.

Date: March 15, 1960.

Re: Deed to Ideal Aluminum Company Limited.

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on March 10, 1960, the proposed covenants to be contained in deed from the City to Ideal Aluminum Company Limited, were submitted and approved, as follows:

Council,
March 17, 1960.

1. The Company to construct on the land a prefabricated first-class building at a cost of between \$50,000. and \$60,000.
2. The area of land to be conveyed to the Company is 38,131.5 square feet, at a price of .77¢ per square foot, for a total of \$29,361.25.
3. Construction is to commence on or before April 15, 1960 and is to be completed by May 1, 1961.
4. The plans of the building to be submitted to the City, including the proposed location of the building on the land.
5. If the Company decides not to build, the land is to be re-conveyed to the City for the sum of \$29,361.25.
6. The Company will manufacture aluminum products on the premises and any part of the building used as a warehouse must be so used in connection with the said manufacturing. The Company shall not, without the consent of Council, change to a different type of manufacturing.
7. The Company is not to sell or lease the land or any part thereof without the consent of Council, prior to or after completion of the building referred to.
8. The covenants are to run with the land for a period of ten years from the date of the deed.

T. C. Doyle,
CITY SOLICITOR.

Mr. Frank Zebberman was present and addressed Council as follows: "We agree with all your terms with exception of No. 8. With your permission, I would like to have you give this some consideration. I think ten years is an awful long time. May I suggest that five years is long enough in this particular case. We aren't asking you for any tax concessions. We aren't asking for a favor outside of having this ten-year covenants reduced to five."

His Worship the Mayor said he understood that activities other than that of Ideal Aluminum Company Limited were to be carried on in this building and he asked Mr. Zebberman about the proposed storage of cars.

Mr. Zebberman: "Yes. I had a chance to purchase a two-storey steel building. I spoke to members of the City Council and they told me that they didn't think that the Council will allow that where this property and land is restricted to manufacturing only. So, we changed our plans and our architects are drawing up a one-storey building for the manufacturing of aluminum products only."

Alderman Trainor read the following from the Finance and Executive Committee minutes:

"The City Solicitor said he had not included a clause which would enable the Company to change to another type of manufacturing operation, only with the consent of Council."

Council,
March 17, 1960.

He then asked the City Solicitor for an explanation of his remark.

City Solicitor: "That wasn't in the original draft sent to the Finance Committee and I have changed it and it is now in the draft tonight."

Alderman Lloyd: "Could Mr. Zebberman tell us why he wants it reduced from ten to five years?"

Mr. Zebberman: "There is no reason whatsoever except that ten years is a long time. The aluminum business may go bad in three or four years' time; and if it is only the matter of a year, I can carry that building empty. If it is ten years, what can I do with an empty building? I may not be able to rent it to somebody who wants to come into manufacturing."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think we should point out to Mr. Zebberman that this is a bid price in an area which we were holding as much as possible for industrial development."

His Worship the Mayor: "We had other bids for this land for almost twice the amount which we turned down because they weren't manufacturing."

Alderman Lloyd: "The purpose behind this ten-year proposal is to insure that the land will be used for industrial purposes. Otherwise, a person could come in and buy land for a purpose with all good intentions in one year; and, as you suggested, Mr. Zebberman, they could keep it idle and they could sell it for a substantial gain."

Alderman Macdonald asked if Clauses Nos. 6 and 7 wouldn't protect Mr. Zebberman to some extent.

His Worship the Mayor: "Of course, they do."

Alderman Dunlop: "If he can't use it for an aluminum business, he can come back to Council and turn it into an iron foundry or something like that."

Mr. Zebberman: "But I may not want to go into the foundry business."

Alderman Dunlop: "Then make it an automobile industry."

MOVED by Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Fox, that the sale be approved subject to the covenants as contained in the report of the City Solicitor, dated March 15, 1960, but that the term mentioned in Clause No. 8 read 5 years instead of 10 years.

Alderman Connolly: "From what date?"

His Worship the Mayor: "From the date of the deed."

Alderman Dunlop: "I think if we do that, we are defeating our purpose of