

Council,
June 29, 1965.

it should not be extended.

Alderman O'Brien was of the opinion that it lends emphasis to the possibility of a special localized approach to the Federal Government and that in preparing a brief, His Worship the Mayor might come to the conclusion that some special arrangements, through the Atlantic Development Board, might be used to make it possible in the areas where there is a serious inflationary pressure, to have the same kind of assistance made available without making it available to Toronto or some City where they seem to be able to have a boom without this kind of assistance. He felt that the Federal Government might, in the light of what Mr. MacEachen says, want to find another way to assist municipalities in certain parts of the country and that if a brief were prepared with that in mind, there would be some possibility that it could have some effect.

His Worship the Mayor: "I will be happy to accept the motion and work with the City Manager and City Solicitor on a presentation of a brief to the Federal Government but I don't hold out much hope in the light of discussions I have had with the Federal Officials concerned for an extension at this time. I could make a case and did discuss this point you raised with the Minister Saturday morning about the fact that British Columbia is quite a prosperous part of Canada and would quickly use up its quota. You are seeking to have the Federal Government re-allocate the unused portion of those moneys voted to the various Provinces so they, in New Brunswick and others, might share in the money. I think to serve this purpose, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, to stimulate the economy, they are unwilling to extend the forgiveness feature.

Council,
June 29, 1965.

However, I will be happy to make the presentation, pointing out the particular circumstances involving the Atlantic Provinces."

Alderman O'Brien then agreed to insert in the motion, after the word "Fund" the following:

"In its present or some other form with particular reference to the needs of Cities and Towns in the Atlantic Provinces."

The motion, with the inclusion, was then put and passed.

MOTION - ALDERMAN MOIR RE: AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE NO. 108
"CITY PRISON"

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the following amendment to Ordinance No. 108, "City Prison", be read and passed a first time:

BE IT ENACTED by the City Council of the City of Halifax, as follows:

1. Subsection (1) of Section 11 of Ordinance Number 108, the City Prison, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(1) Every prisoner shall be permitted to receive visitors one day each week during the hours of 9:00 to 11: o'clock in the afternoon; the day on which each such prisoner may receive visitors shall be determined by the Warden.

2. Subsection (14) of Section 16 of said Ordinance Number 108 is amended by striking out the words "two weeks" in the fourth line thereof and substituting therefor the word "week".

Alderman Richard asked if there had been any effort to determine the policy of the Federal Institutions to which the Commissioner of Health replied in the affirmative and said he had received several copies of regulations and they were handed to the City Manager. He said the regulations put into effect

Council,
June 29, 1965.

in the City Prison compare very favourably with those in effect in the Federal Institutions.

The motion was then put and passed.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Accounts Over \$1,000.00

The following accounts over \$1,000.00 were submitted from the City Manager:

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Minister of Finance and Economics	Balance of grant to Neptune Theatre	\$9,000.00
Minister of Finance and Economics	First instalment (50%) on Hospital per Capita Tax, due July 1st	46,005.50
R.K.Kelley & Co. Ltd.	Auto Fleet Insurance	<u>11,392.56</u>
		<u>\$66,398.06</u>

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman A.M. Butler, that the accounts be approved for payment. Motion passed.

Alderman Connolly asked if the payment to the Neptune Theatre would be final to which His Worship the Mayor replied that it was a yearly grant of \$15,000.00 to be carried on until Council took action to cancel.

Application to Rezone #6287 & 6299 Liverpool Street
From R-2 Zone to R-3 Zone

Referred to Town Planning Board for a report.

Application to Rezone Five Parcels of Land Adjacent to Dalhousie
Campus From R-3 Zone to Park & Institutional Zone

Referred to Town Planning Board for a report.

Letter - H. H. Marshall Limited Re: Land - MacIntosh Street

A letter was submitted from H. H. Marshall Limited requesting information as to when the Company could expect a decision from the City so they could proceed with their proposed warehouse on land on MacIntosh Street.

Council,
June 29, 1965.

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman O'Brien,
that the letter be referred to the Town Planning Board for con-
sideration. Motion passed.

Letter - Brunswick Street United Church Re: Provision of
a Hostel Home

A letter was submitted from the Brunswick Street United
Church suggesting that the City Council consider providing a
Hostel Home for Girls.

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman A.M. Butler,
that the letter be referred to the Public Health and Welfare
Committee for consideration. Motion passed.

Letter - Leslie R. Fairn & Associates

A letter was submitted from Leslie R. Fairn and
Associates listing their partners, staff and (1) partial list of
projects designed by the Company; (2) list of current projects
in the course of construction; (3) list of projects in the design
stage; and (4) list of projects recently completed.

The letter was submitted to the Council in view of
statements which imply a lack of confidence in the firm and to
advise that the firm is adequately staffed to handle large pro-
jects of a complicated nature.

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman H.W. Butler,
that the letter be tabled. Motion passed.

QUESTIONS

Question - Alderman Richard Re: Dairy Queen - Dutch Village Road

Alderman Richard asked on whose authority was the permit
issued for the construction of a Dairy Queen on Dutch Village
Road.

The Commissioner of Works replied that the permit was

Council,
June 29, 1965.

processed through the regular channels concerned and the permit was issued by the Building Inspection Office and it is in a commercial zone.

Alderman Richard then asked how far does the discretionary power of the Building Inspector go and why was it not exercised in this particular instance to permit the Town Planning Board or City Council to decide whether the area was a proper place for such a business.

His Worship the Mayor replied that the matter is heard by the Council when the inspector refuses the permit.

Opinion from the City Solicitor - Alderman A. M. Butler

Alderman A. M. Butler requested that the City Solicitor submit a written opinion as to how far the authority of the Mayor extends (when he is presiding in Council) to rule in a manner contrary to a legal opinion given by the Solicitor, the latter being the Statutory Legal Officer of the City.

Question - Alderman Doyle Re: Africville

Alderman Doyle referred to the C. B. C. Programme concerning Africville and stated that the programme completely ignored the efforts of the City and no attempt was made to show that the City had taken positive action to help the people in Africville.

His Worship the Mayor stated that he had sent a letter of protest to Mr. Ouimet, the Chairman of the Board, because he received a protesting letter from a lady in Vancouver who seemed to believe all she heard on C. B. C. He said he had been talking to Mr. Grant who was present when some of the people and matters concerned were discussed and some of these remarks were edited out. In the case of Mr. Stead, it is correct when he

Council,
June 29, 1965.

added to his remarks that the City was doing all it could, these remarks were edited out of the final production; an attempt to produce a negative show.

Mr. Grant replied that this was a statement made by Mr. Stead to Mr. MacDonald the next morning to the effect that his remarks did state he did speak and he wanted to make very clear that the City was attempting to rectify the situation.

Question - Alderman LeBlanc Re: Tree Planting - North Park Street

Alderman LeBlanc asked if the Commissioner of Works would consider planting some trees on the North Park Street Boulevard to replace those that have been removed.

His Worship the Mayor replied that it is planned to bring in 30 mature trees for planting in that location.

Question - Alderman Connolly Re: 2456 Brunswick Street

Alderman Connolly asked if the City Manager would delve into the matter of Mrs. Fleet, 2456 Brunswick Street, who claims the City is using means to remove her from the property which she has occupied for some years as the City requires the same for the Uniacke Square Redevelopment. She has applied to many sources in the City of Halifax and to the Housing Authority but, so far, hasn't had a favourable reply.

Question - Alderman O'Brien Re: Aquarium

Alderman O'Brien asked whether the Waterfront Redevelopment Report respecting the "Aquarium" has actually gone to the Committees that it was referred to and if anyone has any idea when Council might have it back so that a decision can be reached by the Town Planning Board and Council.

His Worship the Mayor replied in the negative and stated that Council named a Sub-Committee of 3 Organizations to be

Council,
June 29, 1965.

consulted and representatives of the 3 Groups were to meet.

Alderman O'Brien suggested that a representative of the Downtown Merchants' Association be also named to meet with the other representatives.

Question - Alderman Doyle Re: Elimination of City Dump

Alderman Doyle asked if it was not time that Council made some definite decision about moving the City Dump from the shores of the Bedford Basin.

He recommended 2 plans for study as follows:

1. dump all combustible materials at sea by the use of barges; obtain an isolated barren area from the County away from habitation and not create any new City Dump;
2. failing to obtain approval for the above, he suggested that the present Dump be re-located in Francklyn Park so that the outgoing tide would carry the garbage out to sea.

The matter was referred to the Committee on Works for consideration.

Question - Alderman Richard Re: Rehabilitation of the Commons and Fires on the City Dump

Alderman Richard asked the Commissioner of Works if there has been any progress made on the rehabilitation of the Commons, the renegotiating of the project and if he has made any progress on finding an alternative solution to the burning of the garbage on the Dump.

His Worship the Mayor stated that a letter pertaining to the Commons went to the Minister last week pointing out that a good portion of the money to be borrowed would be applied to permanent work. The matter is now in the hands of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Council,
June 29, 1965.

Question - Alderman Moir Re: Centennial Project

Alderman Moir asked if Staff could give Council some indication of the time required in order to have the City's Centennial Project in operation by the Centennial Year and also, if Council is not already behind the recommended time as scheduled.

His Worship the Mayor replied in the negative but he did think Council should give early consideration to appointing an Architect.

Question - Alderman O'Brien Re: Urban Consolidation

Alderman O'Brien asked if His Worship the Mayor would undertake to place the question of Urban Consolidation on the agenda for either Committee or Council action at a reasonably early date for general discussion.

His Worship the Mayor stated that he would do so as soon as possible.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Notice of Motion - Alderman Black Re: Relocation of the
City Dump

Alderman Black gave notice that at the next meeting of Council, he would move that Council or the Committees thereof, look into the matter of relocation of the City Dump and possible alternative locations.

His Worship the Mayor suggested that the matter be referred to the Committee on Works rather than by way of Notice of Motion.

The City Clerk was directed to place this matter on the agenda of the Committee on Works.

Council,
June 29, 1965.

ADDED ITEMS

Lord's Day Permit

An application was submitted from Chow Dam Do for a permit to operate a grocery store at #2390-92 Creighton Street from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman H. W. Butler, that the application be approved. Motion passed.

Alderman Richard asked if any check is made on the business occupancy assessment of \$5,000.00 and under, which is required in connection with the granting of these permits and was advised that the City Assessor signs a certificate to the effect that the assessment is within the limit of the law before any permit is granted.

Alderman Connolly asked if any check is made on those stores which open on Sunday whose assessment is over \$5,000.00.

His Worship the Mayor stated that no store can open on Sunday without a permit from the Council.

The Chief of Police was directed to check on this matter through the License Division and obtain a list of stores which have permits and those which do not.

Alderman Matheson suggested processing these applications through a Committee and then report to Council.

His Worship the Mayor replied that if Council wishes to act through a Committee, it can do so, and the Finance and Executive Committee would be the proper one.

Alderman O'Brien asked on what basis would further Committees or Staff reports put the Council in a stronger position.

His Worship the Mayor replied that it might be considered that in certain places it may not be desirable to have a store open on Sunday, especially near a church.

Council,
June 29, 1965.

He felt Council could exercise its judgment.

The City Solicitor then read the Ordinance for the information of the members of Council and stated that the way the law is written it states that the Council can use its discretion in the granting of these permits and, therefore, could refuse as well as grant an application.

Alderman O'Brien asked if the Dairy Queen on Dutch Village Road has such a license or permit and does it come before Council to which His Worship the Mayor replied that it was his opinion that the Dairy Queen does not serve meals and is not a restaurant, therefore, it must be a food shop; but the City Solicitor advised that such a business comes under the Federal Act and ice cream is specifically mentioned as being permitted to be sold on Sunday.

Letter - Retail Merchants' Association Re: Harbour Bridge

A letter was submitted and read from the above Association as follows:

Downtown Business Association,
P. O. Box 761,
Halifax, N. S.,
June 29, 1965.

The Mayor and Aldermen,
City of Halifax,
City Hall,
Halifax, N. S.

Dear Mayor and Aldermen:

The Downtown Halifax Business Association, Gottingen Shopping Centre Association, Spring Garden Area Business Association are unanimous in their feeling that a decision regarding the location of a second harbour's crossing should not be based on construction and land acquisition costs alone, as the effect of a total decrease in benefits as opposed to a total increase in benefits to the Halifax Area over an extended period of time should be of prime consideration. It is most certainly a matter of vital concern to our entire economic future.

When costs become the deciding factor perhaps we could learn a lesson, an expensive one, in recognizing that in the case

Council,
June 29, 1965.

of the Armdale Rotary, a temporary expedient was implemented because of cost even when all were aware that the proper solution which was deemed too expensive, was a complex arrangement similar to what is now recommended in the Fenco Report. Should this be implemented now, very little of the original capital cost will be salvaged.

We must therefore urge that if an admitted "second-best" solution is before you for consideration, a decision cannot and must not be made without the additional long range costs and benefits included.

The matter of location of a second harbour's crossing, be it a bridge or a tunnel, so important to the population at large, and the business community in particular, has never been the subject of a public hearing which would allow the interested parties to be informed and express their views in the various schemes proposed by the Bridge Commission or any possible alternatives to these schemes.

In the interests of the public welfare, we are therefore unanimously prepared to support the findings of an independent study of all reasonable alternatives to determine the optimum solution in terms of costs and resultant benefits to the Halifax Area.

Sincerely,

(signed) Isabel MacAulay,
Downtown Business Association

(signed) Bob Strand,
Gottingen Shopping Centre Assoc.

(signed) Peter Andrews
Spring Garden Area Business Assoc.

It was agreed that the letter be circulated to the members of Council.

Account for Personal Guide Books - Tourist Bureau

A report was submitted from the Tourist Committee recommended that an account amounting to \$4,317.45, covering 26,561 copies of the "Personal Guide Book", be approved for payment.

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman LeBlanc, that the account as submitted be approved for payment. Motion passed.

Narrows Bridge

The following letter was submitted from the Minister of Highways:

Council,
June 29, 1965.

Minister of Highways,
Province of Nova Scotia,
Halifax, N. S.,
June 28, 1965.

Mr. Charles Vaughan, Mayor,
City of Halifax,
Halifax, N. S.

City of Halifax Brief, dated June 7, 1965,
Respecting Provincial Cost Sharing on
Certain City Streets

Dear Sir:

We have carefully examined your brief on behalf of the City of Halifax as above noted and have considered the views expressed therein that the Province share with the City the capital cost of reconstructing a portion of Chebucto Road and the cost of maintaining portions of certain other streets referred to under the Items 1 to 9 inclusive on pages 11, 12 and 13 of the brief.

I would have no hesitation in recommending to Governor in Council that cost sharing maintenance agreements be made under provision of the Public Highways Act respecting Items 1 to 7 inclusive, subject of course, to concurrence of all concerned on details and timing.

With respect to Item 8, Barrington Street (Harbour Drive) we are not convinced that this section of street can be readily considered as the principal entrance route to the proposed Narrows Bridge. Principal entrance is apparently from Kempt Road and Robie Street as presently planned.

Considerations of Item 9, connecting links between the proposed Narrows Bridge and the highway system at Fairview, will almost certainly have to include a proper means of interchanging traffic at the junction of Lady Hammond Road, Windsor Street and Kempt Road as well as adequate traffic connections to the Bedford Road and to Bicentennial Drive. It seems that there is a great deal more than a maintenance agreement to be anticipated in connection with Item 9.

Reconstruction of a section of Chebucto Road from Mumford Road to Swaine Street could best be considered after discussion with the City of plans and estimates of cost in order to judge the possible extent of involvement, etc. Information would also be welcome concerning tentative plans to improve other sections of Chebucto Road and North Street which together constitute the main traffic artery across the City between the Angus L. Macdonald Bridge and the Arm Rotary.

Because of the foregoing considerations respecting Items 8 and 9 and Chebucto Road, I feel that there is not sufficient information available to support any recommendation to the Governor in Council at this time. As previously stated, however, I shall be pleased

Council,
June 29, 1965.

to recommend Items 1 to 7 inclusive as acceptable subjects for maintenance agreements and to enter into further discussion with you of Items 8 and 9 and Chebucto Road.

Yours very truly,

Stephen T. Pyke

Alderman Matheson made reference to the letter from the Minister which he felt largely answered the reservations that many members of Council have had concerning approaches to the proposed Narrows Bridge. If he interpreted the letter correctly, the Council now has an undertaking in principle from the Minister that the Province will participate in the cost of the highways in a fair and reasonable proportion.

Referring to the letter from the Merchants' Association, he stated that it deserved merit and it is something that Council should not lose sight of in trying to keep up with the demands of motor vehicle traffic of today that Council not destroy or prejudice the position of Halifax citizens whether they be downtown, on Gottingen Street, Spring Garden Road or Quinpool Road, as Council has a duty to encourage in every way it can, the preservation of the investments and improvements of the business opportunities of the merchants of the City. On the other hand, there is a very urgent problem needing a solution and that is the problem of traffic congestion which is getting worse every day which handicaps the entire City. He said there are 5 bodies dealing with these problems, namely, 3 Municipal Councils, the Provincial Government and the Bridge Commission. It would appear that there is not much headway and a failure of communication between the various bodies and that the source of the difficulty is the inability of the Council to take positive action. Everyone agrees that another crossing of the

Council,
June 29, 1965.

Harbour is needed; everyone agrees that a bridge is needed across the Arm; everybody agrees that improvements are needed to the Arm-dale Rotary and everybody agrees that traffic flow within the City Limits must be improved.

Alderman Matheson further stated that there is an area of disagreement with regard to the proposed location of the Harbour Bridge, and he indicated that City Council prefers the South End location but City Council, many months ago, was informed that it could not be built there and therefore agreed to the proposed Narrows Crossing. He suggested, some time ago, that it was time that the various bodies, at a policy-making level, should put their feet under the same conference table and try to resolve the difficulties which existed. As a result, Alderman O'Brien had made a motion with several parts, which he had seconded, and very little has happened since then. He said he was going to move a motion dealing with the Narrows Bridge because he did not believe that Halifax would get a South End Bridge. He cited two reasons why the South End Bridge was not possible: (1) the Provincial Government feels that it cannot guarantee the very high percentage of the very high cost of the same; and (2) that Council has been advised by people with actuarial experience that it is uneconomical and cannot pay for itself on a toll basis. He contended that if everyone agrees that the South End Bridge is the desirable location and everyone agrees that it cannot be built there, then the decision to be made is whether Council is going to participate or not in the construction of a Narrows Bridge.

He then submitted and read the following Resolution:

WHEREAS at a meeting of the Halifax-Dartmouth Bridge Commission, held on the 9th day of March, A.D., 1965, the plans, specifications and cost estimates as submitted by

Engineer H. H. L. Pratley for the proposed Narrows Bridge, were considered and approved by the Commission for submission to the Premier of Nova Scotia, the Mayor of the City of Halifax, the Mayor of the City of Dartmouth, and the Warden of the Municipality of the County of Halifax, it having been unanimously resolved that the plan dated March 4th, 1965, of a bridge at the Narrows site and the necessary approaches thereto, be approved subject to certain undertakings by the City of Halifax and the City of Dartmouth;

AND WHEREAS the undertakings by the City of Halifax, as requested by the Halifax-Dartmouth Bridge Commission, are to:

- (a) construct at its own expense a 4-lane street from a point 30' south of the power transmission line crossing North Barrington Street, thence westerly approximately 1500' to meet the bridge approach street;
- (b) provide, coincidental with the opening of the Narrows Bridge to traffic, street connections to Kempt Road and to Robie Street from the terminus of the bridge approach street at Columbus Street, with traffic patterns in the area satisfactory to the Bridge Commission;
- (c) grant to the Bridge Commission rights-of-way and easements over land owned by the City for the construction of approach streets by the Commission which, on completion would become part of the street system of the City of Halifax;
- (d) accept title to and assume responsibility for the maintenance of all bridge approach streets not on elevated structure.

AND WHEREAS in order to comply with such undertakings, the City of Halifax would be required to connect certain roadways with existing streets at the following points:

1. Harbour Drive and Lady Hammond Road

Interim road connections would have to be built by the City to provide adequate traffic distribution in the vicinity of the Kempt-Windsor-Lady Hammond intersection.

2. Harbour Drive and Barrington Street

Interim road connections would have to be made with existing Barrington Street, with the Bridge Commission requiring that at least 1500' of this be built to final specifications.

3. Robie Street Extension

The new Robie Street Extension shown on the Bridge proposal plan terminates at Columbus Street. At this point roadways would have to be built to connect with Robie Street and Kempt Road as an interim solution.

AND WHEREAS a preliminary appraisal of the cost of these three connections indicates that the expenditure required by the City of Halifax would amount to at least \$2,000,000.00.

AND WHEREAS these three connections, arising out of the construction of the proposed Narrows Bridge and the approaches thereto would also create links between the following Provincial Highways:

Council,
June 29, 1965.

- a. Highway No. 1 - Halifax to Yarmouth via Valley;
- b. Highway No. 2 - Halifax to New Brunswick border;
- c. Highway No. 3 - Halifax to Yarmouth via South Shore;
- d. Highway No. 7 - Bedford to Antigonish via Eastern Shore;
- e. Highway No. 18 - Dartmouth to Waverley;
- f. Bicentennial Drive - Halifax to Enfield.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Halifax approve of the plans, specifications and cost estimates as submitted by Engineer H. H. L. Pratley to the Halifax-Dartmouth Bridge Commission on March 9, 1965, for the construction of a bridge at the Narrows site and the necessary approaches thereto and that the City of Halifax further agree to undertake to:

- (a) construct at its own expense a 4-lane street from a point 30' south of the power transmission line crossing North Barrington Street, thence westerly approximately 1500' to meet the bridge approach street;
- (b) provide, coincidental with the opening of the Narrows Bridge to traffic, street connections to Kempt Road and to Robie Street from the terminus of the bridge approach street at Columbus Street, with traffic patterns in the area satisfactory to the Bridge Commission;
- (c) grant to the Bridge Commission rights-of-way and easements over land owned by the City for the construction of approach streets by the Commission which, on completion, would become part of the street system of the City of Halifax;
- (d) accept title to and assume responsibility for the maintenance of all bridge approach streets not on elevated structure.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that upon completion of plans, specifications and cost estimates by City Staff of the required street connections at the following points:

1. Harbour Drive and Lady Hammond Road

Interim road connections would have to be built by the City to provide adequate traffic distribution in the vicinity of the Kempt-Windsor-Lady Hammond intersection.

2. Harbour Drive and Barrington Street

Interim road connections would have to be made with existing Barrington Street, with the Bridge Commission requiring that at least 1500' of this be built to final specifications.

Council,
June 29, 1965.

3. Robie Street Extension

The new Robie Street Extension shown on the Bridge proposal plan terminates at Columbus Street. At this point roadways would have to be built to connect with Robie Street and/or Kempt Road as an interim solution.

And upon acceptance or modification of such plans, specifications and cost estimates by City Council, a Committee of City Council be formed to meet with and negotiate with the Province of Nova Scotia for financial assistance in the construction of the required road improvements arising out of the construction of the Narrows Bridge and the necessary approaches thereto.

Alderman Matheson stated that it was his view that a South End Bridge would be desirable but it appears to be impossible. Therefore, he did not know why Council should continue to try to receive the impossible and that Council should try to do something that is within the realm of possibility and which can be a reality. He suggested that if the bridge cannot be built in the South End that Council decide whether or not it wants to build a bridge in the North End.

Alderman Moir advised that he favoured the South End Crossing but due to the fact that what is good for the general area, will certainly in time, be good for the City of Halifax and for every business area of the City, he said he would favour the Resolution.

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Moir, that the Resolution, as submitted, be approved.

Alderman Black agreed with Aldermen Matheson and Moir when they favoured the location of a South End Bridge. He then referred to the Resolution approved by Council on May 7, 1965, as follows:

- (a) that Council recognize the need for an additional crossing of the Harbour, North West Arm Bridge at the south end of Robie Street, and a grade-separated improvement at the Armdale Rotary as recommended in the report of Foundation of Canada Engineering Corporation Limited;

Council,
June 29, 1965.

(b) that Council indicate its sense of priorities as follows:

1. Right-turn improvements at the Rotary;
2. Arm Bridge with connecting roads to Spryfield;
3. Full Rotary project;
4. Second Harbour Crossing linked to the Arm Bridge, south end preferred to Narrows Bridge.

(c) His Worship, with Staff and/or Committee assistance (Committee to be named by Mayor) seek Provincial consent to these priorities prior to any commitment by the City on cost-sharing; and subsequently seek adequate Provincial financing of traffic arteries serving the Metropolitan Area;

(d) His Worship negotiate for assistance from the Atlantic Development Board on these matters; and

(e) A round table conference with all interested parties be convened to seek a consensus.

He specifically recited Clause (c) of the Resolution and wanted to know what if anything, has been communicated to the Province with respect to consent to the priorities prior to any commitment by the City on cost-sharing.

His Worship the Mayor stated that on May 14th he and the Commissioner of Works met with the Minister of Highways at 1:00 p.m. and the whole matter was discussed. He pointed out to the Minister that it would be very well to build roads and bridges but who would pay the cost of the streets leading into them. For this reason, he resolved to secure the cost-sharing agreement from the Minister if at all possible. On May 28th a copy of the Resolution of Council was sent to the Minister and on June 4th the Submission was also forwarded, acknowledged by him, and a copy furnished the Premier. His Worship the Mayor advised that he had had several talks with the Minister and one with the Premier in connection with the question of the South End Bridge and the question of assistance from the Atlantic Development Board. The answer he received from the Premier with respect to the South End Bridge, was to the effect

Council,
June 29, 1965.

that the South End Bridge was not economically feasible and his Government was not prepared to recommend it to the Bridge Commission. With respect to assistance from the Atlantic Development Board, the Premier informed His Worship the Mayor that the proposed Bridge across the Narrows was, from all calculations, deemed to be a self-supporting project and he said he could not make an application to the Atlantic Development Board under these circumstances.

His Worship the Mayor then referred to the letter received from the Minister with respect to cost-sharing and it seemed that the Council has an indication of intent from the Minister to a greater cost-sharing or acceptance of certain streets for maintenance as submitted to him. He felt that the way is open to the Council to proceed with the projects now in hand.

Alderman Black again recited a Clause set out in the Resolution of Council May 7, 1965, which put the responsibility on His Worship the Mayor with Staff and/or Committee assistance, to seek Provincial consent to the priorities and that this be carried out prior to any commitment by the City on cost-sharing, and that subsequently the City seek Provincial financing.

He said he read the brief presented to the Minister of Highways with respect to cost-sharing and he had a great deal of admiration for it but there was no authorization to forward it to the Minister until the other matters were dealt with first. He did not see much point in Council passing one Resolution on May 7th and June 29th there is another Resolution before it which completely contradicts the one of May 7th.

Alderman A. M. Butler referred to the meeting of May 7th and stated that he suggested that Alderman O'Brien should be on the Committee to be appointed in accordance with the Resolution approved

Council,
June 29, 1965

by Council at that time and go down to the Provincial Government, along with His Worship the Mayor, members of Staff and any other Alderman His Worship may select, to discuss the matter at a round table conference. He wanted to know about the Arm Bridge which was Number Two in the list of priorities. He said he was for the Resolution of May 7th and would not agree with any variations from it.

Alderman Richard asked if the Province received a Submission from the Council requesting its approval of the priorities which were adopted on May 7th regarding the Armdale Rotary, Second Harbour Crossing and the Arm Bridge.

His Worship the Mayor replied that the whole Resolution of Council was sent to the Minister for his information.

Alderman Richard asked if the Province was aware of the priorities to which His Worship the Mayor replied in the affirmative.

Alderman Richard asked if the Province had any reaction to the priorities to which His Worship the Mayor again replied in the affirmative and advised that the Minister wrote him asking for a meeting of the two Staffs to discuss the Fenco Report. He stated that he had no indication in writing from the Province with respect to the priorities.

Alderman Richard referred to a newspaper clipping which stated that the Province has received no list of priorities from the City and he found it difficult to believe that His Worship the Mayor was quoted accurately in this respect.

At this time, Alderman Matheson stated that since May 7th, he felt it was clear from the Press that the Government will not underwrite 60% of the cost of \$50,000,000.00 for a South End Bridge and that it was also clear that while the Government

Council,
June 29, 1965.

agrees that a North West Arm Bridge is necessary, the only area of disagreement is the matter of timing when the Bridge should be built. He felt that the City should make a very good case for having the planning started at this time which is the intent of the Second Resolution which also takes into account the improvements to the Armdale Rotary. He was of the opinion that Council would not get anywhere if it insisted on the Resolution of May 7th.

Alderman O'Brien felt that the Number One urgent matter was on the western side of the City and that the Armdale Rotary situation is much worse today than the Bridge situation. He said the Premier is calling for action. He suggested that the Department of Highways take the Fenco Report and do the job at the Armdale Rotary and let the Council discuss the cost-sharing, at a round table conference, after the Government proceeds with the work. He said there is nothing holding up the Department of Highways and on May 7th, Council indicated its approval of the plan and recognized the need for a grade separated improvement at the Rotary. If the Department of Highways is anxious that there be no Arm Bridge immediately, but that the Rotary be proceeded with, he suggested that the Department proceed and if difficulty develops with traffic getting through at that location, it would be the responsibility of the Department. The Fenco Study has been carried out and that should be proceeded with. He felt that there was not quite such urgency with respect to the Narrows' Bridge. He was of the opinion that the City got into trouble in the past because of a habit of the City doing its negotiating with the Province and Federal Government to some extent, through private discussion with one person on each side. He specifically referred to the Bicentennial Entrance to the City and the previous Mayor was instructed, with a Committee named by the

Council,
June 29, 1965.

Council, to negotiate cost-sharing with the Province after construction was begun. He never called the Committee together and it never did its work. He felt a somewhat similar situation existed presently with the failure to implement the Resolution of Council of May 7th. He thought the City should proceed with more of the Council being involved but not without His Worship the Mayor being in on any Committee activity in relation to the Province of Nova Scotia. He said that he was not satisfied that the answer from the Province on cost-sharing was all the Council needed because it is an implementation of certain of the present Provincial Legislation in relation to the City of Halifax but the total capital expenditure situation in relation to the Province is absolutely inadequate and the City does not get the kind of funds from the Province that are required when all the capital requirements are considered for schools, hospitals, jails in which capital cities in other Provinces get very much larger contributions, plus the highways. He again suggested that the Province proceed with the Rotary and that the City argue about the other questions until the City's case has been adequately presented to the Province and Council has an answer. He said he would like to see the benefits and disadvantages of the two Bridge approaches lined up on paper according to the letter from the various Merchants' Associations because he felt that their point about the Armdale Rotary was well taken. He asked what the value is of the original capital expenditure for the Armdale Rotary when it has to be scrapped to put in a grade separated improvement. He wanted more facts and not accept from the Province that it is refusing to go along with the South End Bridge. He asked why the Council should participate in the decision of the Province if it has made it. He asked if there were to be some cooperation or negotiation on this matter. He said His Worship the Mayor, the Mayor of Dartmouth and the Warden

Council,
June 29, 1965.

of the County agreed with the Premier that it should be recommended to the respective Councils, approval in principle of the Narrows Bridge and that was done without having adequate Staff reports and on the basis that the Premier said he would not go along with the South End Bridge. He hoped that the Council would authorize any cooperation, except financial at this moment, on the Armdale Rotary and look very carefully at the Bridge question and not be stampeded by a series of contradictory statements in the Press from His Worship the Mayor and the Premier.

His Worship the Mayor reminded Alderman O'Brien that when he made his motion on May 7th, he put the Arm Bridge ahead of the whole complete Rotary project.

Alderman O'Brien stated that on the basis of acceptance of those priorities by the Province, the City would be prepared to discuss cost-sharing with it but if the Province did not accept the Council's priorities, then it can go ahead and build the Armdale Rotary as its first priority. He said that was his position then and it is so at the moment.

Alderman LeBlanc concurred with Alderman Matheson to a degree and he agreed with Alderman O'Brien. He felt the Council was boxed in as a result of rushed meetings where His Worship the Mayor and the Commissioner of Works left at 1:00 p.m. for the Province. He was of the opinion that it was not a pre-arranged meeting. He said that a matter of this magnitude, based on the Resolution of Council of May 7th, should not have been called at 1:00 p.m. when no one was around from the Development Staff or any other Alderman to attend with His Worship the Mayor. He felt that a situation has come about as a result of private discussions. As far as the City of Halifax is concerned, it is becoming boxed in

Council,
June 29, 1965.

by public opinion. The Council finds itself at this hour, after many deliberations and after having passed motions, boxed in. He thought the time has come when Council has to rebel from this sort of pressure. He felt that Council should lay bare the fact as to the relationship of cost. Suddenly the traffic on the Armdale Rotary and on the Dartmouth Bridge, between the hours of 7:30 and 9:00 a.m. is much the same as 4:30 to 6:00 p.m. because people of Dartmouth and the County are coming in and out of the City to work. He felt that Council was now in the position that it has its back to the wall because of the necessity of people in the County and Dartmouth getting in and out of the City of Halifax. He thought that Council must have some cost information as to the County's relationship of expenditures on the Rotary as well as that of the Province of Nova Scotia. He asked why the City of Halifax should assume all the cost because the City is being boxed in continually. He referred to page #2 of the Resolution which mentioned that the sum of \$2,000,000.00 would have to be expended by the City for three road connections. He said that Council could spend this sum for other needs.

His Worship the Mayor stated that this is why he went to the Minister to try to get the cost-sharing arrangement first so that Council would know the answers to these questions. He said he was trying to put the City in a financial position first and then proceed after an answer was received to the next step which would be discussions.

Alderman LeBlanc said that Council was asking that His Worship the Mayor adhere to the motions as they are passed. He said there were motions passed by Council and for some reason His Worship the Mayor saw fit to disregard them. He referred to his request for

Council,
June 29, 1965.

a meeting of the members of the Legislature of the Province of Nova Scotia who could have done so much to bring the parties together. He said that His Worship the Mayor deals with other people but he realized that His Worship the Mayor must do this on occasions but he felt it was a matter of coordination. At the moment, the County, the City of Dartmouth, the Province of Nova Scotia and the City of Halifax are all going in a different direction. He suggested that somebody bring these parties together to objectively discuss these problems and in particular, relate the expenditures to the people so affected. He said he could not endorse any of the Resolutions before Council at this time.

Alderman Black informed Council that he recalled a meeting about September 11, 1964 when the Narrows Bridge was approved in principle.

Alderman Black started to move an amendment but Alderman A. M. Butler rose to a point of order and asked how could Council put on record at this meeting, any Resolution in view of the existence of the Resolution approved by Council on May 7th.

Alderman Matheson replied and said that the Resolution on May 7th stated that Council recognize the need for an additional crossing of the Harbour, Arm Bridge, etc. which this new Resolution deals with and also that Council indicates its sense of priorities. He said this part of the Resolution of May 7th did not mean a positive action by Council.

MOVED in amendment by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman Richard, that this Council restate the position as stated in the motion passed at the meeting of Council held on May 7, 1965, and that the matters required to be done therein by those by whom they were required to be done, be done.

Council,
June 29, 1965.

Alderman Matheson stated that at certain times, further negotiations would be entirely useless because negotiations can be carried out to a point but beyond that, time is just being wasted. He felt that Council was wasting its time trying to persuade the Province to guarantee 60% of a \$50,000,000.00 South End Bridge and that this has been reiterated. He asked how could Council re-negotiate this statement. He said that the Premier has insisted on the Armdale Rotary having priority over the Bridge. He pointed out that over \$30,000.00 had been spent for a consultant's report and he asked why not accept the report and get on with it. He said that Council agreed in principle with the Narrows Bridge. He asked, "does it not mean that Council will cooperate in the construction of the Bridge and underwrite its share of the cost of same?"

Alderman H. W. Butler advocated that the County of Halifax should contribute to the cost of improvements to the Armdale Rotary.

His Worship the Mayor said he had discussed with the Premier the matter of the County not contributing and the Premier said the Province would pay for the entire cost of improvements to the Rotary outside the City boundaries and they would share with the City the costs of improvements inside the boundaries.

Alderman O'Brien was of the opinion that if the Province has picked up the entire share of the County they should do the same for the City as they are both urban areas.

Alderman Moir urged that the Rotary problem be considered apart from a resolution respecting the second Harbour Crossing.

His Worship the Mayor ruled the amendment as being out of order.

Council,
June 29, 1965.

Alderman Black then repeated his amendment as follows:
"that the motion of Alderman Matheson be amended to the extent that
this Council re-affirm the position it took at the meeting held on
May 7, 1965."

His Worship the Mayor requested that the Council re-
place His Worship the Mayor by Aldermen O'Brien, Black and Richard
to be the Committee to approach the Province as he maintained that
he had gone as far as he could in his negotiation with the Province.

The City Solicitor ruled the amendment out of order
under Section 35, Sub-section I in the Rules of Procedure Ordinance.

Alderman O'Brien commended His Worship for the work
he had done for the City with respect to the cost-sharing matter
and the answer received from the Minister of Highways. However,
he said there was another aspect of cost-sharing that some members
of Council had in mind in the resolution of May 7th and it related
to the City's cost, if any, of the major projects such as the
Armdale Rotary. He felt that Council had seen sufficient evidence
tonight that the City's bargaining position with the Province is
weak, but the moment Council passed a resolution saying that the
City will go ahead with the Narrows Bridge and negotiate later on
cost, at that moment, whatever bargaining power the City has with
the Province is gone completely as was proven in the case of the
Bicentennial Entrance. He contended that the City is just accep-
ting whatever cost-sharing the Province wants to force on it. That
is why some members feel it is time to argue the matter now and not
later when its hopeless.

His Worship asked what answers Alderman O'Brien was
seeking at this time. He then summarized the cost-sharing facts
as they stood at the moment.

Council,
June 29, 1965.

Alderman O'Brien said the answer as contained in the motion of May 7th was that if the Province insists on its priorities, then the implication is that it will build the Armdale Rotary at its own expense.

His Worship the Mayor contended that such implication was not in the motion.

Alderman O'Brien replied that before Council would discuss the cost-sharing of these projects, that it wanted consideration given to the priorities.

The motion, MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Moir, was put and passed, 6 voting for the same and 5 against it as follows:

For the Motion:

Aldermen Richard, H. W. Butler, Black, Abbott,
Moir and Matheson - 6

Against:

Aldermen LeBlanc, Connolly, Doyle, O'Brien
and A. M. Butler - 5

Alderman A. M. Butler gave Notice of Reconsideration.

Alderman Matheson then submitted and read the following Resolution:

WHEREAS in March, 1965, Foundation of Canada Engineering Corporation Limited submitted a functional planning report with respect to the Armdale Rotary and North West Arm Bridge to the Province of Nova Scotia and the City of Halifax;

AND WHEREAS such report set out in detail three proposed schemes for recommended improvement to the Armdale Rotary and recommended the adoption of Scheme 1;

AND WHEREAS such report further recommended that the North West Arm Bridge and Drive are found to be necessary and form an essential component of any efficient area-wide transportation plan and further recommended that more detailed planning and careful protection should begin immediately for the North West Arm Bridge and Drive from Robie Street to the Saint Margaret's Bay Road at the Prospect Road connector;

Council,
June 29, 1965.

AND WHEREAS at a meeting of the City Council held on May 7, 1965, it was resolved inter alia that the Council recognize the need for an additional crossing of the Harbour, a North West Arm Bridge at the south end of Robie Street, and a grade-separated improvement at the Armdale Rotary, as recommended in such report of Foundation of Canada Engineering Corporation Limited, and it further resolved that the right turn improvements at the Armdale Rotary should be the first of several priorities;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and City Manager be hereby authorized and directed to arrange a meeting or meetings between staffs of the City of Halifax and of the Department of Highways, to consider together detailed recommendations of the report respecting improvements of traffic facilities at the Armdale Rotary and the construction of a North West Arm Bridge and Drive, all as set out in the report of Foundation of Canada Engineering Corporation Limited, and that both staffs endeavour to arrive at an agreement on such recommendations as contained in such report or some adequate modification thereof for improvements at the Armdale Rotary and the construction of a bridge across the North West Arm including a Drive from such bridge to the Prospect Road connector.

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman H. W. Butler that, the Resolution, as submitted, be approved.

The motion was put and passed, 7 voting for the same and 4 against it as follows:

For the Motion:

Aldermen Richard, O'Brien, H. W. Butler,
Black, Abbott, Moir and Matheson - 7

Against:

Aldermen A. M. Butler, LeBlanc, Connolly
and Doyle - 4

The following Resolution was then MOVED by Alderman Richard, seconded by Alderman H. W. Butler:

WHEREAS the Council of the City of Halifax has adopted resolutions on this date pertaining to the commencement of planning for the Armdale Rotary and North West Arm Bridge, and the Narrows Bridge;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council indicate to the Province of Nova Scotia the following priorities for the commencement or completion of the undernoted projects, as follows:

1. Armdale Rotary
2. North West Arm Bridge
3. Narrows Bridge