

Council,
June 30, 1960.

2. Clause (d) of Section 1 of said Ordinance Number 49 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(d) For roughing in or installing each fixture, as defined in the said regulations in excess of ten such fixtures 0.25

MOVED by Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the Ordinance be read and passed a second time. Motion passed.

REPORT - REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES - SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF SITE.

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

At a meeting of the Redevelopment Committee, held on June 22nd, consideration was given to a report which was approved by Council on June 16th respecting the increased boundaries of the School for the Deaf Property and which area was described as a site for a private housing project; the area bounded by Gerrish Street, Gottingen Street and on the north by a diagonal line running from the corner of Brunswick and Gerrish Streets to the corner of Gottingen and Uniacke Streets.

Your Committee wishes to advise Council that the boundaries mentioned above are in error and it is requested that a Notice of Motion be made that the resolution of Council on June 16th approving of these boundaries, be rescinded.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

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

NOTICE OF MOTION BY ALDERMAN LLOYD.

Alderman Lloyd gave Notice that at the next meeting of City Council he would move that the motion passed by City Council on June 16th respecting the increased boundaries of the School for the Deaf Property, be rescinded.

REPORT - REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
PROCEDURE FOR APPROVAL OF PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS - REDEVELOPMENT AREA.

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

At a meeting of the Redevelopment Committee, held on June 22nd, the following procedure was approved and recommended with respect to property acquisitions in the redevelopment area:

(1) Mr. Smith before discussing settlements with the owners, if possible, will consult with Mr. Ridout to determine methods of approach, amount of compensation, etc.

Council,
June 30, 1960.

- (2) Mr. Smith will negotiate with the property owners.
- (3) If settlement at the formula is not secured an appraiser will be obtained so that we will be aware of the appraiser's values as compared with assessment plus 5%.
- (4) If the owner comes to agreement with Mr. Smith on the compensation for the realty in business relocation, etc. and Mr. Ridout is in agreement, this property will be presented to the Redevelopment Committee, in camera.
- (5) The settlement will then be presented to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in Ottawa through the local office.
- (6) Having secured approval of the Ottawa office, the settlement will be presented to a public meeting of the Redevelopment Committee and if approved by them, to City Council.
- (7) Settlement for the property will be concluded by the City Solicitor.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

His Worship the Mayor: "This is the procedure arrived at after meetings arranged between Mr. DeBard and Mr. Borland, and their staffs."

Alderman Lloyd: "This is a modification of the one presented at a recent meeting?"

His Worship the Mayor: "That was several months ago."

Alderman Lloyd: "The reason I recall it, was that the first modification followed very shortly on the heels of discussions we had with Mr. Borland, generally, on the whole problem. This is purely coincidental, and this reads, now, somewhat differently. I think it pretty well meets some of the criticisms of those who have had to do recently with settlements; Mr. Smith, Mr. Ridout, Mr. Borland and members of the Committee. So, this is now to be the final procedure."

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

REPORT -- REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
EXPROPRIATION OF PROPERTIES - JACOB STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA.

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

At a meeting of the Redevelopment Committee held on June 22nd, it was agreed to recommend that the following properties in the Jacob Street Redevelopment Area be expropriated and that the assessed value plus 5% be paid into Court.

Council,
June 30, 1960.

BLOCK 92

71 Duke Street
Lot - North Side Duke Street
Two Lots - East Side Market Street
Lot - West Side Grafton Street
140-142 Grafton Street
44 Buckingham Street

BLOCK 87

241-243 Market Street
Two Lots - East Side Market Street
253 Market Street
24-26 Jacob Street
180-182 Grafton Street
184 Grafton Street
184½-190 Grafton Street
192-196 Grafton Street

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

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

REPORT - REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
ENGAGING APPRAISER - JACOB STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA

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

At a meeting of the Redevelopment Committee held on June 22nd, it was agreed to recommend that the City Solicitor be authorized to engage the services of an appraiser to appraise the remaining properties in the Jacob Street Redevelopment Area.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

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

REPORT - REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
ANGUS L. MACDONALD BRIDGE - NORTH STREET APPROACH.

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

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

Date: June 30, 1960.

Subject: Angus L. Macdonald Bridge - North Street Approach.

At the Redevelopment Committee meeting of June 22nd, 1960 mention was made of a study by consultants of the two plans, identified as the 'Munnich Plan' and 'West Plan'.

Council,
June 30, 1960.

In their original submission to the City on the Bicentennial Drive approach Whitman, Benn had submitted certain specific studies involving the Bridge. These were deleted and the price reduced because it was thought the Bridge Commission would have a study made.

The work they proposed to do was:

Halifax approaches to the Angus L. Macdonald Bridge.

- (a) Interviews of sufficient number of drivers on the bridge to establish the proportions of harbour-crossing traffic that are generated in each census tract in Halifax on an average day in 1960 and project the origin-destination pattern to 1980.
- (b) Analysis of the Halifax origins and destinations of traffic to and from the bridge and determination of the direction and volume of all turning movements, 1960 and 1980.
- (c) Recommendations of revisions, as necessary, to the proposals for a new bridge terminal interchange in Halifax so that access to the bridge will be effectively integrated into the street system.
- (d) Analysis of traffic operations, present and future, within the immediate area of the proposed Angus L. Macdonald Bridge interchange and recommendation of traffic engineering treatment to insure optimum operation.

The cost of these studies would be \$5,000.00.

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

Alderman Lloyd: "This is something that should be part of our consideration when we have the meeting planned for discussion with Consultant Engineers on the entire matter of approaches. It seems to me it is related."

His Worship the Mayor: "The only thing is, though, we are losing most valuable time in the appointing of Consultants. This matter was brought to the Redevelopment Committee because it involved some of the lands that were the property of the School for the Deaf Board which the Province has agreed to sell to the City."

Alderman Lloyd: "I thought we were talking about the Bridge Approach."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, the North Street Bridge Approach. So, Mr. Munnich prepared a plan and Mr. West prepared a plan. The Bridge Commission has accepted and approved of the 'West' plan, and they have secured the approval of Mr. Pratley, their Consultant. The members of the Redevelopment Committee, who studied this proposal, felt we should engage the services of a Consulting Engineer, to advise us on this matter. Now, I will show you those two plans that have not previously been shown to Council."

Council,
June 30, 1960.

Alderman Wyman: "In that report, from the Redevelopment Committee, was there a recommendation with regard to this or was it just a report that carried the information forward to us?"

His Worship the Mayor: "It was a recommendation."

Alderman O'Brien: "The Redevelopment Committee recommended the appointment of Consultants because we were not satisfied with the planning. We were not willing to accept, in the Redevelopment Committee, the plans that Mr. Pratley had approved on behalf of the Bridge Commission."

His Worship the Mayor: " - or the 'Munnich' plan."

Alderman O'Brien: "No, that wasn't really before us. We had asked, at one stage, for the Bridge Commission to study the 'Munnich' plan. We got word back to the Redevelopment Committee that they had approved a new plan, the 'West' plan, which we felt the Consultants should look at, and you informed the Committee that Mr. Pratley was not really a Traffic Engineer; and that, therefore, the proper kind of Consultants had not considered these two plans. As I recall it, the Redevelopment Committee said it should be considered by someone who knows traffic planning."

Alderman Wyman: "I say this with regard to the question of the Bridge Commission's reference to the matter of traffic. The concern of the Bridge Commission, and of the Bridge Commission's Consulting Engineer, is entirely a problem of Bridge operation, and the Bridge Commission is in no way concerned with what problem the City may have handling the traffic once they've got it clear of the Bridge."

His Worship the Mayor: "Except for that, they haven't conveyed the land yet for the City houses they have purchased, and they hold the right to approve the plan."

Alderman Wyman: "Their Consultant, as I understand the matter from the Bridge Commission, has examined the plan and his approval of Mr. West's plan was in the form of a statement that it would, satisfactorily, take the traffic away from the Bridge; and that was as far as the Bridge Commission needs to go. Our problem, of course, is how do we handle the traffic after it does come off the Bridge and how well does it disperse to other parts of the

Council,
June 30, 1960.

City."

Sketches of the Plans of the North Street Approach, as prepared by both Mr. West and Mr. Mannich, were then displayed.

Alderman Dunlop: "Let's spend the \$5,000.00 and keep the third plan. Apparently, somebody is not satisfied with either Mr. West's or Mr. Mannich's plans."

His Worship the Mayor: "Council can decide tonight whether or not they want to make this expenditure or make a decision on either one of the two plans before them."

Alderman Dunlop: "I think that is what the Deputy Mayor wanted to know, whether the Redevelopment Committee, who know more about this than the rest of us, were recommending the expenditure of \$5,000.00 for this."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, they were."

Alderman Wyman: "The matter is contained in their Report, isn't it?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Well, Mr. DeBard made this report. As a result of the motion in the Redevelopment Committee, Mr. DeBard consulted with Whitman, Benn & Associates."

Alderman Dunlop: "That was a package deal of \$30,000.00."

City Manager: "Originally, they gave us a \$30,000.00 proposition, including a study of this material before you tonight, because we thought at that time, back in the middle of June, that the Bridge Commission had their own Consultant. Possibly, it would have been better, but we took it out of what we presented to Council because the Council wouldn't accept it if the Bridge Commission wouldn't. Subsequently, the Bridge Commission came back and said: 'We have had our say'. Then, when the Redevelopment Committee said: 'We are not satisfied with the progress that has been made, either by the City or the Bridge Commission', I said I would bring forward what Whitman, Benn & Associates had originally suggested with regard to the Angus L. Macdonald Bridge Approaches. That is the memorandum brought here tonight, which has a price tag of \$5,000.00 attached to it."

Alderman Lloyd: "The study was made by the Bridge Commission, as they saw it. Now, they see other things that do not serve the purposes, perhaps,

Council,
June 30, 1960.

of the City's Traffic Engineering and the like of planning. What you have to do now is to find some proposal which will compromise between the two bodies-- reach some area of agreement. Is that it?"

City Manager: "Yes, I think the Deputy Mayor put his finger on it when he said the Bridge Commission was only concerned with getting traffic off the Bridge, whereas the Redevelopment Committee says what happens after it gets off the Bridge; and if the Bridge Commission didn't really study that at all, or not too thoroughly, then, it will still have to be studied."

Alderman Lloyd: "That is what I say. The terms of reference for the Bridge Commission were somewhat different than the terms of reference which are required by the Redevelopment Committee. Now, we had the third possibility of this submission before the Finance Committee, the other night, for a study of all the entrances to the City. You said, in their recent proposal, they were going to do this, and you would explain why. At our Finance Committee meeting, the other evening, it was indicated that when you are dealing with the study of approaches, you are dealing with the perimeter to the City, itself. You have got all these traffic or highway approaches in the perimeter, in which the traffic congestion takes place. It would seem to me that unless this proposal is much less than envisioned, normally, one can expect the whole thing to be done in one job, and be properly integrated. I wonder if we are not getting into this in pieces which may cause a conflict somewhere else later."

His Worship the Mayor: "I don't think so. Have you a copy of the Report, Mr. DeBard?"

Alderman Dunlop: "I have no doubt that Mr. West and Mr. Munnich gave a great deal of study to both of their plans. It seems to me what we are saying is that they didn't know what they were doing, and we should get a third expert."

Alderman Wyman: "There are two plans there. I think that it was the feeling of the Bridge Commission that, probably, they would both, from every point of view, get the traffic away from the Bridge all right. When the first one, Mr. Munnich's, was proposed, it is quite a complex plan, and the members of the Bridge Commission did not feel that they were able to judge the workings

Council,
June 30, 1960.

of as complex a traffic system as that; and they expected that, probably, Mr. Pratley would say it was more of a traffic problem than a straight engineering problem. And they proposed, at that time, to refer it to a Consultant to get an opinion; that is a Consultant who would be an expert on traffic. However, when the second plan was brought to their attention it was somewhat simpler and it came, fortunately, at the time that it was convenient to show both plans to Dr. Pratley. Dr. Pratley's conclusion, as I understand it, was that the second plan would get the traffic off the Bridge just as well as the first plan would and was, probably, considerably cheaper and was, therefore, satisfactory from the Bridge Commission's point of view.

"As I understand the position now, we have these two plans, one of which is considerably more compact than the other and, probably, considerably more expensive. They have both been drawn up in good engineering fashion but I would judge from the questions in the Redevelopment Committee, and certainly the question that arises in my mind is, from a traffic point of view in the City, have these been sufficiently examined to know whether the less expensive one will be completely satisfactory or whether we must go to the more expensive one in order to do it, or whether there is something else that we can do. I think that is where the proposal of calling in Whitman, Benn & Associates on the matter arises. I think it is as simple as that. We have had it worked on by two members of our own staff and neither one of them can, possibly, have had the opportunity to make the type of traffic study that Consultants of this type would make and, therefore, apply it to the problem."

Alderman Lloyd: "Which plan is which?"

The City Manager indicates Mr. Munnich's and Mr. West's plans.

Alderman Lloyd: "Where is the 'Pratley' one?"

His Worship the Mayor: "He didn't make a plan of it. As far as the Bridge Commission is concerned, they were willing to accept Mr. West's plan."

Alderman Butler: "I feel considerably reluctant to vote for the expenditure of \$5,000.00, unless it can be shown to me that it is absolutely necessary, that either one of these plans, or an integration of both of them, is not feasible and practical; and simply because they were done by our own

Council,
June 30, 1960.

staff, I don't think we should automatically consider they are not as good a quality as we will pay \$5,000.00 for. So, before I, personally, am going to vote \$5,000.00, I want some further explanations. I would like to hear both Mr. Munnich and Mr. West, and let them defend each others plan."

His Worship the Mayor: "I want to explain that this is not a question of conflict in the staff; both had ideas and they brought them forward. I am glad to have that kind of thing in our staff."

Alderman Abbott: "Do we have any idea of the cost of these plans?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, the cost of the 'Munnich' plan -- \$1,500,000.00, the more complex plan."

He then asked the Commissioner of Works to indicate the estimated cost of the plan proposed by him.

Commissioner of Works: "Your Worship, you might recall that this came before the Redevelopment Committee just this week; and, actually, I didn't know at the time that it was going to be discussed at the Redevelopment meeting, and up to that time we hadn't worked out detailed estimates of it. Since that time, we have not yet had the detailed engineering estimates but our preliminary estimates are between \$280,000.00 and \$300,000.00. We reserve the right to do some further checking on it."

Alderman O'Brien: "As a member of the Redevelopment Committee, I would like to say it seemed to me, sitting there, that you, from the Chair and, perhaps, the Bridge Commission were saying that the 'Munnich' plan was too expensive. We, on the Redevelopment Committee, made no criticism of the traffic patterns in the 'Munnich' plan. We didn't, really, consider it that day. We were shown the 'West' plan, so-called, and we were told how the traffic would work, and we weren't convinced that this weaving in a short section of North Street -- ."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think it is only fair, as Alderman Butler has stated, that both plans should be explained to all the Aldermen, and let them decide whether or not these plans are good; otherwise, it is not fair for you, as members of Council, to give your views without having the plans explained to you, first."

Council,
June 30, 1960.

Alderman Lane: "Your Worship, you said there was no contention on this matter; there was contention and I was the 'bone of contention', the other day at the meeting."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, I meant among the staff."

Alderman Lane: "Oh, no, not among the staff. Perhaps, there wasn't contention but there was, certainly, disagreement on the value of the two plans. I, for one, took positive exception to the alleged 'West' plan, and I say that as I understand Mr. West is not too happy about having his name on it. I objected on the grounds that there was a bottleneck involved. I just spoke to the Chief, who says it is not a bottleneck as far as he could see, and that it is better than what is there, which is hardly a recommendation."

Alderman Dunlop: "I don't think we should discuss the plans now. Mr. West just said he didn't know this matter was going to come before the Redevelopment Committee. I think it is a question of whether we would want to take Consultants or whether we want to say to our own people, 'You could draw another plan. There is some objection to this one'. It is a question of whether we want our own staff to do it or whether we want to pay some one \$5,000.00. I am perfectly satisfied to have our own staff do it."

His Worship the Mayor: "Could I ask one question of Mr. Munnich? Can you see a modification of your scheme that you would recommend?"

Planning Director: "On what basis, Your Worship? I would want to know the reasons why a modification would be suggested before I would concur in it."

City Manager: "Supposing Council said to you that is too much money, we would like a plan developed for less than a million and a half. What can you do, Mr. Munnich?"

Planning Director: "I would say it could be done, considered in that light."

Alderman Dunlop: "I think if the Redevelopment Committee are not satisfied, and I gather that is so, the plans should be sent back to Mr. Munnich and Mr. West. They are both employed by the City, and surely because you call one 'West' and one 'Munnich', doesn't mean they can't co-operate and work

Council,
June 30, 1960.

a plan that they can recommend to the City. Then, if the City doesn't accept their plan, we can spend the \$5,000.00."

His Worship the Mayor: "Except that, if this is the case, at the Redevelopment Committee, one principal point was raised, and that is the manner of treating the traffic coming through the Bridge and proceeding north on Gottingen Street, and the traffic coming up below from North Street and Barrington Street, merging with the traffic west bound on North Street. Now, Alderman O'Brien and Alderman Lane, who also objected that this wasn't good traffic planning, said we didn't have advice of a Traffic Engineer."

Alderman Lloyd: "What did the Redevelopment Committee agree on? Did they agree to engage someone?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Lloyd: "Were the members unanimous in their recommendation?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman O'Brien: "Yes, that was their recommendation."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think, then, Your Worship, I have another reason. We have the Jacob Street Redevelopment Area to get on with; we are working on the Spring Garden Road Development Area; we have talks about staff being considered; we have our summer works programme on; the phasing of these jobs, in my opinion, are becoming extremely important. We all agree we have to do something about taking another look at our whole organization, step by step, if these efforts were made. For that reason I think you had better get somebody from outside and let this one get over with."

Alderman Wyman: "I think I am correct in saying that we have undertaken to arrange to have a member of our staff trained as a Traffic Engineer."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, he will be going to University in the Fall."

Alderman Wyman: "Now, the only justification for our doing that is that we need a Traffic Engineer on our staff. We don't need a Traffic Engineer on our staff if we have one now. Therefore, I maintain that these two plans are drawn without the benefit of the advice of a Traffic Engineer, as such. I acknowledge the fact that men who are trained in Town Planning and in Munici-

Council,
June 30, 1960.

pal Engineering do have some training in traffic but they are not Traffic Engineers in the sense that I mean. The problem in this area, on the Bridge approach, is too serious a one to be deferred for something of the nature in here, to wait for our own man to be trained and come back to it. Perhaps, if it is one of the more difficult problems, it might not be the right thing for him to 'cut his teeth' on as soon as he comes back from his training. It, therefore, seems to me that we are in the position, at the present time, of having to borrow, from some source, a Traffic Engineer to really study the overall traffic implications of this problem. With that as an explanation of my thinking I will move that the recommendation be adopted by Council."

Alderman DeWolf: "Did I understand, Your Worship, \$280,000.00 for the 'West' plan, and a million and a quarter for the 'Munnich' plan?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, a million and a half."

Alderman DeWolf: "I haven't had an opportunity to see it before. However, even with a minimum of \$280,000.00, the cost of \$5,000.00 is only 2%. Are you sure they are going to come up with a plan?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes!"

At this point Alderman Lloyd seconded the motion to accept the recommendation.

His Worship the Mayor: "It has been moved by Alderman Wyman, seconded by Alderman Lloyd, that the firm of Whitman, Benn & Associates, with William Smith, be engaged to do a survey of the North Street approach to the Angus L. Macdonald Bridge."

Alderman Dunlop: "Does Clause 'B' cover the preparation of a plan, perhaps a new plan entirely; or will Whitman, Benn & Associates be coming back to us for \$25,000.00 for these plans?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, this envisions the drawing of a plan."

Alderman Dunlop asked if that would be revisions of the 'West' and 'Munnich' plans.

His Worship the Mayor: "No. They didn't know about these plans."

Alderman Dunlop: "It doesn't say anywhere in their submission that they are going to provide us with a plan. They say they are going to make re-

Council,
June 30, 1960.

commendations of revisions as necessary for the proposal for a new Bridge channelling into Halifax. I presume these are the proposals for the new Terminal Interchange. Will these Consultants prepare a plan?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, they will."

Alderman Dunlop: "Well, all right."

Alderman DeWolf: "One more question I would like to ask. Does the first plan take in other properties that we presently don't own?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, both plans do."

Alderman DeWolf: "They both take in properties other than we now own?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, they do."

Alderman DeWolf: "When Whitman, Benn & Associates are given this contract, will it be with the understanding that they may suggest any other property that we do not now own?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes!"

Alderman Wyman: "The time I made my motion I was not too clear in just what the recommendation was, I thought it was something different. So, I would like, with the concurrence of my seconder, to rephrase my motion and move that the firm of Whitman, Benn & Associates be employed to make the study, as is outlined in the Manager's recommendation; and produce a plan at a price not to exceed \$5,000.00, funds to be provided under the authority of Section 361 'C' of the City Charter."

Alderman Lloyd, seconder of the original motion, concurred in the rephrasing of the motion.

Alderman Butler: "My feeling is that this matter should be deferred to give our staff a reasonable time in which to come up with some compromise between the two plans. I think that could be done. I don't think that this is an insoluble problem that we have to hire outside experts to come in and tell us how to do it. For that reason, I am going to vote against this expenditure."

Alderman Greenwood: "I am going to support that, Your Worship, for the reasons given are quite logical and sensible. May I suggest that, in future, if we have two staff plans that we call them staff plan 'A' and staff plan 'B',

Council,
June 30, 1960.

and leave the personalities out of it."

His Worship the Mayor agreed with the suggestion, but pointed out that there is no conflict between the members of the staff.

Alderman Wyman: "The situation is not serious, but I do think that the suggested plan is in order."

Alderman Connolly: "Would it be possible that Whitman, Benn & Associates would come back with a plan for a new Bridge?"

His Worship the Mayor: "I don't think that is likely."

The motion passed, with Alderman Butler voting against.

Commissioner of Works: "May I be permitted just one remark, Your Worship? The reason Mr. Munnich and I are so friendly on this particular thing is that we don't really consider them two different plans. The idea that they should be labelled 'A' and 'B' is a good idea, because we were not at odds, at all. If I may just review as quickly as possible? Mr. Munnich's was the first plan, and I think it is a study that has a lot of merit. It was only when there was some doubt about the expenditure for that particular plan, at this time, that the suggestion was made that we investigate an alternative something that could be put into effect very quickly and would serve the purpose and get this traffic off --."

Alderman Lloyd: "One was a temporary proposal and the other was a long-range proposal?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, no!"

Commissioner of Works: "Naturally, for a more grandiose plan, the so-called 'West' plan, is not presenting future development along the Rotary idea, and so on. If that is the wish of the Council at some future date."

His Worship the Mayor: "Now, what about the Bicentennial portion of this? If we just keep on dragging these studies out, it will be the middle of winter before we get the proposals."

Alderman O'Brien: "What is the holdup now?"

His Worship the Mayor: "I don't know what the Finance Committee did with it. Have you a report, Alderman Lloyd, you are Vice-Chairman of that Committee? I wasn't present at that meeting."

Council,
June 30, 1960.

Alderman Lloyd: "Which is this?"

His Worship the Mayor: "On the proposal for the study of the Bicentennial Highway Entrance."

Alderman Lloyd: "Well, that day, Your Worship, the Finance and Executive Committee was concerned about the fee. They recognize, I think it is correct to say, there is a need for a study of the approaches to the City of traffic arteries. It certainly is essential that the study be made. In fairness to Whitman, Benn & Associates, the Committee felt that we should meet with them to have a little more detail as to the work programme that would be involved to bring out the report that they projected. We felt there would be some advantage in having a discussion with them about such details so we would be in a better position, if we favoured the proposal, to support it in Council.

"Secondly, another Alderman proposed that we might interest, in an informal discussion, the Highways' Department Minister and, perhaps, some other members of his staff. I think Alderman DeWolf made that proposal. We felt, certainly, a discussion with the Consultants should come first and, then, we could decide on the second one after the first discussion before we reported to Council. That is about the situation."

His Worship the Mayor: "Aren't we in much the same position on this study as we are on the Bridge study? As every month goes by, meeting after meeting, we lack the reports that we can submit to the Province, as our proposal, and I think the proposal should be ours. In the absence of Metropolitan planning, we must come up with our own study."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think, Your Worship, if I may step in there and finish this. I am speaking now of what I thought was the concensus of opinion of the Committee, not necessarily one view, but sort of a general agreement after discussing the pros and cons, the natural implications, the very thing that happened here, tonight; Alderman Butler said, 'what are the justifications for spending such a fee?' We felt we should be well informed, as Committee members, before we brought the proposal back with a recommendation; but by no means did we intend any delay on the matter. We feel that such a meeting should be held as quickly as it can be arranged."

Council,
June 30, 1960.

Alderman Wyman: "If I may re-emphasize what Alderman Lloyd has just said with regard to that? It was definitely the feeling of the Committee that we did not want to delay the matter. However, we have a proposal to spend \$25,000.00 for a study and a report on it. It was not the kind of thing on which we could get competitive tenders and the Committee did feel that they needed to know a little more of just what would be involved in doing the job before they were in a position to say to Council '\$25,000.00 is a proper price for it'. That was the purpose of the suggestion that we consult with the Consultants."

Alderman Dunlop: "I think the first thing the Council should do is to decide on the site of the Arm Bridge, that is a prerequisite to any study of traffic on the west side of the Arm -- terminal point of the proposed North West Arm Bridge. I suggest that you put that on the Agenda for the next meeting of Council to see if we can't arrive at some solution. When that is on, I think the study should be made as soon as possible."

Alderman Lloyd: "That is the decision of the Committee."

His Worship the Mayor: "We will follow the Committee's direction, then, and have a report back before you, with respect to the success we have with the Provincial authorities, by the next meeting, at which time we will discuss the proposed entrance of the Arm Bridge."

Alderman Wyman: "With respect to Alderman Dunlop's remark, I think it might well be a question that the Committee might ask the representative of the Consultants, if we meet with him, whether or not he needs such a decision before he can give us a proper study on this second matter. If he doesn't need it, there is no reason why we should be worrying about it."

Alderman Lloyd: "As a member of the Finance Committee, we are happy to meet, as soon as you can arrange such a meeting, with Mr. Benn, of Whitman, Benn & Associates."

Alderman Greenwood: "I think the Committee also thought that matters arriving out of the discussion with Whitman, Benn & Associates might result in the Province changing their decision to share the cost."

His Worship the Mayor: "I will do what I can for you."

Council,
June 30, 1960.

Alderman Lloyd: "We are ready, Your Worship, to meet in a special meeting for this purpose, if you can arrange such a meeting."

TROLLEY COACH PROPOSAL

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on June 27th, consideration was given to certain proposed amendments to the Agreement between the City of Halifax and the Nova Scotia Light & Power Company, Limited, respecting the trolley coach operation in the City of Halifax.

After receiving a report from the City Manager and hearing Mr. A. R. Harrington, General Manager of the Company, it was agreed to recommend the following to Council:

FOR THE YEAR, 1960, THE COMPANY WILL PAY:

- (1) Normal taxes on real property of the Company included in its transit service account.
- (2) Normal business taxes at the rate in force in 1960.
- (3) Fire Protection Rates.
- (4) One-half of all other taxes payable under the Agreement.

FOR THE YEAR, 1961, THE COMPANY WILL PAY:

- (1) Normal taxes on real property of the Company included in its transit service account.
- (2) Normal business taxes at the rate in force in 1961.
- (3) Fire Protection Rates.

It was also agreed to recommend the following changes with respect to routes 7 and 10:

1. PROPOSED CHANGE ON ROUTE 7:

The Route 7 to continue all day as at present, but to be discontinued at approximately 6:30 p. m. on weekdays and not to operate on Sundays and Holidays. Extra weekday service after 6:30 p. m. will be provided, such as on Friday nights, if same is required.

Alternate service to be provided by Route #9 coaches operating on 20 minute headway during weekday evenings. Sundays and Holidays - 30 minute headway. This change removes service south-bound on Windsor Street after 6:30 p. m., Sundays, and Holidays, but Route #4 coaches will provide alternate service at North and Windsor Streets.

On weekdays the last coach from Highland Park at 11:15 p. m. south-bound for Miller Street with last coach from Miller Street at 11:45 p. m. arriving Highland Park at 12:15 p. m. thence to the terminal. Sundays and Holidays last coach from Highland Park at 10:40 p. m. for Miller Street. Leaving Miller Street at 11:10 p. m. for Highland Park and Highland Park at 11:40 p. m. for the terminal.

Reroute #9 westbound on Spring Garden Road and southbound on South Park Street to compensate for service removed from #7 route.

Council,
June 30, 1960.

2. PROPOSED CHANGES ON ROUTE 10:

To operate on Saturdays from 6:48 a. m. on a 20 minute headway all day instead of the present 10 minute headway.

6:38 a. m. to 9:08 a. m.
11:48 a. m. to 2:08 p. m.
5:08 p. m. to 6:28 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

His Worship the Mayor asked Mr. H. B. Rhude, Solicitor for the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company, to explain the background of the Company's relationship with the City for the benefit of the members of the Council.

Mr. H. B. Rhude: "Your Worship, you know the present Agreement between the Company and the City was entered into April, 1947. Under that there were certain taxes paid and a certain number of taxes to be paid by the Company; first the real property taxes, the business taxes and, in addition, certain other special taxes. This Agreement, which I have drafted for the Company and submitted to the City Solicitor, would provide two things; first, for the year 1960, it will provide that the Company pay to the City only the following amounts; first, the normal taxes on real property of the Company, included in its Transit Service Account; secondly, the normal business taxes at the rate in force in 1960; and thirdly, one-half of all the other taxes, which would be payable under the terms of the Agreement if this amendment, which is now proposed, was not put into effect. The Company's estimate for taxes which it will pay to the City in 1960, if the Agreement is not amended, is \$70,986.67, roughly \$71,000.00. If the Agreement, as amended, is accepted by Council, the Company would pay to the City realty and business taxes, a total of those two items of approximately \$31,000.00. It would, then, pay to the City half of that sum. So, that the total the Company would pay is roughly \$51,000.00 to the City in 1960 rather than \$71,000.00.

"For the year 1961, they propose that the Company pay to the City only the normal taxes on its real property and its Transit Service Account, and the normal business taxes at the rate in force in 1961. If the tax rate doesn't change in 1961, if assessments don't change, then, instead of paying \$71,000.00, as it would under the existing Agreement, the Company would pay only \$31,000.00,

Council,
June 30, 1960.

approximately. From the Company's point of view the saving in 1961, in taxes, would be approximately \$40,000.00.

"As far as taxes are concerned that is what the Agreement provides. The Agreement, however, also provides that the Company and the City will jointly petition the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities for a pass fare increase becoming effective in 1961. It would, probably, be made late in 1960, say the month of December. The increase would be in such an amount as the City and the Company may agree and the application would be made at such time as the Company might determine. They say, probably, in December, 1960.

"The last thing that the Agreement provides is -- I will read this portion, it is very short. 'During the year 1961, the Company and the City will enter into negotiations for the purpose of receiving all of the terms of the 1947 Agreement. The taxes and the fees to be paid by the Company to the City in 1962, which is not provided for in this amendment, and 1962 and subsequent years, and the financial assistance, if any, should be given by the City to the Company in the operation of its Transit Service, in the City of Halifax.'

"That is the Agreement, Your Worship, which the Company desires to enter into with the City."

His Worship the Mayor: "Thank you, Mr. Rhude. Those are all the facts in connection with the amendment to the Agreement of 1947 respecting the Transit Service. Also, proposed is the change in route of No. 7. I think all members have a copy of this report. Have you not?"

THIS AGREEMENT made this day of , A.D.,
1960,

B E T W E E N:

NOVA SCOTIA LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY LIMITED, a body corporate having its Head Office at Halifax, in the County of Halifax and Province of Nova Scotia, (hereinafter called the "Company") _____

_____ OF THE ONE PART _____

A N D

THE CITY OF HALIFAX, (hereinafter called the "City") _____

Council,
June 30, 1960.

OF THE OTHER PART

WHEREAS the Company and the City entered into an Agreement dated the 3rd day of April, 1947, with respect to the transit service to be provided by the Company within the City of Halifax, which Agreement is hereinafter called the "Agreement";

AND WHEREAS by virtue of Section 49 of Chapter 64 of the Acts of Nova Scotia, 1960, the City may by resolution enter into an agreement with the Company modifying and amending the Agreement;

AND WHEREAS the City and the Company are desirous of modifying and amending the Agreement;

NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH that the Agreement be and the same is hereby amended by adding thereto immediately after paragraph 15 the following words and figures:

- "16 (A) Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement contained the Company shall not be required to pay to the City in respect of the calendar years 1960 or 1961 any taxes or fees in respect of its transportation service in the City of Halifax other than those specified in this paragraph 16.
- " (B) The Company shall pay to the City in respect of the calendar year 1960 the following taxes in respect of its transportation service:
- (i) normal taxes on real property of the Company included in its transit service account;
 - (ii) normal business taxes at the rate in force in 1960; and
 - (iii) one half of all other taxes payable under this Agreement.
- " (C) The Company shall pay to the City in respect of the calendar year 1961 the following taxes in respect of its transportation service:
- (i) normal taxes on real property of the Company included in its transit service account; and
 - (ii) normal business taxes at the rate in force in 1961.
- " (D) The Company and the City will jointly petition the Board for a pass fare increase to become effective in 1961 in such amount as the City and the Company may agree and at such time as the Company may determine.

Council,
June 30, 1960.

"(E) During the year 1961 the Company and the City will enter into negotiations for the purpose of reviewing all of the terms of this Agreement, the taxes and fees to be paid by the Company to the City in 1962 and subsequent years and the financial assistance, if any, to be given by the City to the Company in the operation of its transit service in the City of Halifax."

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the City has caused this Agreement to be executed under the hands of Charles A. Vaughan, its Mayor, and R. H. Stoddard, its City Clerk, and by affixing its corporate seal hereto, and the Company has caused this Agreement to be executed in its name and on its behalf under the hands of John C. MacKeen, its President, and Edwin A. LeBlanc, its Secretary, and by affixing its corporate seal thereto.

MOVED by Alderman Wyman, seconded by Alderman DeWolf, that the Council authorize the Mayor and the City Clerk to sign the Agreement, as outlined. Motion passed.

Alderman Connolly: "On the matter of the amount of \$37,000.00 a year, I can't see the City giving that back to the Tram Company, or allowing them that much money. After all, what the Tram Company are asking us to do is to share their losses. That is how it looks to me. After all, the Parent Company makes plenty of money on the electrical service users, they ask us to share their losses but not their profits."

His Worship the Mayor: "Alderman Connolly, that is a false statement and, said outside this Council, it might be received with a certain amount of credence; but this is not in keeping with the facts. The Public Utilities Board will not allow the Company to take profits from one phase of its operation to offset losses on another phase. I think that Aldermen, who are acting here, must be fully informed of all the facts and should only vote on them on the context of the reasons now before us. If we do not agree with the Agreement, by all means let us have something else then. I think to boldly state that the Company should subsidize the operation of the Transit Utility, without knowing all the facts or without knowing what power the Company has to do these things, is an unfair statement and is one, I think, that harms our negotiations to provide an adequate Transit System for the people of Halifax. Indeed, I think the Council and the Company are working in partnership to try to keep alive a very vital community service."

Council,
June 30, 1960.

Alderman O'Brien: "Your Worship, I would like to say a word about that, now, that you have spoken so strongly against what Alderman Connolly has just said. It is certainly true, as you say, that the law of the Public Utility Board does not permit this kind of transfer of funds, at the present time, but it is within the realm of possibility for future consideration, the changes in policy at either the Municipal or Provincial level, may make some such transfers possible and may make them to be public policy. This is a possibility in the future, and it seems to me that Alderman Connolly was advocating a policy, which we are not really considering at the moment, but it is a possible policy for us to consider in the consideration that must come on in the year, or so, that this Agreement is binding for us in time."

His Worship the Mayor: "The way you explain this, is a different thing from Alderman Connolly's statement. All we can do, as far as signing the Agreement is concerned, now, is to act on what the Public Utility Board has done. It is not a matter of Government policy, either."

Alderman O'Brien: "Well, the Public Utilities Board have acted under legislation set up by the Province. So, it is within the possibility that a Provincial Government, some day, can revise the legislation governing the Public Utilities Board."

His Worship the Mayor: "Oh, it is possible, too, that some Government will take over the Light & Power Company."

Alderman Lloyd: "Your Worship, I have attended three Committee meetings, on this matter, and I am somewhat in the middle, in as much as you said, and also between the arguments advanced by Alderman Connolly and Alderman O'Brien. I would like to assure them, again, in somewhat different words than you have assured them, that this matter is to be entirely subject to study in the ensuing months ahead. This whole matter will, then, be gone into much more thoroughly, which is the wish of the Company, I might say, as well as the Committee advising Council. There are some implications entering into this matter. For instance, the Company, without any assistance from the City, can project on the basis of present rise, the possible conceivable deficit of some \$200,000.00. Now, let's project our minds to the possibility that they would

Council,
June 30, 1960.

abandon the system. Then, we would be pressed, as a public body, either to encourage other private interests to take on such a system, or to take on public operation, such as this. We would be bound by the existing regulations of the Board of Public Utilities, as has been pointed out. So, what we have done, in effect, we have with the guidance of the Manager, who also pointed out these facts, made a compromise to borrow time to study the thing still more thoroughly than we have done, to study all the implications and to watch the effect of some of these changes in traffic patterns; also, the effect in a rate change. I think all will agree, if the City took on this service with the business tax rate we now have in the City, we would be compelled to follow, at least in the first instance, a self-sustaining operation where the service can be measured. So, we would be back to exactly the same position as the private Company. Now, without committing ourselves, however, as to alternatives that may be open to us as a Council, the Company has agreed not to seek a long-term proposal. They are quite happy to work in harmony with us in a common cause. It involves traffic engineering as well as moving trolley buses around. The extent to which the City is making this contribution for the next year and one-half, from the 1st of July on, to that extent at least, we are helping to keep the increase in fares at what might otherwise have to be the case under our present Agreement."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think, too, it is fair to say that the members of the Finance Committee have gone over this on two occasions, and we have had conferences on three other occasions, which is five or six meetings in all on this proposal. Were it possible for us to hold the line, as suggested by Alderman Connolly, the present Agreement would not be before us in its present form. I think it is quite fair to say we would have taken that course, suggested by Alderman Connolly, if a legal way were open for us to do so. It was not."

Alderman Lloyd: "No, legally we can't do so."

The motion was then put and passed, with Alderman Connolly wishing to be recorded against.

Alderman Wyman: "Your Worship, may I make a plea for all possible

Council,
June 30, 1960.

publicity to the proposals that we have just agreed to. I had occasion today to listen to one gentleman, who had read the newspaper account of the Finance and Executive Committee meeting, bemoaning the fact that the No. 10 Route was to be abolished. Anything that can be done in the way of publicity to counteract such misconceptions, I think, is desirable both from our point of view and the Company's."

His Worship the Mayor: "Mr. Harrington, will your Company not publicize these changes?"

Mr. A. R. Harrington: "Oh, yes. As soon as we hear from the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities we will advertise them because we do want to educate the public."

Alderman Wyman: "I would like to also mention that, at the Finance and Executive Committee meeting, the question of possible extensions into areas which are not now served by the Transit System, were discussed and it was agreed, there, between the Company and the members of that Committee, that the Company would be prepared, at any time, to entertain proposals from the City regarding such extensions, referring specifically to the one that has previously been mentioned on Connolly Street. I wish to keep that matter alive and before us because I feel there is a problem in there that directly concerns us. I don't want it to be lost sight of."

CAPITAL BUDGET - 1960

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

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

Date: June 20, 1960.

Subject: Capital Budget - 1960.

At the June 16 meeting of City Council quite a few capital budget categories were considered and passed. Their total was \$2,160,475.00.

Submitted in the original budget were the following additional categories which were not considered on June 16.

Schedule "C" Sewer Construction \$ 152,000.00

" "E" Proposed Street Widening 155,000.00

The first four items in this schedule were recommended for 1960 totalling \$155,000. They were not considered. The 5th item -

Council,
June 30, 1960.

Schedule "E" (Cont'd.)

Dutch Village Road scheduled for 1961 was approved for 1960 at \$230,000.00.

"K"	Aerial Photographs	\$ 49,000.00	
	Lighting	105,000.00	\$ 154,000.00
"L"	Equipment		139,300.00
"I"	Redevelopment, Housing & Parking		
	Downtown Shoppers Lot - land only (my estimate)		400,000.00
	Spring Garden South - Estimated loss - our share		150,000.00
	Housing - Westwood Park - Prefab Surplus if Council approves		?
	Exhibition Grounds		?
	Relocation - City Field		?
	Relocation - Wanderers' Grounds		?
			<hr/>
			\$ 1,150,300.00

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

City Manager: "I have circulated two memoranda. In the first one, I pointed out to you that you had approved thus far \$2,160,475.00, and in the second memorandum I listed the items which were in the Capital Budget, and which had not, as yet, been considered. They came to a total of \$1,150,000.00. The purpose of bringing it here, tonight, is to call your attention to two items which I hope you will consider. The first is Schedule 'C' - Sewer Construction for \$152,000.00. The items included in that are Chisholm Avenue, Desmond Avenue and the Fairview Overpass. The second item I would like to call to your attention is Equipment for \$139,300.00. This is not replacement; this is new equipment. They have the recommendation of the Commissioner of Works and they have my recommendation too."

The City Manager pointed out that among these items was one Microfilm Unit at a cost of \$15,000.00, and he continued: "The Microfilm Unit is for our plans. We have a small machine now for copying purposes but it doesn't begin to do the job. We send out quite a bit of work now, about \$5,000.00 a year."

Commissioner of Works: "I might add further to that, if you don't mind. One of the main purposes of this type of machine is that we have so many plans piled everywhere in City Hall that if anything ever happened we would never find any records. We would want to microfilm those and store them somewhere, in one place."

Council,
June 30, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor: "I think this is the only thing they can do. From my observation we are getting so jammed for space for the Town Planning and Drafting Rooms that we may have to seek temporary quarters outside to carry on efficiently; even renting quarters for the time being, because I think we are reaching that point now. I was in there the other day with the Premier. I don't see how the staff can produce work under those conditions."

Alderman DeWolf: "Will this complete the Capital Budget?"

City Manager: "Not, actually. There are other items."

Alderman DeWolf: "There was one item I wanted to ask about."

His Worship the Mayor: "We are looking at Equipment, Schedule "L". The City Manager is recommending \$139,300.00."

MOVED by Alderman Wyman, seconded by Alderman Fox, that Schedule "C" - \$152,000.00 and Schedule "L" - \$139,300.00 be approved. Motion passed.

Alderman DeWolf: "Has any consideration been given to the construction of a house, or quarters, for the Superintendent of Basinview Home?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Perhaps, we should ask Dr. Morton as he is in charge of that Department."

City Manager: "I think this is something we should consider for the future but we haven't built anything for him. I would have to consult with Dr. Morton."

His Worship the Mayor: "Does the fact that it is not included in the Budget tonight rule out consideration of it this year?"

City Manager: "No, if Council asks for a report on this, we will give it."

His Worship the Mayor: "All right, put it in the form of a report. The City Manager will consult with Dr. Morton."

FENCE FOR NEEDHAM PARK

Due to damage in wintertime, His Worship the Mayor brought up the matter of constructing a fence around Fort Needham Park and suggested that a chain link fence be erected along the Gottingen Street - Union Crescent side. He asked the Commissioner of Works if he knew what the cost would be.

Council,
June 30, 1960.

Commissioner of Works: "I don't remember the exact figure but I could get it."

Alderman Greenwood: "What is the nature of the damage?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Vandalism, and the children coasting destroy all the shrubs. They also destroy the hedges which means new planting every Spring. This is, particularly, so on the Gottingen Street frontage."

Alderman Wyman: "I think, in connection with that, Your Worship, it is well for the Aldermen to know that it was practically impossible to maintain that bank on the Gottingen Street side, so those shrubs were planted there. They were needed in order to keep that section from eroding away and, therefore, the destruction of them is a really serious matter."

His Worship the Mayor: "In 1949, when the Memorial Park was first proposed, the Honourable R. G. Beazley, who was then Chairman, called a meeting, of the Mayor and the North End Aldermen, to confer on this matter. I was present at the time. The Relief Commission wanted the City to take over the responsibility of maintaining the bank. It was successfully argued that this was the responsibility of the Commission. Anyone who knows that area knows that every Spring there would be a continual wash of mud down the Gottingen Street properties flowing down into the Hydrostone Area. You could hardly get off the trolley coach without sinking almost ankle deep in mud. This has now been cleared up. We put drains along the bottom of the hill as well. They have since given the Park over to us. My feeling is that if the new fence seems to be necessary, that we should, more or less, follow up the opportunity that we have to get an ornamental fence for the price of a chain link fence. It seems to me that we should do this now as it may not have the same consideration in a couple of months' time."

Alderman Dunlop: "In moving this, I hope we won't go there and find a chain link fence built like at the Wanderers' Grounds."

His Worship the Mayor: "You won't, I can assure you of that."

MOVED by Alderman Dunlop, seconded by Alderman Wyman, that this ornamental fence be erected around Fort Needham, and that the sum of \$10,000.00 be provided in the Capital Budget for this purpose. Motion passed.

Council,
June 30, 1960.

SCHEDULE "E"

City Manager: "'E' is Proposed Street Widening. We had \$155,000.00 for four projects recommended for 1960. The Council took Dutch Village Road which was scheduled for 1961 at \$230,000.00. I think we had better not do those other things. We are up to \$2,461,000.00 for this year and last year's Budget was over \$2,000,000.00. That is a lot of money."

Alderman Dunlop: "Your recommendation, which we receive every year, is that we don't spend over \$1,000,000.00."

City Manager: "I have got to retreat from that for two reasons. I think we can afford a little bit more, and I think that the demand for the projects is so great that, probably, what Council has been saying in effect is that while we don't like to see the Capital Budget and the Bonded Debt go up, we simply have to ask for it."

Alderman Dunlop: "I was very much interested when you recommended \$139,000.00 or \$140,000.00 for machinery. I hope next year when you make your comments you will not emphasize so much what you have said in the past that you have to keep expenditures down."

City Manager: "Well, I am sorry, Sir, if the Council has kicked out other items, which is what they did, to get up to \$2,000,000.00. That modifies my thinking, but it doesn't change the necessity for that equipment."

His Worship the Mayor: "The City of Regina will be spending this year \$6,000,000.00 on Capital Program. The City of Ottawa is spending \$16,000,000.00; and the City of Hamilton is spending \$17,500,000.00 on Capital Program for the year. Now, the Manager does not say that when he talks about the Borrowings he does not take off returns from abutters on total Borrowings. Secondly, too, I heard a good expression at a recent Convention describing such Capital Borrowings. It was described here, and I may be accused of being a Socialist when I described it so, as being Social Capital. I think it an improper term to call this Capital Borrowing. If we spend the money for community improvements, isn't that just what it is, Social Capital?"

Council,
June 30, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor continues: "Now, on the comparison per capita debt for Cities 1949 to 1958, it is interesting to note, too, that the growth of Halifax per capita debt was not twice. Hamilton is four times; London is ten times per capita debt; Ottawa is five times; Calgary not quite three; Regina almost three times; Toronto is three times; Vancouver is roughly the same as Halifax \$103.00 per capita in 1949 to \$195.25.

"Now, how do you relate the capacity of Capital Borrowing Budget in a community unless you have constant factors in every City? Comparison is useless. I don't know how much the City of Halifax can afford for Capital Borrowings at the moment. I think it can be calculated, but it must also be described, I think, with a certain degree of confidence. The City is going to grow as it has been growing in the last few years. It need not be growth by population, but it is growing other ways.

"Remember, too, that the capital money that we spend for improvements is not like money we pay out when we buy a car for our Police Department when the bulk of the money goes to Central Canada. Most of the money spent on Capital improvements remains in the community in the form of wages and materials purchased here. Now, it may well be that this coming winter we may need such a program. Let us not condemn those who, in the thirties, did not have enough vision to carry out projects of this type. I think it is unfair in looking at it now to condemn them, but it was not done; and we saw what happened on School Maintenance, for instance, where we had to remove three School buildings and replace them in the forties, thus adding to our debts. You also had a report from me in which I showed the relationship of Capital Repayments which is important today in relation to the overall Budget.

"The capacity of the City to borrow, I think, can be carefully calculated; but, also, we always have to act with caution when dealing with this Capital Budget Program. At the same time, the Capital Budget must be the reflection of what the Aldermen want and what the Council want by way of the Community, as expressed by community interest and community demand. If the public continue to ask for these things, or continue to express the desire for new Schools; for improvements by way of traffic improvements; improvements by

Council,
June 30, 1960.

way of adding to our recreation facilities; parking lots and skating rinks, they all must be prepared to pay for them. These are things, if people want them and Council approves of them, the Council must stand behind the Borrowing, then.

"It is interesting to note that Halifax has increased its Borrowing, has the most favourable rate this year of any Municipality of its size, it certainly is far less than that had to be paid by a great many municipalities in Canada, some of them over 7%. And, when the Manager cautions us to keep it to a minimum of \$1,000,000.00, I think, too, that the Manager's philosophy is one that, as he explained to a Committee meeting recently, was that he would like to see Halifax eventually reach a pay-as-you-go policy. This is fine if we can afford it. If we can afford to wait for these things. If we can forego some of these things we want now, we can wait for these things until we can afford to pay for them. But, this Capital Budget as your Current Budget, must be the reflection of what the Council wants to do for the people of Halifax. If the Council is extravagant and overspends, then, they must face the people in their Elections and the Public will, in no uncertain terms, say whether they are right or wrong."

Alderman Dunlop: "I think we had better delete the \$150,000.00 and put in the \$260,000.00 for the Dutch Village Road widening."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think it should go up."

Alderman Dunlop: "We decided on that and the Manager suggested these other four for Street Widening. We should put them over."

City Manager: "I think so, unless you feel otherwise. I will give you what they are and if you decide to put them in, Robie Street from South Street to University Avenue, to be widened at a cost of \$19,000.00; the second, Brunswick Street, from Sackville Street to Duke Street, to be widened at a cost of \$82,000.00, that is the east side of Citadel Hill. The third one is Brunswick Street, from Buckingham Street to Cogswell Street, that would be along by the Pavilion Barracks; the fourth one is Robie Street from the Willow Street intersection to Cunard Street, widening at approximately \$44,000."

Alderman Dunlop: "I think the other three should be deleted. Robie Street from the Willow Tree intersection to Cunard Street should be left in,

Council,
June 30, 1960.

as that is necessary."

Alderman O'Brien: "Your Worship, on the Brunswick Street one -- is this related to our inability to solve this problem of parking on the edge of the Citadel on Brunswick Street, where we are not getting any revenue, but are providing parking facilities?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, I think it is an attempt to clean up the mess we see every Spring, and all summer long."

Alderman O'Brien: "What I am asking is this, are we losing potential revenue which might be gained from the parking facilities if we completed the widening? Are they related in this way?"

City Manager: "No. I don't think so. I think the City Solicitor should comment on the parking aspect because, apparently, there is no way to get that place for parking if it is part of the street."

Alderman O'Brien: "Why not do the widening and, then meter it?"

City Manager: "It is the wall we are talking about, really."

Alderman Lloyd: "Your Worship, I just want to follow this, if I may. Robie Street remains, you said."

His Worship the Mayor: "Does No. 4, on Page 22, remain?"

City Manager: "No."

Alderman Lloyd: "Does No. 1 remain, or is it coming out?"

His Worship the Mayor: "One, two and three are out. That was the motion of Alderman Dunlop."

Alderman Lloyd: "Right. Now, what about Robie Street -- the Willow Tree intersection? It will remain and the rest of it is for later on? That is all we have in there for 1960. Now what about Dutch Village Road?"

City Manager: "That is No. 5. That has already been approved."

Alderman Lloyd: "Approved for 1960, and because of that you were concerned about the Street Widening Program as a whole. Wasn't that it?"

The City Manager said he felt that with a \$2,500,000.00 budget the item of \$230,000.00 for widening of Dutch Village Road should be deleted.

Alderman Lloyd: "That is quite properly so. I think you can talk about generalities, but you must still use a bit of a 'green thumb' to feel your way."

Council,
June 30, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor: "There is an old agreement, too, between the City and the Province whereby the Province will pay three-quarters of the cost of paving Dutch Village Road."

Alderman Lloyd: "That is very interesting."

Alderman Greenwood: "It hasn't been superseded, has it?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Not that I know of."

Alderman O'Brien: "How old is the agreement?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Oh, it is some years old, now."

MOVED by Alderman Dunlop, seconded by Alderman Lloyd, that the Item Nos. 1, 2 and 3 of Schedule "E" be deleted and that Item No. 4 in the amount of \$44,000.00 be approved.

Alderman Wyman: "Your Worship, with respect to Brunswick Street, may I ask this? If the wall is built and widening is done, will that provide for the possibility of parking, either diagonal parking or the cars parking 'nose in' and meters along there? We won't come to a point where the cars will have to park parallel to the curb on that side and therefore, limit the number of cars."

City Manager: "They will have as much room or more than they have now. I don't know just where the line is."

Alderman Wyman: "Is there any estimate of the revenue that might be expected from meters, if that were done?"

His Worship the Mayor: "What is the average, per meter?"

Chief of Police: "Roughly, \$75.00 a year on 5¢ meters and \$135.00 or \$145.00 for 10¢ meters."

Alderman Wyman asked how many cars will be accommodated."

City Manager: "About close to 100 cars. I would say 85 to 100 cars."

Alderman O'Brien: "Would that influence the decision? Does the Manager want to recommend it in the light of that or would that make any difference?"

City Manager: "Oh, yes. That would make a difference, but I would have to think about it. I wouldn't know now."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think some study is needed on that one, Your Worship, before you do it on the basis of meter revenue alone."

His Worship the Mayor: "The proposal was that it would be on the basis

Council,
June 30, 1960.

of 5¢ an hour because this is away from the shopping area."

Alderman Wyman: "It would probably not be one-hour metering."

Alderman Lloyd: "In view of the possible change in the plans for the Redevelopment area, the motel site going in there, and so on, I think you had better go easy on that one."

His Worship the Mayor: "There is no question, there is some revenue."

Alderman Lloyd: "Oh, yes. There is no doubt about that."

Alderman O'Brien: "I think the Manager ought to study that; and, if he finds it advisable, bring it back to us later on."

City Manager: "Yes, that would be better."

The motion was put and passed.

SCHEDULE 'K'

City Manager: "The next is Schedule 'K' -- Aerial Photographs, \$49,000. I think we better forego those; and, Lighting -- \$105,000.00, I think until we get some particular project where we don't have funds. Each project that has come up so far we have had funds."

His Worship the Mayor: "We have the program all lined up this year, haven't we? Part of the program we started last year?"

City Electrician: "This is a continuation of the program. This includes flood-lighting the Tower and also lighting the Parade."

Alderman Greenwood: "Lighting of the Tower has already passed Council."

Alderman O'Brien: "This is more street lighting on the main arteries, is that right?"

His Worship the Mayor: "You wouldn't call them main arteries because we have done most of the main arteries, but we plan to do Cornwallis Street, Gottingen Street from North to Duffus Streets, Barrington Street, etc. We plan to increase the wattage on Maynard Street and Creighton Street by doubling up the present standards. I checked with the Chief on this and there were 65 thefts last year from cars in the Maynard-Creighton Streets area."

Alderman Dunlop: "Have we dropped entirely the idea that the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company might take over our system?"

His Worship the Mayor: "In any event, they can still buy up our system. We haven't had a report yet. They are studying all that."