

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

of statements on T.V. about the Manager and is he really the right man, and this sort of thing - maybe he is too fair - he is too good a guy - I would like to know exactly what he sees wrong with my performance, and if he told me that maybe I would know how I could improve myself if I am as bad as he thinks I am.

Alderman LeBlanc: Well, I would be very happy to accept the Manager's invitation, this is a delightful offer and I realize, again I don't think Mr. Ward this is entirely your own doing - I think you have been invited to make this invitation -

His Worship the Mayor: Alderman, would you say who invited him - you are saying that you believe he was invited. Were you invited Mr. Ward?

City Manager: No. I happen to be my own man and I do as I feel is right, and I don't have people telling me what to do, and if you think this is a put-up job, you are completely mistaken.

Alderman LeBlanc: But you stated Mr. Ward that a number of persons had come to you today and asked to meet with me, and I accept that too with pleasure so that I just assumed; did you mean that or didn't you?

City Manager: Yes - but the trouble is there is too much assumption going on. The individuals came to me to express great concern, because they happened to be present in some cases last night, about what you had said, and what is in the newspapers today as a result of your remarks to Bernie Raine.

Alderman Abbott: Mr. Manager, would you explain to the Alderman was it staff who came to you, or Aldermen.

City Manager: Staff

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

Alderman LeBlanc: Let's put this in its proper perspective.

If I remember correctly, Mr. Ward said that several members of staff had come to him today and invited me to meet with them after - something to that effect - Did you not say you would be glad to meet and have certain members of Staff?

City Manager: No. I said that some individuals might like to make some comments during this meeting perhaps.

Alderman LeBlanc: During this meeting - oh, well that is all right too - I didn't understand - I thought you meant after the meeting was over, but that is what I based my premise on that you must have felt you should bring this forward; that is my point. I didn't think it was entirely yours, I was wondering if you are committing other members of staff to make these comments.

City Manager: What has happened once again - There are all sorts of statements being made with no backing to them, and it is a very unhealthy situation, both within the administration, and within Council, and the way I see it we are heading towards a crisis. Now Council has it within its power to stop this or to continue it. The administration is under the gun. We are doing the best we can. There are not very many people here to carry the show, and if you want to get rid of those for any purpose - we are going the right way about it.

Alderman LeBlanc: Are you telling me that we have less people now than we had - has our staff diminished in the last year?

City Manager: What I am saying is this, that we are trying to attract staff to the City of Halifax. First of all - we are not getting very many applicants. The applicants that are coming in

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

are very concerned about coming to work for the City when they read and hear about what goes on in this particular local government. It is very difficult anyway to attract good people to Government, because it has got a lousy image. Let us face it and what is happening here is not making it any better.

Alderman LeBlanc: Well O.K. - I don't want this to be a two-way battle - maybe some of the other Aldermen may have some views, and I am certainly delighted that staff are going to stand up and be counted. If they are going to take after me - I don't mind this a bit - this is what I like, clear the air - and Mr. Ward you are very sensitive and I am not attempting to misquote you, I am trying to paraphrase so that I can accept your invitation. Am I correct in understanding you to say that you would like me to say what I think of this administration. Is that what you said? I just want to do what you ask.

City Manager: You say you are concerned about staff morale - you think there are things wrong with the way it is run - lack of co-ordination - I think if we had this issue down and just found out what the problems are - maybe we could find out just what is behind all this.

Alderman LeBlanc: O.K. I will speak from a personal point of view. In the last - since the re-election on December 11th; we were sworn in on January 1st, I have not been able to get, and I have written, any information from any Department from which I sought information, and I have done it in most cases through the City Manager, and it is continual frustration as an Alderman, to represent people who come to you with legitimate or maybe unfounded or maybe misdirected quotations, problems, requests, con-

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

siderations and you, as an Alderman, must go back to City Hall for direction, and you go, and there is nothing, as far as I am concerned, being done in many stages of the things which concern me, and this is what is causing frustration as far as I am concerned. But one thing I am not going to accept, Mr. Ward, is your invitation to name names of people. This I will not do in Council. I would say that I am personally not satisfied with civic administration at City Hall. Now I was one of those persons who rightly or wrongly, voted against your appointment, following, and if we want to be consistent, the assassination which the Commissioner of Works, who was merely an applicant for the position, following the precedent established at that time in a personal feud, in a vendetta - then I don't think there is anything that I have ever said that has reached that magnitude, but I have been consistent. Following this - we have to review this very briefly. I did not have this opportunity. When Mr. West was not accepted, and Mr. West I mention your name only because I am forced to do so, was not accepted for the position, and there were reasons given that under no circumstances could he fulfill this job which required qualifications of such extreme magnitude that I didn't think there was any man alive who could fill it; and suddenly, sir, and I say this with respect, and I say it now and I say it with conviction, that you were forced into a job, you accepted it but you did not apply to my knowledge at that time although I don't know if I had all the facts and I stated, with respect that if the qualifications were as great as some persons told me they were, then Mr. Ward could not under any circumstances fill the bill as far as I was concerned. Subsequently we got involved

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

with many things and annexation came upon us - you never, as far as I was concerned, had an opportunity to organize City Hall staff as I thought it should be. Now I can jump over to July this year, at which time I was invited to a meeting at one of the Aldermen's homes, and let us get this straight, to discuss how the Mayor and the Aldermen could create relationship which would be better for the civic administration and so that we could do our role and play our job more effectively, and Alderman Abbott called a meeting at Alderman Hogan's house on a Friday afternoon, and I attended. Alderman Abbott invited me to go to discuss the City Council's role, our relationship, what we could do to make a better City and how we could work with Staff, and I was invited by Alderman Abbott that we wanted a frank discussion - no holds barred - if you got something against the Mayor you say it, and if the Mayor had something against you Mr. LeBlanc, he will say it. O.K. I accepted that and I went. One Alderman declined, Alderman Connolly would not go because to date he has not been part of secret meetings for his own reasons. We have never once discussed the aldermanic relations. We got out there with two points - Items 5(a) and 5(b) which were introduced several weeks ago and again last night. This to me is sabotage, as far as I am concerned and this is the way it started. If we cannot have a meeting called for the purpose expressly to discuss aldermanic efficiency if you like - and then get out there and discuss two things which were decidedly far removed from what we were called for - consider them and suddenly they become an accepted fact before we ever, to my knowledge, I

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

may not have been here, discussed these two things fully. They are put on the agenda, they are then removed, and this obviously has some effect on staff morale. But Mr. Ward, getting back to what you said there is no, in my opinion, now an opinion, I want you to remember and everyone in this room, an opinion can't be wrong - I think what I think and obviously each person thinks what he thinks - but my opinion can't be wrong until such time as it is proven wrong. I can think it is a muggy day and you can think it is a delightful day - An opinion can't be wrong and it is my opinion that this City administration is weak. It is not co-ordinated - it is not organized, and I am not going to mention names and this is where I might get my bluff called, but there are people, and they are not in this room, who have told me in the last few days - Alderman Sullivan I am not going to bring you into this - that you were a party to it - it was unsolicited that there is no organization, there is nowhere to go, we don't know what in the hell we are doing, there is no communication. Mr. Ward, I cannot give you details - this is something that builds up - it is like a storm - you can't say at what moment was the intensity of the wind the greatest - this is something that has been brewing. But I can say to you, sir, that with the staff we have, and a reasonably good pay-roll, and with the City Council that to date, to my knowledge, has never declined any recommendation you have made - appointments or promotions - now do you agree with that particular point - that we have never interfered with any of your appointments to date?

City Manager: No.

Alderman LeBlanc: We have accepted and we have on our hands this staff which Mr. Ward hired -

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

His Worship the Mayor: Only a small part of it did he hire

Alderman -

Alderman LeBlanc: I stand corrected on that - I mean the persons he did hire and we are doing our best to work with it, as well, but the production, I submit, and I know Scotia Square and it has been used so often - that is one thing where so many departments seem to hang their hats on - and this has virtually eliminated and paralyzed the effect and control of works throughout other parts of the City. But the production has not gone up considerably since annexation - I think there are some departments who have slipped - and I am not going to mention those now because I would like to have a little more information on them. So my opinion is as an Alderman who has been here and I don't subscribe to seniority, I think there is a time for a person to get in and do what he can and get out but I do have eight (8) years here - and I go back to things like the Master Plan. If someone had told me the Mayor of the Day, Council would have voted me down, someone had said to me, "a Master Plan is not the criteria, it is not the consensus - we don't want it" - I would have forgotten it - but we have been talking about it ever since. Eight Years - A Master Plan how we can approach it. Now you are not entirely responsible for this but you have been on the job a couple of years - your predecessor has - he had just joined the staff - eight years - I think that is weak - eight years - a Department with eight or nine hundred people - a City administration can't produce a Master Plan. When I write simple letters, I am not going to mention because I could be involved in a lawsuit, but was one particular problem on Purcell's Cove - I

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

wrote you I think January 27th with a request - and I wait and I wait - and I am pressured by citizens - why don't you do something - what kind of an Alderman are you - you told us you would help us get this cleaned up if you were elected - and I get this and I am getting this crunch from every angle - because you have ten men, you have got 120,000 citizens out here - it goes through ten men, who take the brunt of it and then it goes back out again to a healthy staff. We are the ten men right there and the Mayor, eleven right there, and I wait and I wait, and now I get a letter from your assistant - months later - "You referred several weeks ago to a matter...". I wrote you on another occasion about a property out in the west-end of the City which I thought was deplorable - healthwise and convenience - because they were flagrantly violating the law. There were things in that particular letter about that particular problem that I didn't even put because it was embarrassing to my Secretary and embarrassing to read what is going on in that particular area. I copied Dr. Fogo, I copied the Fire Chief, I wrote you, I think I copied Mr. Grant, I forget - I didn't realize I was going to be on trial - but I copied these people and said is it conceivable that in this day and age that you Mr. Manager and these civic officials - all of whom are being paid a reasonably good salary, don't have the power to exercise the law which is written down to get things done, and today this was January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September 24th, today the same conditions exist. Those are two examples and I could go on. Now I would go on - maybe I am expecting too much - but I will say this in closing, and I was, last night, accused by you, and

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

one other Alderman of being a prima donna when I said some members of staff were and simultaneously two people said it - all right I accept that. I said last night in the conference, and I stand by it now, that there are those Aldermen who feel, for one reason or another, that they must support staff, and there are those Aldermen who feel that they have a right to speak up when things are not going right. There was some modification in between - there was some give and take. I say this is part of the battle - and I say that had these two motions been put forward last night and had we had a full Council either you, Your Worship, would have cast the deciding vote or it would have been won or lost by one vote. This is not positive action about re-organizing our City structure. This again would have been Council, by a split vote, moving to give the City Manager more power or to give him an assistant. I said last night in your office, speaking of assistants, when I first came on, there was a City Manager and a secretary, there are now six under the City Manager's Department; there is also the Long-range Planning and they are doing an independent job but they are still under him - but they are not directly connected, I appreciate that. There are now six - that is an appreciable increase. The Aldermen have gone from 15 to a representation, if you include the County Council, down to ten. The Fire Department, the Police Department and the Planning Department have increased substantially. The representation, the persons who are trying to make the so-called policy and I use that in quotes since it is almost a mockery - are the ones in the middle - so there is frustration, Mr. Ward, but I

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

cannot go listing a whole lot of names now - I don't have them on my fingertips - but I have a file. I have a lot of things - I write a lot of letters. Other Aldermen do but it is to no avail. I have shortened my letters. But I just say, sir, that when the time came to make a recommendation that you be given a substantial increase, I voted for it - it was unanimous, there was no argument. Anytime assistance was sought to date I have backed it, but I have stopped until such time that I am convinced that we cannot do and make better with the staff we have, and that organizational structure, I think is a sick piece of paper. It is so full now, I could presume now that with the added positions we have had in this last six months that the regular foolscap which took the former organization structure would no longer hold it - and that organizational structure is the only thing I have and there is no terms of reference on that. That is on paper, fine, it is a theory, but there is no coordination there as far as I am concerned. I am not going to name names, this is where I renege, I am not, at this time, but I have been told, that you don't know which way to turn and if you are too ambitious and that if you want to do a job there are other people who don't want this done and so it goes. This I admit and I acknowledge that in Government structure, there is bureaucratic procrastination. I acknowledge also, to my knowledge, and you told us things last night, you know, you put us on a spot so I am going to put you on a spot, that there was bickering and pushing and jealousy amongst the staff. You told us in the office in the presence of every Alderman here with the exception of Alderman Abbott who went - you told us this. You

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

told me this last night about 11 o'clock that all these things prevailed. You admitted it. Now if you have since had other members of staff who disagreed with this I would be willing to hear from them. But if I want to learn, I want to be a good Alderman, I want to make the City click. I've lived here all my life - I love it, but I am not, because some people don't like someone to stand up and rock the boat and make waves, I am not going to back off, until such time as it is proven that we have an efficient civic administration, but the consensus that I face among the constituents I represent is to the contrary and I only go by this, that I cannot substantiate every little incident. I am only a part-time Alderman.

City Manager: Your Worship - I think I have made it perfectly plain in the past that the administration in the past has had its problems. We are not as strong as we should be and there are many reasons for this, and I don't see any point in going into that here. We were starting to get on our feet when annexation came along, and you all realize the problems that we were handed as a result of taking over that part of the County. In addition to this many other problems have been multiplied anyway - we now have got this regional growth, this regional planning which is facing us, which is going to tax all of the staff's efforts over the next few months, and as far from increasing the staff, we have, in fact, decreased in that prior to annexation we had 14½ persons per thousand and it is now down to 11.8, so that the staff has not grown in the same relationship as the population, and I have noticed on checking some of the statistics with other municipalities that have had reasonably

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

large annexations, their per capita staff remain about the same, so that normally one would have expected the City's 14½ per thousand to have remained at that level, and I think this is an indication that possibly we did not add the staff that we needed to cope with annexation. Now I am not saying that all of the staff is of the best mix - there are problems, but let us be honest about it. One of the ways in which to get the most out of staff is for them to know that if they produce, they will get the rewards, and if they don't, that they should go and seek employment elsewhere, and let us face it, that there are; there have been individuals on staff who are protected by Aldermen, and it was made perfectly plain to me before I was appointed City Manager - that you know we don't want you to do this thing to this employee, and this sort of thing. I don't remember all of the details who said what, when and where, but this was definitely mentioned at the meeting, and I think we have to get to the point where City Council has got to accept the fact that if they want the administration to run properly, we have to be given a chance to prove ourselves to make proper arrangements for dismissal of staff when necessary, to attract the sort of staff we need, to give incentives to staff, and we will come up with a proposal in next year's budget as a matter of fact, which may achieve some benefits in this regard, that to attract people to local Government you have got to give them something over and above what they could expect in private enterprise, because this is a very difficult organization in which to work, and I think you will see if any of you happened to read "Newsweek" last week, they are having exactly the same problem down in the

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

U.S. They just cannot attract people to Government, at any price, and they are doing what is known as the "quality trade-off" - they will take less than the best just to get somebody. We have tried that this year - we have taken less than the best, and they have had to go, and this is one of the unfortunate things, you really can't afford to do this, because we, of all organizations, have to have the best staff because we provide the climate in which the tax payers operate - and if we don't have a good climate here - they can't operate. There are all sorts of inefficiencies and wastes. You know what the Urwick Currie report showed? It is still going on. We have managed to close some of the gaps, but there is so much of it, and so few people to do the job. If you talk to some of the key department heads and ask them, who they have on their staff they can rely on to do more than the day to day routine; I think on the average, a lot of the staff do their day to day routine very well, but don't forget we have a long-range outlook as well, and this is where we fall down. It is very difficult to get enough of the right sort of people who are willing to do more than they are asked - this is one of our problems. But my point is this, there are faults on both sides. The present situation though does not help us on the administration, because it is going to make it more and more difficult to hire staff, and this is one of the questions that people are asking now - is my job safe if I come to the City? What is all this that is going on in City Hall? It is bound to have an adverse effect on us. We have got to come to a state where we have a neutrality - I think both sides have got to say, for a fairly long period of time, we won't

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

criticize each other. We will accept the fact we are not going to get all of the answers we want because we know that you have no large amount of additional work from annexation, the needs of the future, we realize that you weren't able to get all of the staff, the right sort of staff that you wanted - we will accept this - but we expect that within two or three years, that we will see some definite results. If we can operate on this basis, then I think we've got a chance. If we don't, you're going to lose what you have.

Alderman Hogan: I think, Your Worship, now that we have gone this far in washing dirty linen in public, I don't suggest it is the proper place or way to do it, but, I think now that Alderman LeBlanc has gone this far, that he must name names, otherwise he has thrown suspicion on all department heads and perhaps lesser persons, and, I think if he is saying there is inefficiency, undermining of the operation, it throws suspicion on each and every person employed in the City and I think in fairness to all of them, names should be named. He has already named yourself, Your Worship, he has named the City Manager and I think these other names he should name those to protect the ones he is not throwing suspicion on, but at the moment everybody is under suspicion and I think that is wrong.

Alderman Ivany: I didn't want Alderman LeBlanc to be standing here and voicing his concern about the administration all on his own because there is no question about it, in that secret meeting, we all expressed our concern about the administration, some a little stronger than others, but I would remind the Manager, going back, and I would remind the Manager of this that we, as the

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

Council had nothing whatsoever to say, I think I am right about this, about morale, until he, one day, made the statement himself. I told you myself, Your Worship, I felt that at that time the Manager broke faith with this Council, and that is my opinion. Then we did have one or two meetings and, I think in fairness to Alderman LeBlanc, he was the instigator of calling a meeting with anyone on staff to come and express themselves before this Council. Now he did that. And I would also remind the Manager and yourself that we had a meeting with the Heads of Departments over in the Carleton Hotel, where we again asked for an expression so I think this Council has gone beyond the call of duty in my humble opinion to hear the facts. I said this publicly, not as loud as - but I have said this that this Council, up to a point, has been more than co-operative, and I don't know what else we can do. The Manager said that when people come here for employment are asking the question "Is our job safe" - wouldn't the record prove that anyone who works in City Hall has a safe job? Isn't the record such that this is so? I got a call this morning - from a chap who called himself a Financial Planner - five months here, hired in March - had seven moves, seven places to sit and he packed up and he told me he quit himself the first part of the week - that is what he told me and I don't know whether the facts are right but that is what I was told this morning.

His Worship the Mayor: Why don't you state the facts if they are right?

Alderman Ivany: I only know what he told me. We complain very much about the Herald and Mail, we call it all kinds of names some

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

of us, but here is the Fourth Estate, what are they saying about the fact that our friend Mr. Lubka has seen fit to resign. It would be worthwhile to read this - it is quite enlightening. Yes, I am personally very concerned and I might be classified as perhaps one of the prima donnas. Some time ago I raised the question, very early in my life in Council about incentives. I recall the Boston Red Socks trying to build a base-ball team and they tried to buy the personnel to do it. I personally think that you have to use a little incentive within the organization and I question whether that is being properly promoted in this administration. I do. I was through Q.R.T.M. and the administration of the Federal Department and the Navy organization, and put together what I thought was a fairly sensible incentive for this administration two years ago - not that I wanted it adopted - but I wanted some appreciation for it - I felt that at least it should have been given some consideration - I think we have to have some incentives within the organization. I am not happy - I would say this publicly: I regret, I must say this afternoon that we must deal with it in the way that we are. Later on, the next item coming up - I will mention it now - you know there is a case of one Department in the City where, in writing, people were advised not to contact their Alderman. Yesterday, I had a call from a lady who felt she must contact me and she told me.

His Worship the Mayor: Is it a department of City Hall that you are speaking of?

Alderman Ivany: Yes - another Department of City Hall.

Adjourned Council,
October 25, 1969

His Worship the Mayor: Should it not be named?

Alderman Ivany: I will name it - the Real Estate Department, pleased to do it, I will name the other department, the Recreation Department.

His Worship the Mayor: The Recreation is not a department, it is a Commission.

Alderman Ivany: The department itself is not a department?

His Worship the Mayor: The Real Estate Division is one section of the Development Department that you are naming and the Recreation Commission is not a Department in our structure. - It is a separate organization with a separate governing body.

Alderman Ivany: They are civic employees.

His Worship the Mayor: Yes, that is correct.

Alderman Ivany: Do they come under the City Manager? Does Mr. Dillard come under the City Manager?

His Worship the Mayor: No, he comes under the Recreation Commission.

Alderman Ivany: Who hires and fires him?

Alderman Sullivan: The Recreation Commission.

Alderman Meagher: When we hired the present gentleman, it was the Recreation Commission group in consultation with the City Manager's extra help by the Personnel.

Alderman Ivany: Well, I only repeat that in this particular case - I received a phone call and the lady was rather concerned that she should call me that it may not go well for her and that she was advised not to call her Alderman. I must say this - that I think, I see a lot of logic and reasoning for people not calling their Alderman. I think when they have troubles in City

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

Hall and trouble with streets and other facilities of the City administration, we should have the kind of administration that they should never have to call an Alderman - I admit to that, but to even be implied that your constituent should not call you - now this is getting around, this is the kind of thing that is getting out and is stirring up the people. I would certainly like to read this but I would advise everyone to get a copy and read it. (The Fourth Estate).

Alderman LeBlanc: In answer to Alderman Hogan - I said earlier that I am not going to name names at this time but, because I fear for those particular individuals and this would be unfair to them. One man phoned me, an employee of the City, crying. I said, look, you had better go through the proper channels, and see the Personnel man and if you can't get satisfaction there maybe he will take you in to see the City Manager. He said if I do that, I'm done. I know of one other person, I mentioned. I am not going to involve Alderman Sullivan, but he heard this - but I have no intention of mentioning names today. Alderman Hogan, I think, I will be only too happy to bring these things into more clear focus again in consultation - when all the staff members are present who are involved, but this could become a real donnybrook in this respect, and I am not going to do that at this time. I would like some time for you Your Worship to call a vote and have those Aldermen who are satisfied with the civic administration - take a vote and if the majority rules, that is it.

His Worship the Mayor: Alderman, with respect to that last remark, I think you must realize that there isn't anyone who would say they are satisfied among the members of Council. We would

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

not stand for office if we thought everything was so good that nothing needed improvement. We are here for that purpose, and the debate really comes down to what we are prepared to do about it - not the assessment that there is a need for improvement. The Manager admits there is a need for improvement, and I think just about every Department Head would admit that, and the question is, what is the Council willing to do to make improvements in the civic administration possible.

Alderman LeBlanc: Well, I am willing, as I said earlier, to wait and see. The City Manager said he is going to have a report first and that is what I said at the outset before I -

His Worship the Mayor: Whatever his report is - may I suggest to you that it cannot in one report overcome the damage that is done by public criticism of a repeated nature of appointed officials who are dedicated but defenseless.

Alderman LeBlanc: Well, Your Worship, the Manager said that Department Heads, you can correct me, were victims of maybe inferior staff, substandard or less than satisfactory staff which they have to work with, but they have power to improve their departments don't they? - hire and fire or recommend that staff be hired and fired - do they have to remain mute? Do they have to remain in straight-jackets, don't the Department Heads have power to reorganize their departments and do things within reason? Maybe dismissals might have to come before you eventually, Mr. Ward - I don't know to what extent you reason these things out with your Department Heads; but they have the power, - we would welcome an opportunity to see some re-organization, this is the whole point - this is what I am longing for and this is what has

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

led to frustrations but it has not been forthcoming for eight years - that is a long while - now you were not responsible for the eight years, I readily concede this - you weren't even here for a good number of those years but my gosh, we must go to the senior man, who else is there to go to. Council are split on the issue. Some Aldermen don't want to mention it at all. That is their privilege but I feel compelled to.

Alderman Sullivan: Your Worship, I am not going to say too much, a lot has been said already but I can't help refrain from making one small contribution towards it. You have repeatedly said there is nothing much to gain by criticising staff in public. Now as a comparatively new Alderman, I was filled with all kinds of push, initiative and drive; as Alderman LeBlanc said, he loves this City - I love it just as much, I think we all love it and we want to do everything we can, but shortly after I was elected, you, as Mayor of this City - you came out publicly and you castigated a member of staff.

His Worship the Mayor: Alderman, if you want to go back prior to the last election, you had better get the facts straight. I was not the person who named the member of Staff, he was named publicly on radio and maybe television and the press in advance and my statement was made without reference to names, and there are more facts about that, but it is ridiculous. We all passed election tests last December, and we should carry on the business as of a fresh start from January 1st, and if we want to go back beyond that, we are just wasting time and further destroying the civic administration. Now, none of us who comes under attack on the previous record unjustly is going to permit it to stand,

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

but let's focus on the period from January first on both up to now and from here into the future.

Alderman Sullivan: Well, Your Worship that is your wish but it is not mine. You made a statement, whether you named names or not, it was a well known fact that you spoke before the Board of Trade and everybody knew who you meant. Now you made a public expression of opinion which was in no way favourable to a member of staff, and now you are criticising the Aldermen for saying anything about staff and you yourself provided an example. Now me, as a comparatively new Alderman, I see you getting up and doing these things - I think if it is fair game for you, why shouldn't it be fair game for us? I don't think in memory have I criticized staff - I don't think I have.

His Worship the Mayor: You did last night in a blanket way Alderman Sullivan - you condemned the whole City staff by saying that if any citizen approached any member of staff they would get short shrift. That was your statement last night and - I asked you if it were correct, and you said "yes".

Alderman Sullivan: But what was behind it Your Worship? I said if the Council, if they use influence, if they had the power to do it, they will do it, and I also stated that the Council hasn't got the power to do that, but administration has. Don't you think that administration are going to be approached to do things, don't you think, as I said last night, it began with the dawn of time and will stand until the end of time - and I stick to that.

Alderman Ivany: No one wants to continue this much longer I am sure, and I would only remind since January this year, I referred -

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

when I felt the Manager broke faith with this Council, and I again repeat that - and we had very good results - now can we start again? I hope that we can on Tuesday night in the privacy of your office. I made one or two suggestions. Some of the Aldermen afterwards felt they were rather good suggestions. I hope that when we meet on Tuesday we will make a fresh start somehow. The Manager referred to the number of personnel on staff - three times last year I stood in that seat there and asked the Manager "are we geared for the new City, for annexation, are we planning the different departments?" and on three times I was told "yes". Now I don't accept from him at this time the excuse for annexation. We tried to plan for annexation. We tried to plan a year ago and I was told we had a plan and would be ready for it. I asked also about plans coming in from the County. I asked are they being indexed; are we getting the card facilities and all the rest, three times I asked that and I was told "yes". Now I hope that perhaps we can reassess our position and I am looking forward to something on Tuesday. That is enough for now.

Alderman Meagher: I suggest we go on to the next item.

His Worship the Mayor: If there is nothing further, Item 2Q(d) Call from Constituents to their Alderman - Alderman Ivany.

Alderman Ivany: I earlier stated my reason for putting this item on. I would hope, and I say this to the City Manager, that we may make it very clear from his office to the different departments, that whatever information is given to them it does not imply that they should not call their Alderman. I don't mind the kind of information as I said on items concerning

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

facilities on the City of Halifax works program and other things, that they should call Department Heads or call his office anyone, but to imply that the people of Halifax should not call their Aldermen and I can only take what the lady told me which the words were "she was rather afraid to call because it may not go well for her"; now she happens to live in a City house. That is my concern and I know I saw it implied in a letter that you saw -

His Worship the Mayor: You mean the Recreation Commission.

Which was a letter thoroughly dealt with according to the understanding that Council had when the matter came to its attention, and needs not to be dragged out again as it has been properly dealt with. That is the Recreation Commission.

Alderman Ivany : Has it been properly dealt with?

His Worship the Mayor: It certainly was. I discussed the matter with Mr. Dillard and asked him to send out a revised letter to state the case more accurately. I think that what he really meant to say was quite proper, but that the wording needed some clarification.

City Manager: This is the sort of a case that I feel the Alderman should first come to me about, and tell me the facts so that I could first of all, check with the division to find out whether or not they had been doing this and whether or not it was right - because what happens is that this is the sort of thing that gets to the Press, then someone says My God that Real Estate Division, you know, and immediately there is a slur on their operation. Now if there is anything wrong you should come to see me first, and I am quite willing to take it up with the

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

division head or department head.

Alderman Ivany: You know my method for approaching you what my procedure is - not to disturb your office, but I do call Mr. Churchill, because I appreciate the fact that he probably has a little more time or should have. I did this yesterday, I called him and said would you inform the Manager that this has been placed in my lap and that if I don't have some definite answer by Council time I will bring it up in Council. Now I might say that I did have a call, questioning me about the affair, but no definite kind of action that should have been taken. I was informed this morning, not by anyone in City Hall because I went to look for myself - nobody called me, and I said there has been more done there in the last day than has been done since March when the thing was first taken in hand. Nobody called me from City Hall to tell me that things had been taken in hand -

His Worship the Mayor: Who informed you of that - whose opinion is that?

Alderman Ivany: What opinion?

His Worship the Mayor: That there has been more done in the last day since March? Is that the statement you make?

Alderman Ivany: Yes.

His Worship the Mayor: That is rather an astounding statement. Would you like to quote your source so that we know what faith we can put in such a statement.

Alderman Ivany: Faith in me that I said it.

His Worship the Mayor: Oh, that is your opinion.

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

Alderman Ivany: It is my opinion and it is a fact. Do you want me to tell you what it involved?

His Worship the Mayor: I am not sure I understand what it is you are talking about - you say there has been done more in 24 hours than since March and I would like to understand how anybody can make that statement unless it is a fact that it is an item that could only be dealt with in one day and other items of priority were being handled in the meantime.

Alderman Ivany: Say that people were having a bath-tub put in and it was recognized in March that there was a bath-tub leaking and that a bath-tub was required and there was nothing done from March up until yesterday, and then the bathtub was put in - in the last 24 hours - would you accept that as being more done in 24 hours than was done in five months.

His Worship the Mayor: All right - it makes sense when it is explained that way, although there are other factors like - it was recognized by whom in March, etc. - that are relevant to the story, but when you make a blanket statement like that it suggests there is a division at City Hall that has been sitting doing nothing for a period of time, and then all of a sudden in 24 hours, because two Aldermen get up and criticize the staff publicly, they have suddenly done a whole lot of work - that is the kind of ridiculous impression that goes abroad out of Council meeting - where broad statements are made without the specifics.

Alderman Ivany: It is not. Let's stop it, Your Worship - it is not because an Alderman did a lot of work, or because an Alderman called - I said when I telephoned yesterday, I said that if I

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

didn't have something on that I would bring it up in Council - I was fair enough about that - my goodness what's wrong with that. We need a few doers around this place - a few doers, and we won't be correct in all the procedures we are doing, and I admit I am not correct in all my approach and in my procedures, but you do get a little bit annoyed when it takes so long to do some simple little thing.

His Worship the Mayor: I might say so about the little things at City Hall - they will be well handled after we have solved the major problems of organization and morale by getting the direction of the administrative side into the hands of the City Manager who has the right kind of assistance and the opportunity to organize his staff and who gets the public respect of the members of City Council so that he can do the job. When that happens, and that can't happen over night - last night's Council meeting, I think, was more destructive than can be overcome by all the good work of three months.

Alderman LeBlanc: Your Worship, if I may pursue this - are you saying that the City Manager is going to bring in some recommendations for changes in administration that are going to extensively improve the overall structure of the City. Now, implicit in this must be the fact that there must be a lot of new blood coming in here, or is he just going to re-organize and revitalize and restimulate those persons serving underneath him. He has had the power to re-organize these departments all along. Is this what is implicit in this - is a bunch of new experts coming in with some vigour and enthusiasm because otherwise if you just move fellows from A to B - that is not changing per-

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

sonalities or characters or productivity. I am anxious to see -

His Worship the Mayor: Perhaps one of the reasons that some Aldermen have not gotten answers to questions that they have put to the City Manager in writing or in Council meetings, is because the City Manager does not have the kind of leverage he ought to have over Department Heads and they perhaps, in turn, over division heads, etc. all down the line. There isn't the kind of control in the hands of the City Council where they can say - Mr. Manager, you've got the whole administrative thing - you produce or else. We have allowed the Department Heads to be not fully responsible to the City Manager and not responsible at all to the City Council, and therefore we have a loose administration which this Council has failed to come to grips with when it has deferred action on the Charter amendments which were put before us last evening.

Alderman Ivany: So you are implying, Your Worship, that the Heads of Departments in this administration just do what they want, is that right?

His Worship the Mayor: I am saying that they have this opportunity to successfully go their own way, or to be slow in production - they have no fear about being fired have they - any of them.

Alderman LeBlanc: Well, they must be, Your Worship, the Manager has said it is almost impossible to get people, because there is such an inherent fear in coming to Halifax. You say they have no fear of being fired - boy, there is a contradiction if I ever heard one.

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

His Worship the Mayor: I think if you think about it a little you will realize there is not.

Alderman Meagher: Do you mean that you believe truly that you can run an organization on fear? It should be run on love not on fear - you know - I am a pretty peaceful fellow and for you to say that an organization should be run on fear ----

His Worship the Mayor: I did not say that Alderman - I said that there needed to be sufficient control in the Manager's hands that in those cases where there is not the cooperation forthcoming that some fear might create that cooperative spirit, and nobody is going to run an organization on fear and run it well today - All of us are aware of that and I appreciate the message from the flower community.

Alderman LeBlanc: The City Manager created the Long Range Planning Department and put it under his wing and there was no argument and no interference from Council and he took much of the responsibility from the Works Department and gave it to Development - he took Mr. Dodge from Works and gave him to Development - there was no Council interference on these things. He set up Departments and no argument. The Social Welfare, for example, I notice is in a higher echelon of civic administration - there was no argument about that when he made this structure. I don't think there was any Aldermanic interference. I cannot accept entirely and I refuse to accept the blame that the Aldermen are the ones responsible. I can't see the logic in it. We didn't hire or fire anyone. Mr. Ward has had the same staff. He could have made changes. If he was so convinced, why didn't these changes come forward 6 months ago? Where have they been?

Adjourned Council,
September 25, 1969

SPECIAL COUNCIL

His Worship the Mayor: Obviously there are a lot of elements in the picture and some of them have been aired today.

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

After the meeting was over, the members of City Council attending led by the Mayor recited the Lord's Prayer.

Present were: His Worship the Mayor, Alderman and Alderman Abbott, MacKeen, Hogan, McKenna, Sullivan, *Allen*

Also present: City Manager, City Clerk and other staff members.

The City Clerk advised that the Council had been called to consider the following:

Tender for Supply and Erection of Signage to the City Hall, Scotia Square.

A staff report dated September 22, 1969 was submitted, which read as follows:

"Staff have assessed the tender documents which were submitted at 12 o'clock on October 1, 1969, and advised the successful tenderer is the Firm of Seaman Cross Limited. It will be seen that their tender bid for Part A of the work is \$63,479 which is substantially lower than the other tenders, and that the price per foot run of work, specified in Part B of the tender is also lower than the other tenders.

"Tenders submitted are summarized as follows:

<u>TENDER FIRM</u>	<u>PART A AMOUNT</u>	<u>PART B - UNIT PRICES</u>		<u>DATE OF COMPLETION</u>
		<u>SIGNAL PANEL PER LINEAL FT</u>	<u>DOOR PER UNIT</u>	
Seaman-Cross	\$63,479.00	\$21.00	\$155.00	Nov. 21/69
Alternative	\$66,312.00	\$22.00	\$170.00	Nov. 21/69