COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday May 18, 2005

The Council met at 9:37 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Wyatt.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Benham, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Wyatt.

Moved by Councillor Thomas

That Council adjourn until 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Council reconvened for May 18, 2005 at 1:32 p.m., all members present, except for Councillor Lazarenko.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have pages with us this morning, Ilana Shapera and Susan Schipper, both attend Gray Academy.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie moves the minutes of the meeting held April 27, 2005 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

MOTIONS

Motion
Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan
Seconded by Councillor Eadie

That Councillor Lazarenko be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to being away on City business.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

We have delegations this morning. Our first delegation Fred Pauls and George Martens in support of item 14 report of Property and Development dated May 3rd. Gentlemen. Welcome.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Just one of you this afternoon? Oh very good.

Mr. Pauls: Thank you, good afternoon. Mr. Martens is sitting at the top, he won't be presenting, just I will be presenting. I believe there was material that was distributed to each of the Councillors regarding my presentation.

Mr. Speaker: No. None on my desk. Everybody but me, I'm not important. Go ahead.

Mr. Pauls: How could they do that? In that is a brochure which I have brought some boards to display but the boards aren't put up but there's some documentation inside the coloured piece that I'll refer to in my presentation.

I thank you for the opportunity to make the presentation today. Mennonite Brethren Collegiate is a Christian middle and high school for students in Grade 6 to Senior 4. We have been providing an excellent learning environment for 60 years to the Mennonite and Winnipeg community. 80% of our graduates go onto university and college. These graduates are providing leadership in the church, business and academic community here in Winnipeg.

Some of our distinguished graduates are Dr. Henry Friesen, the head of Genome Canada; Art DeFehr, businessman and philanthropist; Vic Toews, Member of Parliament; and Cindy Klassen, World champion speed skater and hopefully a winner of at least one gold medal at the next Olympics.

The images in the brochure that you have in front of you in your handout show some of our plans for the development of our school campus. The first phase of construction has begun. It is an investment of $3 million dollars. It

represents a renovated middle school, a new library and this is phase 1 of our redevelopment. Construction of this phase is underway with occupancy of the middle school planned for September 2005 and the library/drama classroom for December 2005.

There is an image in your picture from Talbot Avenue. There is a glass building. This is the original address of our school on Talbot Avenue. This is phase 2 of our project that's estimated at $2.7 million. The total then we are investing in this location in the Elmwood area is close to $5.7 million dollars. We will have a discernable entryway to our school with completion of this phase. Student friendship areas, a new staffroom, an atrium and office space planned for this phase of the project.

There is also the image that represents a campus plan for the school. Our goal is to turn this collection of buildings that are bounded by, in the area by Henderson Highway and Brazier between Talbot and Riverton into a campus. An efficient coherent campus with a middle school that will have its own entrance, a high school with enough classrooms and student friendship areas joined together by our library and drama classroom. We are investing in the Elmwood area. We have been there 60 years; we want to continue to be there.

So the matter at hand today is regarding the Historical Building Committee recommendation that 77 Henderson Highway, the former Anna Gibson School, File G-3.1.1. The Historical Buildings Committee is recommending that the former Anna Gibson School be placed on the Buildings' Conversation list as a Grade III historical building. We appreciate the sentiment of the Historical Buildings Committee because at one time we were at that place as well.

For a number of reasons and we'll try to illustrate it, we've requested that the building be demolished. As listed in the report the school was built in 1919 and named the Anna Gibson School. It is my understanding that this school was an annex to the Lord Selkirk School further down the street on Talbot Avenue. The Disraeli Bridge was not built. This was a residential community. After some time the school was no longer needed by the Winnipeg School Division and during World War II it was used as a dormitory for military persons in the Winnipeg area.

In 1944 the building was sold to the Mennonite Brethren Bible College an agency of the Mennonite Brethren Church of Manitoba. It was used as a classroom and administration building until the college moved to become part of Canadian Mennonite University. The College named this building the A. H. Unruh Teaching Centre. The Mennonite Brethren Church has owned this building for 61 years.

In 2000 the Mennonite Brethren Collegiate Institute took over the ownership of this building from the College along with two other buildings between Henderson Highway and Brazier. We are using the gym and have demolished the dormitory and turned it into green space. The acquisition of this property allowed us to build more classrooms, a new library, student friendship areas and office space. In the short term we saw the A. H. Unruh Teaching Centre, the former Anna Gibson School as a place for us to have four or five classrooms.

Upon investigation we found that this building required many renovations to make the building a safe and healthy space for our students and teachers. Whereas the building was state-of-the-art in 1919 it has received few upgrades since that time. The building would require a new roof, fire-rated ceilings, fire-rated classroom and entry doors and exterior doors, heating, ventilation and cooling systems, electrical upgrades and plumbing upgrades. When all this is said and done it was estimated this would cost around $500,000 dollars.

At this time there were more buildings that became available to the school. When 169 Riverton became available we renovated the main floor and the basement to make five classrooms and a lunchroom for approximately $50,000

dollars. This was much more economical than renovating the A. H. Unruh building, the building at 77 Henderson Highway.

Our plans for a new library and additional classrooms changed with the purchase of the two properties on the north side of Riverton. In consultation with our architect we were able to develop the campus plan that you saw in the brochure that you received. This plan would allow us to separate our middle school and high school but join them with a new library. The middle school requires green space. We would like to turn the area in front of the middle school into green space. This includes the space where the Anna Gibson School is located.

The removal of the Anna Gibson School would allow us to open a campus to the Elmwood/Kildonan community. Many people that come down into the Elmwood area maybe don't even know there is a school behind there. We hope to open up that, our campus to the Elmwood community. We have been in this community for 60 years and plan to be in this community for a long time to come, God willing. If we are allowed to turn this area into green space we would be open to recognizing both Anna Gibson and A. H. Unruh with this location. Our art teacher has begun thinking about a project with his Grade 12 class.

In conclusion as a school we would not speak in favour of the recommendation of the Heritage Building Committee. We would request that you do not accept the recommendation and allow us to have some green space for our middle school children, and allow us to gain some visibility for our school in the Elmwood/Kildonan community. We concur with the recommendations from Executive Policy Committee, the Standing Committee on Planning, Property and Development and the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee.

One of the realities of our school is that we are a non-profit organization. While we get partial funding from the Provincial government for the operation of the school we do not get any funding for our buildings. When the Winnipeg School Division wanted to renovate Wolseley School, and I use Wolseley School because it's also a one storey elementary building, they receive funding from the public schools finance board. We are not able to apply for funding from this source. More than that Wolseley School was and is an existing elementary school. The Anna Gibson School has not functioned as an elementary school for over 60 years.

The Mennonite Brethren Churches of Manitoba have provided generous support for the establishment of our current facilities. They're being supportive of our current campus expansion and various other people are contributing to our current building project. The building at 77 Henderson Highway does not fit into our current or future plans. Thank you again for allowing me to make a presentation here and I look forward to your decision.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Would you permit questions Mr. Pauls? Would you permit questions?

Mr. Pauls: Oh for sure.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Hi. It's my understanding that the main concern of the Historical Committee was the name Anna Gibson and near the end you said and correct me on this that you will still be honouring Anna Gibson and actually for the past 60 odd years her name had actually been lost and it wasn't until these changes were planned that you became aware of Anna Gibson and decided that you would do something to honour her in our community correct?

Mr. Pauls: That's correct Councillor Thomas we plan to create a monument or some sort of thing and we want to make it an indigenous thing. We want our Senior 4 students to learn about her and then make an appropriate monument to her as well.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Yes. And the supplemental is with regard to the green space. Could you comment on the amount of or lack of green space in the area?

Mr. Pauls: The lack of the green space in the area is clearly, our students at our school have to go down to the riverbank to actually get any green space. But we also have a relationship with the Winter Club on Brazier as well that our students use that park as well but there is nothing right on campus.

Councillor Thomas: And will this be open to the general community to utilize the green space?

Mr. Pauls: Yes it will be.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Pauls. Thank you.

Mr. Pauls: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Our next delegation today is Robin Faye in support of item 2 report of Protection and Community Services dated March 11th, Mosquito Adulticiding program. Here you are.

Ms. Faye: Thank you. Hi everybody. I just want to thank in advance all the Councillors who are planning to support the motion, to file that motion, other motion, and regarding that I would just like to reinforce how important it is to those of us who want the buffer zones to be able to have them so that the drift, or to minimize greatly the amount of drift that will come onto our properties.

I would like to also remind you that the City of New York is planning to phase out all toxic pesticides of any kind by fall 2006 and that the Province of Quebec is doing the same as well as other municipalities across Canada. So I want to again thank you and if you have an argument from the people who suggest that how can so few of us affect the so called property rights of others, I would like to argue that it's our personal right to health that is infringed upon when the spray gets put into our airspace. Thank you very much.

Councillor Thomas: Point of Personal Privilege Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Recognize Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Myself and Councillor Wyatt our computers have crapped out on us and we're restarting them right now and so if you could give us a moment so that we can catch up we'd appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker: We are called for services. Report 1 of EPC dated May 4th has three clauses; Land Dedication Reserves, St. James Minor Hockey Association; Winnipeg Arts Council, the Councillor Representative; and the External Auditor Contract. You got it there in writing? You've got the three items? Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 4, 2005**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of May the 4th and move adoption of the Consent Agenda items 1 through 3.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of May 11th, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 11, 2005**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would like to introduce the report of May the 11th and move adoption of Consent Agenda items 1 through 7.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions. We have…

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker if I may?

Mr. Speaker: Yes Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I would request that we suspend the rules for Council to consider the EPC report dated May the 18th

Mr. Speaker: It hasn't been put on my desk.

Mayor Katz:. My humblest apologies.

Mr. Speaker: Report of EPC of this date item 1 the Recreation and Leisure Facilities Policy.

Does everyone have a copy of this?

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEEE
DATED MAY 18, 2005

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of Order Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes Councillor Gerbasi.

Point of Order

Councillor Gerbasi: I have a motion of referral that hasn't been around yet that's coming on this particular item so that would be coming…

Mr. Speaker: Is the referral with or without instructions?

Councillor Gerbasi: I think it's with instructions, yes. And I think it's probably being hand, I don't know if that's it but it's just being made ready. I don't know if that's it.

Mayor Katz: That's it.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, I just wanted to make sure it was while we were dealing with the item.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor would you introduce the clause.

Mayor Katz: Yes thank you. As most of, I'm sure all of Council knows is that we have been reviewing the adoption of a comprehensive recreation and leisure facility policy that ensures grassroots approach to guide future Council decision making. For whatever the reason may be this has not been put in place regardless of whether you have $43 dollars or $43 million dollars we need a policy and we now have a comprehensive one.

We've had the opportunity in a Council seminar to, so everybody could have information on this and to address this and I'm very pleased this policy supports local facilities and even more important that allows communities to work together to find the best path towards their local needs. I believe everybody has had the opportunity to discuss this and should be aware of it. I see Councillor Gerbasi has put forward a motion which obviously we'll be dealing with but at this point in time I would hope that everybody would adopt this motion so that we can get our policy in place and basically get to work.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi I think you should look; it is not a motion with instructions so in moving it you will get one minute to bring your point. There are no instructions it's just to go back for review, referral there are no instructions. So you can have a minute to introduce why you want it referred.

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi
Seconded by Councillor Lubosch

WHEREAS a new Recreation and Leisure Facilities Policy was brought forward at a Special EPC meeting at 8:30 AM on the day of the Council meeting of May 18th, leaving a lack of opportunity for public input and input from non-EPC Council members;

AND WHEREAS the Standing Committee's of Protection and Community Services and Public works who have responsibility for recreation facilities have not had the opportunity to discuss this policy and to ask questions of the administration;

AND WHEREAS the public other than those directly involved in community clubs, have not had an acceptable amount of time to be part of the discussion of this new policy even though the policy covers a wide range of facilities such as libraries, aquatic facilities and not only Community Centres;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the policy, Item No. 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated May 18, 2005, be referred to the appropriate Standing Policy Committees for review before being forwarded back to Council.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, boy a minute that's not long.

Mr. Speaker: A liberal minute.

Councillor Gerbasi: A liberal minute, okay then. The problem is that I agree we need a policy. I'm not necessarily opposing this policy, but this is not just a policy about community centres it also includes libraries and recreation facilities and all of our facilities and there has been no opportunity for public input and there's been little opportunity for Councillors other than one Council seminar to really land on every detail of this policy. We need time to ask the administration questions. We need, we could easily refer this to the Standing Committees as a process to vet through all members of Council and the public who would have a chance to come and discuss some of these policy. This is a significant policy that will change the direction of our recreation facilities forever. And I'm not saying that I oppose it at all. I'm merely asking for the opportunity to have more input. So thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Councillor Gerbasi. Mr. Mayor do you wish to speak in opposition for the motion to refer. Same one minute.

Mayor Katz: Yes I will, same one minute. Thank you very much and I do appreciate the concerns. I think Councillor Gerbasi understands that the reason this process has taken place is because it was EPC that requested the *PUFS* report. This is all in response to the *PUFS* report. We do have the GCWCC and just so there's no misunderstanding when it comes to such concerns as libraries or pools those are not the jurisdiction of the GCWCC, that's the City of Winnipeg.

If some people are worried about the GCWCC coming into play with libraries or pools, that's not the case. They have a, well I'm glad you do then hopefully, they have a very specific mandate and we've set this out and I think it's important that we deal with this quickly and do have a policy and I appreciate the fact you'd like to get information and I very much do understand your logic but I don't' think you will see anything damaging done in any way shape or form because the City is still in control and also they always do report back to EPC that reports to Council. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor question on the motion to refer the report of EPC dated today, dated this day, Recreational Leisure Facilities policy.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Benham, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Smith, Thomas, Wyatt.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 6, Nays 9.

Mr. Speaker: The motion to refer is lost.

Speakers on the clause. All in favour? Oh now we have speakers okay, Councillor Benham. Any others? Councillor Steeves. Okay.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I of course did this vote in favour of Councillor Gerbasi's motion because I think what's missing here is the public. Who's left out of this document, the very people we are supposed to serve, our voters and our taxpayers. This policy, there is nothing inherently wrong with the policy. I'm not speaking against the substance of the policy I'm saying simply that it does not go far enough. That it does not include the public enough. That we haven't heard from the public enough at this stage. I'd like to ask Councillors to join in debate. Who have

they heard from? Who have they talked to? Where did they hold public hearings? How do they know what the public wants?

We have said specifically in this policy that the Greater Council of Winnipeg Community Centres will have a big role to play in consulting with us about the future of community centres. I support that. I see that Mr. Bemrose from the Council is in the gallery and we know that the Council has played a very positive role in the discussions that we have had over the last year or two and we want to recognize that, and we want to make them partners. I support that. And for that reason I will not vote against the policy but I do want to put on the record some very real concerns that I have.

First of all, this policy, yes we all saw it at a seminar. We as Councillors saw it at a seminar and had most of the elements introduced. Where was the public? We were meeting behind closed doors. Is that how we should make decisions in this chamber? Are Councillors proud that this policy which is all about improving recreation and leisure and fitness opportunities for our citizens, that it was done in secret behind closed doors. And then a document was brought forward, and it was brought forward at the last minute, it was brought forward at 8:30 this morning, and now Council is going to vote on it. When did we hear from the public?

We have a policy and a procedure in this chamber, in this Council, of Committee hearings at which the public is welcome to appear and stand as delegation. When did we go through that process Mr. Speaker? We didn't and nine members of Council have now voted down an opportunity to hear from the public. They don't want to hear from the public. We know what we are going to do and that's good enough for us.

The Mayor has said that this policy includes the council, consulting with the council on community centres, but we aren't going to consult with the council on pools or libraries because that's not their field. That's true. Who will we be consulting with about pools and libraries Mr. Speaker? Where is it in this policy that says if we're going to open a pool or close a pool or change a pool or do any of the things that we are talking about doing with community centres then we go to such and such a body to find out what pool users think? Well Mr. Speaker there is no provision for that because there is no provision for talking to the public.

So we have excluded the public from discussion before we have the policy. We haven't provided the policy as we normally do to the public so that they can reflect on it and comment on it. We've now rejected an opportunity to send it back through our Committee process to hear from the public and once we pass this we will no longer be hearing from the public at all. As we or we will certainly have no policy that ensures that the public is heard from. The council represents the volunteers who are already involved in the community centre system. Those volunteers are incredibly valuable. We value their work, we value their time, we value their energy and if the City of Winnipeg had to pay for their labour we couldn't possibly afford it. We would go broke and we couldn't provide anything like the services we do.

So it is right to include the council, but it's also right Mr. Speaker to include the people who use the Pan Am Pool. And have got some very strong opinions about what should happen to the Pan Am Pool. It's also right to include the people who use our libraries and we already have a system of library advisory boards, not even mentioned in here. Do we in anyway give that some structure and some coherence. No Mr. Speaker we've said the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee and those who voted against Councillor Gerbasi's motion have said very clearly public we don't care what you think. We've got a policy, we've got one group that we are talking to, a very worthy group, but that group cannot possibly represent all the views of all Winnipeggers and certainly not when it comes to pools and libraries and some of the facilities that are not community centres.

Mr. Speaker we have backed down a long long way. One of the Mayor's proudest

moments I thought was right after he was first elected when he made the decision to release the *PUFS* report. To release all of the information publicly and get it out there. I commended him for it privately; I commended him for it publicly because it was the right thing to do. That was supposed to lead to some kind of grand debate, some kind of discussion with our citizens about what to do.

What is the premise of the *PUFS* report? The *PUFS* report starts by saying we have 311 buildings in which we deliver programs is that the right number? Should we have more, should we have less? If we had a chance to start all over again and do it system-wide and have a systematic approach what would we do? That was the challenge given to us as Councillors by the *PUFS* report and what have we done? We've ducked it. We've ducked it big time because we don't want to make any tough decisions and we don't want to face the wrath of any voters. And we would rather just muddle through.

Well that was the whole point of the *PUFS* report is that if we just muddled through, but we don't want roofs to collapse on children, it will cost us $1 billion dollars over the next 40 years just to keep the system going. Even if we were to make some fairly tough decisions, it would still be $½ a billion dollars Mr. Speaker. But Mr. Speaker we've rejected all of that and we've simply said it's somebody else's problem. We'll ask some citizens in the GCWCC to do our jobs for us, to make the recommendations, to make the tough decisions, to aggregate the interest and so on and we're going to go along with that and as for everything else well we'll just muddle through some more.

Mr. Speaker that's an abdication of responsibility. I think that this document and this policy could be far better if we allowed our citizens to debate it properly and if we allowed all of us as Councillors to debate it properly through our Committee system. I believe it's the wrong decision to do anything else. I do not believe as I said because I do not believe the policy is inherently wrong I'm not going to vote against the policy as such, but again I point out that I supported Councillor Gerbasi's motion and I believe it's a serious mistake for Council to have rejected that opportunity to hear from the people we are supposed to serve.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Benham. Councillor Steeves followed by Councillor Smith.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just, because I am not certain that I entirely agree with what was just said I want to be clear what we are talking about here because it might not be clear based on the foregoing comments. What we are doing here is the recommendations are, and they are clearly spelt out in terms of the funding and I want to again highlight that a big part of this is what's coming back for our money as it were is a business plan that has to be re-approved by this Council. It's part of the work that we are asking to be done here.

I mean this is a tough issue. It's always a very very difficult issue to ask how do we consult with people. And I suppose if I could offer this, my position on this would be this provides, this document provides for what will probably in time become a more meaningful consultation process. We might have learned a little bit I suppose from the process it went through with respect to the New Deal which was a much wider reaching sort of public consultation process whereby people were brought in on a much larger scale.

There wasn't really that much structure behind what we asked people to do and we had certainly some meetings that were very very well attended. I think in reflection, in reflection Mr. Speaker, everyone in this chamber might fairly ask the question was that the greatest public consultation process that was contemplated? I mean could we have done it a bit better if we had taken steps beyond that would they have looked the exact same? In reflection would we have done things maybe a bit different? And I guess my answer to that would be yes we may well have. And if in that process we happen to have at our disposal a group

like the GCWCC and Steve Bemrose is here and he is well acquainted with the policy and I certainly know that their fully onboard and their in step with what we are purposing to do.

I think what we have to remember here Mr. Speaker is this policy and these recommendations contemplate the change, true change. We paid a $1/2 million dollars for the *PUFS* study. Frankly and with respect I don't think that simply opening this up to sort of the New Deal type wide ranging public discussions is going to really result in very much of benefit to anybody. I just don't think that's going to happen and I think we saw that.

I think it would be more beneficial is on a neighbourhood by neighbourhood basis, maybe Community Committees, maybe we could divide up in some other way that's more appropriate, I'm not sure but we are talking about very specific facilities with very specific funding with very very specific funding formulas. There is a lot of detail here that has to be stewarded. We are talking about facilities where that the people have ownership over. Facilities were there is a lot of most facilities that people care a great deal about. Yeah I'm sure there might be some things that we could work out as we go through but we should, we shouldn't make the assumption that GCWCC are not able to make some of those changes as they go. I'm sure that these people are intelligent enough to make those adjustments if there is shortcomings and if there is problems. I mean no public consultation process is perfect. It just doesn't exist. We would all agree with that.

What we don't' want to see happen, is we don't want to see people in this chamber forgetting that what we are doing here is true change. We've bought this study. We've commissioned this study because we do truly want to change the way we are running our facilities in the City of Winnipeg. And to that end we are going to enlist some real help to do this. And there is going to be some hard decisions and we all know how difficult those decisions can be to make in the context of a community. I guess the philosophy behind this is if we are going to make those "hard decisions" quote end quote in our communities we had better make those hard decisions in the close consultation of the GCWCC and groups that is closely associated with the community club level and other levels that can be brought in.

If we are going to make those hard decisions we have to make sure those groups are front and center because they know the facilities best and they are best able to work with people, because we are going to be talking about things like square footage and what makes sense for a community and who can amalgamate, and these people have to know one another. I mean I guess it's an argument over philosophy and I guess it's a it might be a departure in what works in terms of public consultation and what doesn't work in terms of public consultation.

I think we've had some regrettable experiences maybe with our CIG program, maybe with our zoning process at Community Committee, maybe with our PCG and our land dedication reserve monies. Those processes don't, those funds, those ideas don't really enjoy any sort of process. This whole report, this whole policy is designed to back that and to give I guess some effective structure to that and that's the philosophy behind them. And that's why I would ask folks in this chamber to support this policy because it's that important. This is done after a lot of thought on part of the administration. I mean I don't think anybody here in this chamber can say that Councillors weren't consulted, exhaustedly in some cases, and if you had a point to make with administration, with the consultants, all those opportunities were made available to you.

I mean there are going to be some hard decisions that have to be made in the context of this report and this policy and this I think will give us that structure to do that. I just would remind that if you look at some of the bullets and some of the points that are pointed out and I guess the page 1065 and they talk about the seven components. One of those clearly is a commitment to consultation and those types of things are riddled

throughout this document. Nobody, nobody in anyway shape or form is at all saying that the public will in anyway be excluded from consultation.

But we are saying is what we are hoping to do is that we're not going to look at these and sort of a one-off type of situation. It's not going to be someone sort of showing up and saying we want this for our community. We want a new pool for our community. We want a new this for our community or that for our community, just because there happens to be some money on the table at this stage, that's not where we want to get to. The whole idea and philosophy behind this is to ensure that we are setting up a process in a larger community where people will have a chance to fully understand, fully understand Mr. Speaker, that you are going to have to a certain extent, you are going to have to give to get and we need a forum to do that.

And it can't be sort of a mammoth public consultation forum where there is no structure or it's just too big like the New Deal. It's got to be something stronger, it's got to be something more structured and it's got to be ran by people who really and truly understand this community or that community or whatever community we are talking about, because it is that important and these hard decisions only can be made in that context.

This is not going to be sort of just a random willy-nilly fact gathering mission. We've already paid a $½ million dollars for that. We've already have all those facts. Now we are talking about implementation. It's time for the rubber to kind of meet the road on this policy right now. We have some money that's available for this. We have some money to do some different things. We have some ongoing funding that could be redistributed.

I hope folks in this chamber we're going to support this policy so we can sort of put a structure in place to do that and so this whole thing doesn't fall apart. Because this is a huge spine and this is a huge piece of what we have done up until now. This is the next step. And I promise you nobody, nobody is going to be locked out of this process. If anybody wants to be included in this process I can guarantee you there will be ample opportunity to do that. It's just going to be ran properly. That's our hope and that's our goal.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. You know after listening to Councillor Steeves I, you know I'm puzzled. You know he says the public is going to be consulted after we form the policy, after we accept the policy. The fact is this is a framework policy that establishes how many residents per community club, pools, etc., etc. It's an important policy. We should be consulting with the public now not after the fact. I find it, I'm amazed, did you actually read the policy Councillor Steeves?

Mr. Speaker: Please Councillor Smith direct your comments through the chair.

Councillor Smith: Well it just amazes me to hear all these words that mean nothing. The fact is this is a fairly good policy in my mind, except it's not very comprehensive. What about for example, I went to a meeting of the Friends of Sargent Park Pool or Sherbrook Pool the other night and I found out there is a lot things wrong with Sherbrook Pool that I had never been notified before, and they're afraid that if the boiler breaks down the facility will have to be closed. So there is nothing in this document that talks about City-owned facilities being maintained. So there is nothing in this that guarantees that the Sherbrook Pool will remain open. If something breaks down there. There is no talk about manage; there is nothing in there to safeguard that pool. So it's not a comprehensive policy.

How about Magnus Eliason Centre too, that's another one, community centre, that's another one City-owned, you know. Fortunately it's in fairly good shape but what I'm saying is there is buildings like that that we have not looked after in this policy. So it's not a very comprehensive policy.

What is there is good, and but I think, that's my own viewpoint, I'm wondering about the people in my ward what they think about it. Do they think that so many residents per community club is a worthwhile goal to achieve? So I think we should be I think the motion that Councillor Gerbasi put forth was worthwhile. Why do you have to rush it? It seemed to me that it would be worthwhile to ask questions very closely and to get the answers.

Now for example we know the money is allocated already by EPC for Sargent Park Pool for example. But they don't know what they are going to get. They have no idea. They know just the money allocated. You know, so there is so many questions that have to be answered. Those questions in Sargent Park Pool don't have to be answered for this policy but this policy sets a framework and the public should be consulted if they support this direction, and that's what Councillor Steeves cannot comprehend. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I did want to clarify one point that I'm well aware that it was appropriate that *PUFS* was asked for by EPC and that it should go to EPC. I was actually chair of one of the Standing Committees that was involved in it at the time and I recognize that the *PUFS* study encompasses Public Works, Planning, Property and Development and Community Services departments, so obviously it should be dealt with at the EPC level and I was never questioning that.

But I do think that the Standing Committees have an important role to play and that's not being played here. I mean I don't even know why we have Standing Committees if they don't discuss policy about the departments that they, that you know people come up to me and say you're on the Standing Policy Committee of this and it's like well I don't' know, ask the Mayor or ask EPC about that because we don't' even talk about this stuff at our Committee. You know I don't want to be saying that. I want to be saying we're a policy committee and we want to get down to work and we want to talk about recreation policy because that's our job. But we aren't even being asked to do our jobs and we are here to do them.

There is 16 members of Council here and we aren't being allowed to do our job. We aren't being asked to do our job. And the result of it though, the real problem is, is you know I'm not just looking for more work to do. This, there is a reason we have a Standing Policy Committee process and that is so that we can have a public meeting that the public can attend. I agree with Councillor Benham that 8:30 in the morning the day before Council to roll out a policy that is going to affect the future, it says in the report itself that it will affect the future of our City for decades.

It's a very important policy as Councillor Smith also said. And so if something is this important and is going to change the direction we're going as a City and how we deal with libraries and how we deal with wading pools and how we deal with the amount of recreational space. It's that important but we can't wait a month and let other members not on the EPC sit down and ask some questions. I have some questions. There is things in this report that I never saw at the Council seminar because it wasn't a complete report.

It says that there is labour issues and human resources issues with the Community Services department. I don't know what that means. Does anyone, maybe some people do but I don't think that those of us who weren't on EPC know what that means. I'd like to know what that means before I vote for this and I am one of the biggest supporters that there is of the GCWCC and they know that. It's not about criticizing them or anybody else.

And so I that's one of my questions, I have a whole bunch of questions as I read through this report last night at 9:00 o'clock after chairing the Access committee because I didn't get it till the afternoon. It's here at 8:30 yet we're supposed to vote on our entire future

policy for recreation the next day, you know. And I know people get tired of hearing about process and they think we are just tying to throw a wrench in the works of Council and be oppositional but I mean come on it's a legitimate point to make. I represent 45,000 people. Those 45,000 people don't have a voice on EPC. That's why there has to be 16 members of Council. That's why the rest of us have to be included. And we're not.

And I think the public; I guess it depends on what your philosophy is of public participation. I think the public; there should be public participation in policy development not just whether we close a wading pool in this particular neighbourhood. Yes of course there should be consultation then too. But there also should be consultation in developing the policy itself which is what we are doing today. We are deciding it. Right now we're deciding it. That's it. This is our policy for 20 years about libraries and how many we can build. And all I ask for was to ask the Standing Committees to have a meeting.

I didn't ask for a New Deal type town hall and all that stuff that Gord Steeves made up. I'm just saying that we should have, use our existing process as set out in our constitution or whatever you call it our charter which says we have Standing Committees that are supposed to look at policy. That's not crazy. And I don't understand why we are in such a rush, rushing this through, all of this will still be here next month and all we ask for in this motion which there was a fair amount of support for from non EPC members and even one member of EPC to just wait, to just, and I realize that motion already been defeated.

So I'm in a very difficult position because I do actually like many things in this policy. I think our administration did a good job in dealing with a very difficult problem. And I like some of the ideas. I like some of the approaches but I am not ready yet to sort of say this is our definite policy when the community hasn't had a chance to look at it and when the Standing Committees haven't had a chance to do their job. And I still, I would have loved to have a Standing Policy Committee meeting where the administration could come in, they could answer these questions about human resources, the changes. Like I don't want to vote for human resources changes, I don't know what that means yet. And I don't think it says in the report. It doesn't even elaborate on that.

You know, and that's just one example but there are several things as I read through it late last night that need more explanation. So I'm really not trying to be oppositional. I appreciate that there's an effort being made. I support having a policy on recreation. It's long overdue. But for goodness sake it should be including the public and all members of Council more for these types of very very important decisions. So you know I hope nobody interprets my lack of support as not being supportive of the GCWCC which I fully support and it's certainly not supporting the administration's attempt to bring forward a policy.

I'm merely making a statement today about the lack of public process and the lack of democratic process in this chamber, in our processes, in our committee processes and I know you know the media gets tired about hearing of process issues and I know all of you do too but there is a reason we have a democratic process, there is a reason we have a structure so that policy can be debated and people can know what it is to not get it 9:00 o'clock the night before and try to read it and then try to debate it right now. You know, my comments today are just completely off the cuff, I haven't had time to study this, I haven't had time to talk to Ursula Stelman or talk to Annitta Stenning or any of the administrative people and ask these questions. I haven't had time. And that's wrong on a policy that going to affect us for decades to come as a City. That doesn't mean it's a bad policy but could we do something about the process and make it more democratic. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today just to put a context

of my thoughts on this issue. This is an initiative that has been debated in the papers and the media and now we are having a chance to discuss it on the Council floor which I think the first time we've actually had a chance to discuss the *PUFS* report actually on the Council floor or what has come out of the *PUFS* report, whatever you want to call it.

When I first got elected I made a point of meeting with the staff once I heard about this new study that was taking place. I made a point of meeting with the staff to find out exactly what the plan was for the study and what the terms of reference was going to be and how the process was going to work. And I did that I think it was January or February of 2003. And what I was told at that time by the staff was Councillor there will be an extensive public consultation process involving the communities of the City.

They were actually modeling it on some American cities, I can't remember the American city off the top of my head I probably have it marked in my file. That the Americans had done this and that it was a very much a consultation process in the communities. The style of the public consultations had nothing to do with the New Deal style of public consultations, it was more genuine. Meetings where you actually met with people and listened to people, and that was the kind of consultation process that was being talked about at the time.

And when that never occurred my, again I questioned administration and the response unofficial I got back was that basically Councillor the whole debate over the New Deal, when that all occurred at the same time last fall kind of, or previous to that actually, undermined that process, a year ago last fall. And you know it was felt that while we did this New Deal consultation and it was so wide and so controversial and whatnot, that now to do something like this would be overkill.

Well my thought on it was that we started out with the terms of reference, sure it might have been held up because of the New Deal discussions but nevertheless I think this is something worthy. I agree I welcome some of the ideas in the report. I think they are worthy. I have a lot of questions and that's really why I'm very uncomfortable voting on it today.

Even today when I picked up the *Winnipeg Free Press* and I read that they are quoting one of my community clubs and saying one of my community clubs can't expand on this basis unless another community club shuts down in the area. Well the way I understood previously, I thought the report was the way it was written was that if area is also growing a community club can grow with the area. But I'm not sure of that now you know maybe I misunderstood the report.

I have questions with regards Mr. Speaker to facility hierarchy. What does this mean? What does it mean to places like Sherwood Pool and other pools, indoor pools around the City? If you read the report does it mean from the reports what we are seeing here, when it talks about indoor pools it says rationalization of indoor pools in coordination with new urban oases. What's the implication with that and what does that really mean? I mean if we are making a decision that we are going to rationalize our indoor pools and we are going to move to urban oasis's then I think the public and the community should have a right to have that discussion and be part of that knowing what you know the meaning of this policy will be.

I have questioned for example I don't know why the GCWCC is going to be reporting now on to EPC. Before they used to work with the Standing Committee when I used to sit on the Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services, they used to report there. There is a relationship developed. I don't know why that's now going to, by EPC. Maybe there is a reason for that. The question I have is why is the GCWCC, when we were looking in terms of the *PUFS* report I always thought it was in terms of what was established in the *PUFS* report as the CCA, CCA is Community Characterization Areas, and it was in terms of that that we were always looking at these facilities and community clubs and libraries and recreational

facilities and whatnot. Now by the looks of it we are doing it on the basis of Community Committee areas. What's the benefit of that? What's the downsides of that? You know, you know I thought the CCA's were somewhat interesting you know because of the fact that they took into consideration some of the geography and some of the likenesses of many communities of the City.

I think there is an opportunity to have a discussion here. I think this kind of strikes to what I've often talked about in this chamber for the last two and a half years Mr. Speaker is how policy development actually occurs on this Council. And that is it occurs in the backrooms and then Council is brought in at this point to have some discussion to either rubber stamp it and push it forward or reject it. Which and I don't want to vote against this, you know. I don't want to vote against this because I see there are some good things here but I'd like to be able to be part of the process to, when the policy is being developed before it's actually brought forward here you know at this final stage.

And so you know and that's why we have Standing Committees ideally. And that's what the Standing Committee should be used for and engaged for and in some cases they are not. So those are my concerns on it Mr. Speaker. I think this is a huge policy document we are passing today. It has huge implications for communities. It strikes to the very heart I guess Councillors of what we're all about here. You know this is a basic core service. This to me is what municipalities, a big role that municipalities play and this is a big role that the citizens of Winnipeg play. I think some of the ideas with regards to empowering the community clubs; I think it's a great idea. But I'm also concerned about all these other questions that I've asked. And there is too many unanswered questions Mr. Speaker. And again I think this if we, I voted to lay the matter over to refer it back to have this discussion and I think that could have been something that we could have accommodated but Council voted on it so thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The new guy on the block. I don't know Mr. Speaker if I'm supposed to be surprised that Councillor Smith is puzzled or not but I'll keep a close eye on that.

I want to make just a few brief comments. I can tell you that public consultation is a two-way street. I spent a lot of time talking with people from community centres and other public use facilities in the St. Norbert ward so I have a pretty good idea of what their needs and wants are right now. The most frustrating part is that we don't' have a policy. That when I go to try and work for those needs I don't have the framework to work with it, so this at least puts me, gives me a position to start operating from.

There are shortfalls in it, I'll agree, and I'll give you that. In particular it doesn't address things like the organizations coming to the City to get municipal/rural infrastructure funding. There is no set waiting in it for areas like mine where I have four very well run community centres but the funding suggests that, the policy suggests that funds should go to the areas of greater need. So how do I get my community centres identified as greater need?

At the end of the day what I have is a policy and a framework to work with and I can get to work. So for that reason I will be supporting this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks Mr. Speaker. It should be it should make it clear right form the very beginning in case it isn't to some who might be watching these proceedings that the document known as the *PUFS* report is not here today. It is not a policy document, was never intended to be forwarded to Council as a policy document. The *PUFS* report was received as information by Executive Policy Committee last July and that ends

the *PUFS* report as far as anything moving forward.

But the *PUFS* report is a very good reference document for the development of policies and facilities and programs in the City for the future. So this Council isn't being asked today to say yes or no to the *PUFS report.* The *PUFS* report is on file. It's an information document from here on in used as a reference guide for the future if we so choose.

So we are not debating the *PUFS* report per say. But I wanted to say Mr. Speaker that when the *PUFS* report became a public document last summer, the single most important issue out of that report and the one that grabbed certainly the attention of my constituents, and I can only speak for mine I can't speak for what the constituents of others here might of had to say to their individual members, but in my constituency the biggest single issue in the that *PUFS* report was the future of our community centres.

I have a very active volunteer community in my ward of St. James-Brooklands Mr. Speaker. I have, I used to have seven, I now have six community centres, unfortunately one closed last year due to problems they had internally, but I have six very active community centres in my area. And throughout my constituency the commentary that I heard the most in phone calls, emails, etc., from my residents was what are you doing to our community centres. Well we weren't doing anything to our community centres in terms of shutting them down or anything like that but I had to explain that to people.

The day we tabled the report at EPC I wrote to all my community centres and I gave them the details of what we had done that day and received the report as information. We still have more policy development work to do and as we do it and as we, that we as Councillors sort of land on things, I would keep them informed. And that's exactly what I have done Mr. Speaker. I didn't have to go and arrange all kinds of meetings all over the place or try to scare people into believing something that wasn't really true. I just simply told my community centres the truth. I said the *PUFS* report is received as information, it's never intended to be a policy document, it's not going forward to Council for approval or disapproval, but we will certainly be trying to develop policy around our various recreation facilities.

And that's what we've been doing. We've had these Council seminars Mr. Speaker. After the latest one in April where we seemed to arrive at a general consensus, we being all members of Council who were there, to where we wanted to head. I communicated that again to all of my community centres and said here is what, you know here is where we think we are going to be heading in the general policy framework; identifying the areas of need, re-jigging the general council into a broader governance policy and using them with increased resources to try and resolve any issues between community centres, or to help facilitate if two or more community centres want to look at amalgamation, try to help facilitate that process as sort of an arbitrator of things.

And I got to attend one annual meeting in a community centre in my ward because by the time we finished our seminar most of my AGM's were already done. But I went to one community centre at their AGM and outlined that in person and I never had a single complaint. Everybody who was there thought okay we think that is a decent way to go. We know that there are areas that have greater needs and sure you want to focus some of your resources on some of those areas and we are relieved that nobody is going to put the gun to our head and say you will close by some edict of City government. And we think that the General Council because it has worked already in the past sometimes as an arbiter and as a vehicle through which the community centres can get together amongst themselves and prioritize their needs and concerns, we think that governance model is the right way to go.

So I've done that kind of consultation Mr. Speaker. I haven't hidden anything from any of my constituents. I don’t' need another big song and dance or a pony a dog and pony show rather to handle this

because most of my residents were really concerned about the community centres. And I think in this policy document that we cover that very well.

I have no hesitation in giving increased support to the General Council because I know even with the very limited support they have today they have done an absolutely phenomenal job throughout the City in trying to resolve and meet the needs of our 70 odd community centres throughout the City. I think they have a very positive track record. I don't think we could replicate that in any other process. So I think the General Council works and we think by giving it more tools to do the job that it can work even better.

Why should they report to EPC Mr. Speaker because the issues are going to involve in our system more then one Standing Policy committee. We have some Fiscal Issues concerns that may arise from time to time, we have property matters that may arise from time to time, Protection Committee and Public Works. So it has to be coordinated under one umbrella rather than trying to move things through four different Committees from time to time as maybe some of those local issues will arise.

So I think that we've developed a fairly good and certainly our staff who've worked very very hard to try to understand what Councillors' concerns were since last summer. They have consulted with the general Council and others to try and craft a policy document that I think is, I think it's reasonably reflective of where most Councillors would like to be with a new policy on our recreation and leisure facilities.

Somebody talked about libraries. We don't mention you know consulting with libraries, well Mr. Speaker there is consultation with libraries when we deal with matters dealing with libraries, we have a library board and there is a process there too. It's established by a by-law of the City. So we don't ignore our legislation there.

We have in the document, if this document is passed Mr. Speaker, we'll also be passing appendix "A" which is a part of the policy document and here on clause 5 of appendix "A" is the commitment to consultation. It outlines a whole range of process by which we consult folks when we are dealing with specific issues whether it's a pool or a spray park or something.

You know Mr. Speaker we don't even need this language in this document quite frankly because in your experience and mine and I know Councillor Smith's in the early days you all remember the Board of Commissioners. When they used to write the budgets for the City and there would be closed libraries and closed pools. Guess what Mr. Speaker automatically lots of consultation between the elected and the public on all of those kind of issues. That's going to continue whether we actually put words in a policy or not. I'm quite happy to have the words in here. But do you think for one moment if there was a contemplation of say changing a wading pool in somebody's area to a spray-park that there wouldn't be some kind of consultation with the community, with the local Councillor, with the folks who we think would use that or be affected by it one way or another in that decision making. It happens here all the time Mr. Speaker. So we don't need to formalize anymore than that and say we will consult with this person or that group or the next group. We have a process here which outlines…

Councillor Clement: I move extension.

Mr. Speaker: It is moved by Councillor Clement. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: thank you, which outlines a commitment to consultation when we deal with very specific issues. The community centre one is a lot more involved and we've dealt with that with a proposed new governance model for the General Council which I think is excellent and I think is going to work very well.
I would say to Councillor Smith read on in the appendix clause 6 commitment to managed care which is part of this policy whether it's Sherbrook Pool or Bourkevale Community Centre, that sort of thing, we

are trying to get a better handle on the facilities we have. We have a million square feet of various recreational facilities in the City and we have to get a better handle on what we have and try to do a better job of maintaining what we have. And if there is plans to put something new on the agenda then we have to make sure that we can manage that as well. And that we have not only the dollars to build but more importantly the ongoing dollars to manage and maintain and at the same time continue to manage and maintain what we have.

So the policy tries to talk in broad terms about a whole range of issues. Sorry it's maybe not exactly as specific as some might like about this group or that facility or this sort of thing but we do talk a lot here about commitment to consultation with the public which we do anyway and we talk about managed care and we talk about management and control of the plant that we currently have and making sure that before we add something new we can manage and maintain that as well as every other.

So I think, I think the document is sound. I think, I'm pretty sure that very few people on the street would ever object to this Mr. Speaker. I know that during the process from last summer to now I know what I've been hearing from my community. My community is quite satisfied with the general drift that we've been heading or the general thrust that we've been heading after our seminars, so I'm going to vote for this Mr. Speaker. And I think that we have the beginning of a very good policy process here.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to reiterate a couple of things you have heard already. My community clubs in my ward have also been waiting a long time, they've been, since I have been elected a year ago almost to find out what they can and can't do. There is expansions ready to go on the table, ideas they've got that I can't help them with. This document now allows to proceed. I am so happy that we finally go to a system that's based on need and not want. Because over the years we've watched how that's affected our community clubs and recreational facilities. And my clubs in my area are happy now. We can talk. We can get the ball rolling and we're going start that tomorrow. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mayor Katz summing up on the clause.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I think it's all been said one way or another and on this issue I very much appreciate the comments from everybody. I do feel that today, this is monumental, I mean for a long time now we've had no policy. We finally have a policy in place. And I think the first thing you have to do is we should all say thank you to administration for a great job on this policy.

Number two to leave some of the concerns, I mean this policy it says right here, it commits the City to public consultation about future decisions. Imbedded in the policy is the importance of public consultations whenever key decisions are going to be made about their libraries, their pools, etc. It's there. Now it may not be as wordy as people want but it is there.

We've now had three seminars on this. One specifically we laid into the policy. It wasn't that long ago, approximately two months ago where I believe Councillor Benham, Councillor Gerbasi were saying hey we need action on this and you weren't getting it from the Mayor's office if I recall at the time and I think you had your own meeting and I believe Councillor Smith was part of that.

Mr. Speaker: Through the chair please. Thank you.

Mayor Katz: Yes thank you very much. So the facts of life are you are calling for action now, now we've got action and yet people want to delay it. Well you know what, there's tens of thousands of volunteers who are ready to go out and do what has to be done and we don't want to keep them waiting any longer. The facts of life are this is not an issue

about behind closed doors, this is an open forum and we make a decision through a democratic process. If you support the policy then vote for it. If you don't vote against it. That's what we are here to do. This is a great policy. I hope everybody will support it. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Questions?

RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Benham, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

None.

Mr. Speaker: Unanimous, 15 – 0.

Moving on, Motions.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Eadie
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan

WHEREAS The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) is dedicated to improving the quality of life in all communities by promoting strong, effective and accountable municipal government;

AND WHEREAS The City of Winnipeg is a active participant and strong supporter of FCM;

AND WHEREAS in June of 2004, at the 2004 FCM Annual Conference in Edmonton, Alberta, Councillor Gord Steeves was elected as 3rd Vice President of FCM;

AND WHEREAS in June of 2005, at the 2005 FCM Annual Conference in St. John's, Newfoundland, Councillor Gord Steeves will be running for election as 2nd Vice President of FCM;

AND WHEREAS election of a City of Winnipeg Councillor as a Vice President of FCM offers the City increased prestige and a greater voice in affairs affecting all municipal governments;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Council unanimously endorse the election of Councillor Gord Steeves as 2nd vice president of The Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 1 moved by Councillor Eadie, Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan that Council unanimously endorse the election of Councillor Gord Steeves as Second Vice President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. All in favour? Contrary? It is indeed unanimous. It is unanimous.

By-laws, none. Questions? Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor De Smedt and Councillor Benham.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question is regarding the Humane Society which provides a priceless service in caring for animals. Services that if they were not there to provide the City of Winnipeg would be stuck with all the costs. Recently they told the City they would consider not taking anymore trapped cats due to the frustration with the inaction on the part of the City to address the problems we face with a high number of cats being put to death every year.

In the light of the fact that the Humane Society is building a new building with no assistance from the City of Winnipeg and considering the annual operating grant from the City is only $120,000 while they raise millions privately each year to operate the facility to care for animals is the Mayor intending to provide, given the recommendation has been laid over, is the Mayor intending to provide additional financial support to the Humane Society

as requested by the Standing Committee this year?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Mr. Speaker the situation with the Humane Society is I believe what Councillor Gerbasi has said is very accurate and I can tell you right now that we are looking at the possibility of providing more funding providing we can get specific details of the services that will be provided by the Humane Society and for what term. So I can say to you that is something we are genuinely looking at and exploring, we hope to have some information back from administration in the very near future.

(Councillor Eadie in the Chair)

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: In light of the recent departure of one of the Mayor's key political staff, I would like to ask a question regarding future hiring related to the issue of diversity. Will the Mayor as the former Mayor Glen Murray did reach out to a wider and more diverse pool of applicants in the hiring process, for example advertising in ethno-cultural or in local newspapers rather than just through word of mouth as our diversity policy recommends.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: If the question is specifically referring to the vacancy left by Mr. McFadyen's departure we are not looking at specifically filling that void. But in future dealings if there are any positions available I would have no problem whatsoever with making sure that anybody knows there's an opportunity there and hopefully as many people will come forward. So I have no problem with that whatsoever.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thanks so very much.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: You're through? You're done? Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question to the Mayor and it's a friendly question, but the very topical subject of the Federal new deal and gas tax sharing is now amongst the pigeons since last week the Federal government and the Province of Alberta was the first province to secure an agreement and have started to advertise what they intend to do. I'm wondering if the Mayor could share with us where we're at in our negotiations, if indeed we are in negotiation with the Province, on securing the right amount of dollars, how these dollars will be protocoled for spending in particular areas, and about how much we can expect. It seems to me that we are a bit tardy. We've been having our infrastructure deficit advertised for several years now and I know the Mayor has been very aggressive in the past in trying to pursue it and I'm wondering if you could share with us and with the members of the public of where we may be going in the very near future.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor De Smedt. The infrastructure roads and bridges is the number one concern of the citizens of Winnipeg. I don't think anybody could deny that. And we know we have a serious problem and we know we have to address it and we know it has to be addressed by all three levels of government, the Federal government, the Province and the City. And not that long ago the gas tax was announced and we were looking at approximately about $167 million dollars coming we were hoping to receive approximately $12 to $14 million dollars.

One of the problems that exists right now, and there has been dialogue going back and forth between the City and the Province and the Federal government, is that we just want to make sure that the monies that come from gas tax, from the people who are driving on our roads, goes towards fixing our roads and

bridges. And I do have to confess right now there is a little bit of let's say misunderstanding on what the priorities and needs are. We are doing everything we can to make sure that those monies are directed to roads and streets.

There are some who believe it should go to green projects which has nothing to do with our deteriorating infrastructure. We have been in dialogue everyday and as a matter of fact there appeared to be some urgency when many thought there was an election was going to be called. I'm not sure that the urgency is what it was before, but the dilemma is that we have to make sure that the senior levels of government know that these monies have to go towards roads and bridges. There is a formula that has to do with, which is a transit component as well. At one point in time there was 25% of it going towards a transit equation. We've had some dialogue and we believe 15% is fair and reasonable for everybody. We certainly hope we will get 100% support from the AMM. I have not had positive dialogue before but we are still dialoguing, we are still meeting. I hope to get to that point and if we don't get consensus and support then we are going to have to take different actions. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Speaker a question to the Mayor on the question of bus rapid transit. The Mayor said on September 29th, 2004 in this chamber on a personal level I believe, "that any major initiative to change the way Winnipeggers travel is bound to fail unless we offer a radically different and better alternative than is being offered now. My personal commitment is to move ahead in pursuit of a credible transit system for Winnipeg that will truly capture the public imagination and obtain their true support and backing". That was on September 29th, and this week a public statement Katz said "his priority is fixing the City's roads and bridges as well as improving the existing bus system before building dedicated bus transit corridors". My question to the Mayor through you Mr. Speaker does the Mayor support the recommendations for dedicated bus corridors or the interim report, in the interim statements of the Rapid Transit Task Force he appointed.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Benham. That was a lovely statement I made in September, a quote. The facts are this. What I said in the paper the other day was quite simple. Is that number one I do believe that the priority is to fix our roads and bridges. If they are not in good repair then not much can be driving on them, that's number one.

Number two, I also stated that we should look at our existing transit system and do whatever we can which I'm so happy to see that the Rapid Transit Task Force has identified initiatives that can help make our existing system better.

In addition to that I also said that I think my quote to the Winnipeg Free Press which unfortunately did not get in the paper was that this is very similar to Plan Winnipeg. Plan Winnipeg talks about Winnipeg first, downtown first, but it's not downtown only. What I said is that we don't get in the way of progress. Progress is important and what you're referring to as far as the bus corridors is also important. So once the Rapid Transit Task Force comes forward and when Council approves that then it's up to the Mayor and Council to go forward and get the monies to get that done.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Mr. Speaker that's a good segue to my next question which is in the interim what is the Mayor doing to obtain funding from the Federal government and the Province to fund major changes to public transit?

Mayor Katz: Well I think the first thing you have to do if you are looking for funding is you need to know how much you are looking for, that's number one. Some information has come forward obviously this week. I can tell you that I have had conversations with the President of the Treasury, Reg Alcock. As a matter of fact at the announcement

at the Norquay Community Centre, Reg Alcock was quoted in the media as saying that he would be happy for the City to come forward if they have a plan and he would be more than happy to entertain the request. So as soon as the Rapid Transit Task Force is completed their open house which I believe they have and they come forward with the policy and we have the numbers I have absolutely every intention of going forward to both the Federal and Provincial governments and making requests.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Final supplementary, Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker and through you to Councillor Wyatt in his capacity as chair of the Rapid Transit Task Force. Councillor Wyatt has said in this chamber and in other places that it is a matter of when, not if, for rapid transit and my question is when does the chair of the Rapid Transit Task Force anticipate the building of dedicated bus corridors in Winnipeg?

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker, or acting Speaker. That would be determined obviously we have a report that we are working on as the Councillor is aware and we hope to be able to come forward with the final report with recommendations in that report and maybe that will then shed light on your question. But that is the work that is now undergoing with the task force so I don't want to prejudice that work. I think the task force members are doing an excellent job with the work that they have done so far. They've worked diligently to bring forward some concepts which were concepts that were brought forward on the weekend and to get feedback from the public and then coming back with final report, with that feedback, the final report to this Council. So I think that's something that we're looking to address as well as the actual funding and how the funding will actually work is something that we hope to be able to address in the final report. So I hope to be able to refer you to that and you'll be able to answer your question that way Councillor.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor I would like to know, in light of the fact that we're having these municipal rural infrastructure fund requests coming through. We're not a partner, a funding partner in the program, but we do have to give our blessing to request it come through. Given that the funding is coming from the other two levels of government sometimes the desire to those levels of government as far as spending on some public use facilities is not always in keeping with or may not always be in keeping with our new policy framework. Will we be establishing a vetting process, for lack of better term, for reviewing these requests as they come forward?

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Swandel. As I'm sure many of you know there will be coming forward as far as MRIF is concerned, I believe one project has already been announced which was the Humane Society which Councillor Gerbasi mentioned earlier, and there are four others coming forward that are both been endorsed by both the Provincial and Federal governments. Those are Smart Park, there is the soccer complex, there is the Transcona recreation park and there is the Millennium Library. Those are the four and you're correct in the fact that we are not a financial partner but also there has to be a third partner. It is a tri-level funding scenario.

It's rather unique to me, you know this is my first experience with MRIF, of how the procedure goes and I'm not going to tell you that it totally makes sense to me and that's the way I would do it, but I can tell you that it, one of the conditions is that Council has to basically endorsing we're okay with it even if we're not financially involved. And that's just the way the process works. It also appears that what you have to do is get both the Federal

and Provincial government on board and then they come to us. So if that's the way it seems to precede it may continue.
My concern was that before all this money is used up is that the City of Winnipeg should take a look at some of their priorities and be making a request and I can tell you that that is something that already has been discussed and we have looked at a list of potential projects and hopefully we can get in there as well before the money does disappear. And as you probably are aware of unfortunately it's only $16 million dollars, $8 million dollars from those two levels of government so it's not a lot of money and it's going quick. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Any other questions? None.

We move to the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues, Councillor Cement.

REPORT ON THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED MAY 3, 2005

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I'm pleased to move clause 1 of the Fiscal Issues Committee meeting of May 3rd and I'll move it as a Consent item.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

By-laws, Councillor Clement.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Clement: Yes I will move that By-law No. 7710/2000 be read a first time.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: By-law 105/2005 to amend By-law 7710/2000. All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 105/2005.
Councillor Clement: I'd move that By-law 105/2005 be read a second time.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 105/2005.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and that By-law No. 105/2005 be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Questions for Fiscal Issues? None.

The report of the Downtown Development Committee, Councillor De Smedt.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED APRIL 4, 2005

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker I'm just advising Council that Executive Policy Committee laid over this matter for an additional 30 days. And for the notification of Council there hasn't yet been time for Centre Venture and other interested members to have an opportunity to discuss with administration the policy that's coming forward from the Urban Design Advisory Committee. So we have asked for your forbearance and for another till the next Council meeting we expect to bring it forward. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Okay the report of May 3rd. Oh I'm sorry Question Period under Downtown Development. I'm sorry.

Councillor De Smedt: Yes questions on Downtown Development.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: None. Okay, Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development report of May 3rd, I'm sorry, all pages looked to same to me.

REPORT OF STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED MAY 3, 2005

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated May 3rd, items 1 to 23 as Consent.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Clause 11.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: 1, 2 and 6.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Okay, anyone else?

Okay Councillor Smith will move then the balance of the report with exception, oh it's 12 now not 11.

Councillor De Smedt: It's not 11 it's 12, thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: With the exception of clauses 1, 2, 6 and 12, Councillor De Smedt moves the balance of the report be adopted by Consent. All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Specifically to clause no. 1.

Item No. 1 - Subdivision and Rezoning - west side of De Vries Avenue between Bonner Avenue and Knowles Avenue File DASZ 20/2004 [c/r DAC 25/2004]

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt do you wish to introduce the item.

Councillor De Smedt: Yes, thank you very much Mr. Speaker and just perhaps for clarification if I can have understanding support from the Councillor of the area that essentially items 1, 2 and 6 are companion matters we will be discussing them in the same detail.

Councillor Lubosch: I think we might just, they're related but...

Councillor De Smedt: They're related, well we'll talk about 1 then Mr. Speaker which is the rezoning in the area adjacent to Knowles and Bonner Avenue and the west side of De Vries.

Mr. Speaker it is unusual I think as most members of Council are aware for a Standing Policy Committee and in this case the Committee on Property and Development to turn about a recommendation from the Community Committee. We do understand that the Community Committee in this case on items 1, 2 and 6 have had extensive consultation with the community. It was not just at the last meeting when they made their recommendation. The matter had been heard during the course of last fall and extensive consultation occurred with the department and with area residents.

Let me just say that from the perspective of the Standing Policy Committee in which we put our City-wide hat on obviously we've listened very carefully to the observations by the Community Committee which essentially we are recommending that we would not proceed with rezoning until the substantive argument given until we have a Peguis Trail extension completed. That left I think the Committee with a Hobson's choice of saying for an infill development of 155 homes on item 1 and 20 more homes on item 6, that would stop all future development until the Peguis Trail is constructed and as most of you know we've only got $800,000 committed as an investigative item in the Capital budget for '05 and it's not yet been capitalized.

So I can't ascertain when and if the Peguis Trail is going to be done in the near future. In the meantime I think it was important for the Committee to listen closely to the administration who were recommending that we proceed with the rezoning. It is an infill development. It is consistent with Plan Winnipeg. It's consistent with when we try and measure the impact in our neighbourhoods of how the transportation issues will be dealt

with. We know that the transportation issues aren't perfect but we could not break down the transportation representative from the department on why we would not proceed with this development on the basis of transportation alone.

This area is also contiguous to one of the most important and effective community centres, Gateway Community Centre in town. We have services provided. Why on earth would we recommend to Council that we turn this down? The evidence clearly was not there. It was the majority view of the Committee that we would indeed recommend rezoning. I regret to not listening to be able to accept the arguments that were presented which were given to us in the material that we had on review from the Community Committee that we would reject rezoning. But I would have to say that from the highest policy level and examining it from our Director of Planning, Property and Development from the planners, from the zoning people and transportation and recreation community, whatever else you would want to try and address in relation to this particular infill development, it really is very consistent with what we have done in every other part of the City.

So I do, I nearly have to put my City-wide hat on and try to have second sober thought on a matter of importance to the City. And it was the view and the majority view of our Committee that we would recommend to Council that we would proceed with rezoning.

There may be other issues that are viewed differently by others and of course I'll stand by and listen to the debate and it will be up to Council of course to bring wisdom to this. But I can assure you we don't do this lightly. We made a special effort to bring other administrative people to the table to listen closely as you know and everybody knows we do not reopen public hearings so what we did here though is to get justification from the submissions that were made whether they supported the thesis that was advanced by Community Committee and whether the administration's position was correct. And I do report then that the view of Planning, Property Development Committee is that we would move ahead with these rezoning projects. So I stand by and listen to further comments Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lubosch on the clause.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. As a matter of record I just wanted to clarify for all my colleagues that the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee in fact did have this item on their agenda on three occasions, January 11th/05 and October 5th/04 at both those occasions the developer requested that Community Committee lay the matter over because ultimately they didn't have a deal with the City of Winnipeg. And in fact when this matter was last discussed at the Planning, Property and Development Committee there was still contention between the position of the developer and City staff on a number of issues including the pavement width of the proposed Headmaster Row. The administration wanted 22 metres and the developer only wanted to provide 20 feet.

But all of that aside Mr. Speaker there has been an awful lot of work done in the ward of North Kildonan and by the East Kildonan - Transcona Community Committee on matters of development and matters of traffic. Since 1998 Mr. Speaker and in 2000, 2002, 2003 and 2004 the City of Winnipeg administration has provided comprehensive traffic studies including traffic counts, both visual and using various devices, in order to help the local area Council and the residents mitigate high volumes of traffic that have been brought about not because North Kildonan and the northeast quadrant of the City for that matter has been treated with City-wide hats not because they have been considered in the same way that other areas of the City have been considered.

North Kildonan and the northeast quadrant of the City has been short-changed Mr. Speaker. They've been short-changed since about 1970 on the development of a regional collector street between Henderson Highway and

Lagimodiere. That's the section I'm responsible for. Certainly on the west side of the river and to the east in Transcona this roadway, the Chief Peguis Trail as it's known, would provide a number of benefits to the area.

But let's look at the development in front of us more closely. Mr. Speaker this development is not just about 160 homes an infill area approximately 40 acres. An area that's been left vacant for about 40 years because the owners of that land have had other development interests far more lucrative in East St. Paul and because the current developer who resides in Victoria has suddenly decided within the last few months that it would be a good idea to develop that area because land prices in Winnipeg have soared over the last 18 months. The most problematic element in this development is the extension of Headmaster Row to Lagimodiere and the closure of yet one of three routes Knowles Avenue between Henderson Highway and Lagimodiere.

To understand the traffic picture in North Kildonan picture some 55,000 residents and at least two or three times that many in the surrounding area and in the Capital Region in Birds Hill and East St. Paul using three residential streets Mr. Speaker between Lagimodiere and Henderson Highway to get to and from downtown every morning and every afternoon. Three residential streets. The largest being Springfield Road a residential collector and a truck route by default because there isn't an appropriate truck route. With 35 and 40 foot lots on the south side and 45 and 50 foot residential lots on the north side and elementary kids and elementary schools on either side. Springfield Road where yet another motorist tragically was killed over the weekend at Rothesay and Springfield Road, where accidents happen on a weekly if not daily basis because there is 18,000 to 20,000 vehicles crowding onto Springfield Road.

Bonner Avenue is the other route which has no signals at either Lagimodiere or Henderson Highway. Its one-third length between Gateway and De Vries is oiled and gravel and ditches on either side. It's an unimproved road. And Knowles Avenue, the one that will be closed if this development proceeds and routed into Headmaster Row which is essentially a collector street that currently exists between Rothesay and Raleigh and provides access to a number of cul-de-sacs and bays to the north and south of it.

So what you will in effect will be doing is closing an east-west route between Henderson Highway and Lagimodiere, one of three, and routing that traffic over to albeit a slightly wider Headmaster Row but which is going to provide a signalized access, the head of Chief Peguis, pardon me, the head of Springfield Road and Lagimodiere in fact, almost a full mile ahead of that, roughly in the vicinity of the north perimeter and Lagimodiere interchange and routing that traffic that doesn't want to go to Springfield Road, those 20,000 vehicles, routing that into North Kildonan with no through access to Henderson Highway only to find its way wiggling and squirming through traffic jams and frustrated motorists and all kinds of daily consternations to and from Lagimodiere and Henderson Highway.

Yes infill development is great but who wants to live in an infill development where as soon as it's constructed you're faced with 5,000 or 10,000 motorists frustrated, angry, winding their way down what is not an appropriate through street, what is just another residential collector stopping partway at Rothesay forcing motorists to find their way down other residential streets to get to where they want to go.

Mr. Speaker I'm not against infill development. I understand and know that residential development and commercial development is good for our City. These 160 homes will be contributing school tax and will be contributing property tax probably in the order of about $500,000 dollars combined per year. This is good for North Kildonan. It's good for the Gateway Recreation Centre. No argument there Mr. Speaker.

The problem is we are putting a road that is going to be substandard in terms of the service that it provides in an area where it

is going to provide a lucrative alternative to the mile long bumper to bumper traffic snarls on Lagimodiere both north and south everyday, and forcing this traffic to find essentially residential streets and other routes in North Kildonan to find its way to the regional street Henderson Highway or Lagimodiere.

And therein lays the fly in the ointment. This is the culprit. It's not so much the land use. Nobody argues that houses are a bad thing. Nobody argues that the commercial development that is part of this development is a bad thing. But what it's going to create by virtue of that road extension and by virtue of Knowles which is one of three routes that people have to get between Lagimodiere and Henderson Highway, closing that is going to essentially short circuit all of the good work that the administration and the residents have tried to accomplish in terms of mitigating traffic in North Kildonan while we wait for City Hall, while we wait for the Province of Manitoba, while we wait for the Federal Government to provide the necessary capital funding that we need to make Chief Peguis Trail an reality. Thank you.

(Councillor O'Shaughnessy in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: Extension moved by Councillor Eadie. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Lubosch: The situation as it exists presently is albeit not perfect, but better than it was. Yes residents have had to put up with speed humps which they have petitioned for themselves on Bonner Avenue. Yes they've had to live with speed humps on Knowles Avenue which they have petitioned for themselves to slow vehicles down. Yes they've had to live with turn restrictions during morning rush hours and afternoon rush hours at Bonner and Knowles. Yes they've had to live with the closure of McIvor Avenue because 4,000 vehicles a day between Raleigh and De Vries on a gravel road is unacceptable, as is 15,000 vehicles a day at Henderson Highway and McIvor within a block of an elementary school. Yes they've had to live with Springfield Road having an unacceptable amount of vehicular traffic, 18,000 to 20,000 vehicles a day and trucks and accidents. They've had to live with all that and now what you are doing is you are taking one more access Knowles Avenue and creating a tremendous opportunity with a set of lights at Lagimodiere for additional traffic that is not going to find its way through in any sort of efficient or effective route from Lagimodiere to Henderson Highway.

And that is why Community Committee which deliberated Mr. Speaker until 3:00 a.m. in the morning which heard 167 people registered in opposition who are completely opposed to this development, not because of the houses, not because of the people that it would bring, but because of the road that it would close and the new substandard road that it would create. That is why Community Committee unanimously moved that there should be no development on this scale until the Chief Peguis Trail is a firm tangible reality. Not some twinkle in the 5 year Capital Budget's eye. So Mr. Speaker I'm going to implore everyone here to do the responsible thing to support the Community Committee decision to not proceed with this development until we have a sustainable safe way for people to get through North Kildonan. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I will not repeat the comments of Councillor Lubosch. He stated himself very well.

What I would say is that when this matter was at Community Committee the residents made it clear that they were business people, that they felt that the size of the lots, that the way it was configured, they didn't have a problem with that in the community. What they had a problem with is that they have a serious traffic problem in that area and that before we did development in that area we needed to fix the traffic.

The traffic problems there because it was, it's going to cause problems throughout their community and throughout the whole

of East Kildonan Transcona and they are going to be legitimately the greatest affected. By the fact that we don't have a planning, street planning for that area this spillage has just gone all through our community. Most directly for them but also it affects all the way down. Anytime you have a connection between Henderson Highway and Gateway and Henderson Highway, Gateway and Lagimodiere that all the residential streets through my ward which goes up to McLeod in some places and Leighton in others, in all the residential streets that are there because we don't have a rapid area where people can go quickly from one area to the other. So it bleeds commuter traffic off into the residential area and it shouldn't be doing that and the closer you get to this development the worse it is.

And one of the things that has been suggested is the use of Headmaster Row. Headmaster Row becomes in to fact a collector and right now it doesn't have access to Henderson Highway so you would have to go down there for a collector and then they have to turn off in one way or the other to one or the other of the residential streets. So it creates a kind of a rabbit's warren maze of traffic problems throughout the community. And the community was very concerned about it and said we would welcome new neighbours. We'd welcome them going to our schools and our community centre and the houses look like they'd be there. We know the City needs the money but please, please, please think about what you are doing to our roads, and we don't want our children's lives in jeopardy.

And I drove through there and had an idea of what they were dealing with and it seemed pretty scary. There is a school on Knowles Avenue that could be affected. There is another school just a couple of blocks up, I can't remember the name of it now, Mapleleaf School. There is another one that's a little further to the north there that's between Glenway and the street just south, Emerson, I think it is on Emerson right? The address is on Emerson. And all those residential streets are getting fast moving traffic because there is no appropriate collector for these streets to be used and people know that Winnipeg is a hot market now and they would like to see us do something about it. And we really need to have it properly planned there so that we don't have some child killed because of the rapid transit, rapid traffic snaking its way through the residential community.

So those are the reasons I supported Councillor Lubosch in his motion and felt we needed to do something. We needed to do something quickly. But I wasn't about to make a bad situation worse even though I thought that the housing in in of itself, there wasn't any problem with the housing and the residents made it clear. It wasn't any problem just fix the traffic problems and they'd be happy. And I think we could, if we put our minds to it we could probably have a solution for them fairly quickly and everybody would be happy and this development would be able to go forward without the concerns of the residents because they made it clear that that's what was holding them back. That they had no problems with the development in in of itself. It was the traffic that was making the whole situation dangerous. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thanks Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to speak briefly to this that I have discussed this with the area Councillor and I do feel that we don't always know what happens at a public hearing. I've been here for six and a half years and I've been to a lot of public hearings and when you are the one who is there and you hear all the arguments over an extended period of time, it sounds like they were there until 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning, and you hear hundreds of people you really do get a really really good understanding of what the concerns are of the neighbourhood.

And whether or not you feel comfortable allowing a development to proceed, it is the area Councillors, I respect the knowledge that the area Councillor's each have of their own area. And it does concern me when a Committee such as the Property Committee, I know they do have the right to do it if they believe

something is wrong, and they do have a right, I'm not saying they did anything they don't have a right to do but it does concern me that they may not have the understanding of the local issues in hand as well as the area Councillors do.

I certainly know in my area when City Centre makes some decisions we put a lot of thought into it and sometimes it isn't that it's definitely not clear when we walk in there what we are going to do, and it's only as the evening unfolds and we hear everyone that we realize what the right decision is to do. And I'm not sure that another Committee, that the other Committee had that kind of understanding of the situation. Perhaps they did but I don't know that and now I have to vote on it and I'm uncomfortable not having the knowledge myself to vote against the area Councillor which is what effectively I'm doing. And without all that understanding I'm rather reluctant to go against.

The other thing that concerns me is obviously you don't turn down a development because there is opposition. I mean we always have opposition to almost every rezoning and I've stood up and made some very difficult decisions in my ward but there is opposition. But this is a huge amount of opposition that's very very significant which makes me even more reluctant to go against the wishes of the area Councillors that know their area well.

So and the last reason I wanted to get up and say, this is the Chief Peguis Trail mentioned and I just want to put on record that I'm not standing up here because I think we should rush out and build that immediately. I actually agreed with the area Councillor when he wanted it removed from Plan Winnipeg. Now he's changed his view on that. I'm not saying that should be our City priority. You know what I think our City priority should be for new infrastructures for transit. But I would, so I don't want anyone to think that that's why I am supporting this but I with great respect of the area Councillor's knowledge of his own community and traffic concerns deferring to that. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: I would just simply like to say that when things are brought before the Committees Mr. Speaker from the areas that have had contentious issues that go till 3:00 in the morning and I know I've been through some of those contentious issues myself that sometimes these issues are not seen maybe as clearly as they could be. Because there is obviously going to be some bias and you get pressure from the area and that's fine. And the area Councillor should be the one to look to to make the final decision.

But we were given the information at these meetings that the area wasn't against the project per say, it was a traffic issue. And when the administration that you look to, the traffic division of the City of Winnipeg indicates clearly there is not a traffic concern, they have done the studies we have nowhere else to turn. We must make decisions, all of us, on our Committees based on the information that we are given. We cannot make things up. I'd like to. I'd like to wave a magic wand and say these people are all wrong, I know better, but I don't.

We must make the decisions based on the information at hand. And that's all I believe all of us try to do at these Committees. And that's why sometimes PP & D or whoever else overrides some decisions; even though it is difficult to do, based on the information we are given. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was, I am also a member of that Community Committee and it was a lengthy meeting. We heard from a lot of members of the community who came out to speak with their concerns. And I don't think it was an easy decision coming out of Community Committee. But it's a realization that based on the traffic studies talking about engineer reports and traffic studies we have a traffic study, the North Kildonan traffic study, which

basically says that there is a huge need, we have to, put through the Chief Peguis Trail. It's clear right in the traffic study.

And without the Chief Peguis Trail being constructed we're going to continually have problems. The traffic study rightly point it has as indicated in this development a connection of Headmaster Row to Lagimodiere with traffic lights. Well I don't know I'm not that excited about having another set of traffic lights on Lagimodiere Boulevard but I guess that's in the traffic study, but then I don't' think a lot of the community is that great about it. But there is an understanding that in the traffic study we are basically kind of putting together bits and drafts of the traffic study, or are implementing bits and drafts as it suits the development community but when it comes to the actual needs of the residents in the community that already is there you know, we are saying well sorry that can't be addressed right now. We can address that later.

The busiest two lane regional street according to our administration in the City Mr. Speaker is Springfield Road now. The second busiest two lane regional street in our City is Plessis Road. Where are those two regional streets? In northeast Winnipeg. We have invested over the last few decades lots of money in the City with new infrastructure, new roads, new bridges. We've built extensions to Bishop Grandin. We've built the Charleswood Bridge. We've built the Charleswood parkway. We've done a number of things with regards to St. James Street and other parts of the City but Mr. Speaker we have done very little investment in my mind, and I guess I am speaking as a Councillor from northeast Winnipeg and I also see in northwest Winnipeg when it comes to real investments of new infrastructure in those quadrants of the City and I think it's now starting to reflect with the kind of traffic problems that we starting to have.

I don't begrudge the work that's been done. I don't' begrudge the fact that work is going on and there is plans for the Kenaston underpass. But a former City administrator who is now retired, who was with the City for 30 some years you know, point blank indicated that the first project in the minds of our administration that should have come forward, for the next major expenditure should have been the Chief Peguis Trail, based on the challenges and issues they had. I'm just saying what I was informed. But I'm just saying what I was informed. And I'm not begrudging the work going on on the Kenaston underpass. You know Mr. Speaker I think that's a worthy project. But I'm just saying that there has to be a better balance when it comes to the infrastructure works.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order please. Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: I think Mr. Speaker this is kind of representative of the fact that we have this kind of divide between the north and the south. It's an old historic divide in our City that goes back many years. But nevertheless I think it doesn't have to be reflective when it comes to public policy development and how we actually decide on how we spend money on new capital projects and regional streets. But the reality is I think the challenge for the Councillor for the area is he's heard it loud and clear it's just the challenge with regards to the traffic in the area.

This Councillor has constantly tried to work between new developers and developments coming forward and the community to try to find ways to make things happen. And I think what we are hearing and what I am hearing and what I heard at Community Committee from the community and the area Councillor was that it's just they've hit a mark now where they just, you know, it's beyond reason to continue the development and developing with the kind of problems they are having. And I drive Springfield Road back and forth. I drive Plessis Road and you have massive trucks going up and down these streets, residential houses on both sides, it's ludicrous. And yet this is where the community is going to move, this is where the community is going to, these are the roads the community is going to use and we are adding more development to the area.

I think the rationale behind saying right now look we have to hold off with regards to this development until we make the kind of investments. I realize that we as a City haven't had some of that policy in place and I know that work is being done right now by the chair of the Standing Committee on Property and Development and EPC when it comes to establishing ways for new developments to pay towards new infrastructure so that we have a good regional street system in the City. And I think that is a welcome thing. I know it's controversial and it won't be easy to achieve that. There will be resistance to that. But clearly when you see other municipalities going down that road because of their transportation needs I think there a long time due that we might have to look at something similar here.

But in the interim we are dealing with this issue that we have before us Mr. Speaker and after hearing delegations and being at the Community Committee until 3:00 – 3:30 in the morning, you know, the community I don't think was being unreasonable. And as was said before many of the people in the community are business, in this community are business people, entrepreneurs, they're not per say against the development. They know the area will be residential. They're just really concerned Mr. Speaker with regards to the woes and the traffic problems in the community that are there now. And I think that they're very reasonable in their concerns and they're rationale. And I think the North Kildonan traffic study actually supports their concern, because the North Kildonan traffic study actually says we have to build the Chief Peguis extension. And I think if we did that or had we done that by now we wouldn't be having this conversation as we are having. So Mr. Speaker I support the decision coming out of Community Committee and I support the area Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I always find that these particular debates are in many ways more difficult than a lot of others we deal with here because I recognize that what we are dealing with is an issue that came out of a public hearing and I know that the local Councillor and the Councillors who sat on that hearing for many hours took the brunt of the representations that were made pro and con and came to a recommendation. I say right at the beginning that Community Committees don't make decisions Mr. Speaker they make recommendations only. It is City Council at the end of the process that actually makes the decision yes or no to a rezoning or many of these other things.

So I, but these ones I always find difficult when a group of my colleagues have sat in the hearing and have dealt with the representations and make a recommendation that gets flipped at the Property Committee. I usually pay a little special attention to those particular ones Mr. Speaker because I, many of you know my feelings about Community Committees as a process. I would abolish them in a nanosecond if we could land on a much better and more efficient process for hearings than what we have now, but that's another debate.

I respect the fact that when members of Council sit in those hearings it's difficult. And it's difficult when we're faced with a different recommendation from the Standing Policy Committee. So this one I've spent some time on Mr. Speaker simply because the Community Committee after concluding hearings made a recommendation and the Standing Policy Committee has made a different recommendation. So I, when I heard that I took some time to drive around this area to make sure I had some familiarity with it. I don't have the extensive knowledge that my friend Councillor Lubosch would have obviously but I certainly tried to drive around this area a number of times just to get a feel for it and to specifically look at the property in question that is the subject of this rezoning and to look at the various streets to try and get a perhaps a little better understanding of the neighbourhood.

I also took the time as I usually do on something like this to go through the transcripts of the public hearing to get an indication of what was said there and I

understand a lot of the comments that came forward. There are, and there was a various number of opinions on this, both pro and con, lots of con. I understand my recollection of reading the transcript, lots of folks like the idea, didn't have a problem with developing the land, infill housing and all of that, concerns about traffic, some where concerned about lot sizes. There we other issues that arose up there. So I certainly have, I think that understanding even though I didn't actually, I wasn't a member of that hearing panel, I certainly understand from the transcripts what was said so at least I have in some ways the same, an idea of what the three Councillors from that area heard.

In, certainly in my own firsthand look at the neighbourhood Mr. Speaker I would say to you that I think it just simply makes common sense to approve this rezoning. And I intend to vote for the recommendation of the Property Committee Mr. Speaker after having looked at that area, looking at the, reading the transcript and the recommendation of the Community Committee.

I quite frankly am not convinced that it's a valid reason to turn down a rezoning for infill housing on the premise that we don't have the Chief Peguis Trail. I don't know whether one can sustain that reason. My own view personally, I don't know whether one can sustain that for any length of time as a reason to turn down a housing development in a residential neighbourhood, in an infill housing development as well which in every way meets our Plan Winnipeg objectives.

The Chief Peguis Trail has been around this place for some time. I seem to recall at one time it had a higher priority through our Plan Winnipeg process. It was removed for a time through local concerns. I don't remember the exact detail. And then at a later time it was brought back and reinserted in the list. But in the meantime while it was out of the list of high priority transportation projects others moved in to fill the gap. So now as we did in our last Capital Budget in '04 Mr. Speaker '05, we inserted an amount of money in the 5 Year Capital for Plan Winnipeg, sorry for Chief Peguis Trail, down at the end of that 5 year process which is our policy for new projects.

And we inserted I think about $800,000 or $900,000 dollars in there which would be for the engineering design works, the preliminaries and as we get into that actually year of expenditure I am assuming that at that point we would start to actually plan a budget to build the Chief Peguis Trail. So it's been set aside not by accident I don't think Mr. Speaker but through circumstance. It was in, it was taken out, others came in to fill the gap but now we've inserted it just six months ago into the Capital Budget. So I, you know I can't answer in great detail for that but I don't think for 5 or 6 years it makes any reasonable sense to hold up a valid infill residential development here.

I know there is some issues with some streets. Headmaster Row for example, I know was designed as a collector street, it's built that way. I understand I think one of the quid pro quo of this rezoning is the closure of Knowles at De Vries, closing Knowles opening Headmaster. I see that as sort of a give and take as I understand it through the negotiation process. I also have noticed though that streets such as Sun Valley Drive and Ragsdill are also built to collector standard to move traffic as I see it east-west between Gateway, De Vries or Lagimodiere and Headmaster of course is from Raleigh eastward, or westward rather to Rothesay.

So I understand there is some issues. I also understand that McIvor Avenue through a decision made earlier about four or five years ago was closed at De Vries as a part of a rezoning and a development. It is still temporarily closed. I understand there is no support to remove that temporary closure and open up McIvor straight through to De Vries, I think it is De Vries, I don't think it goes right through to Lagimodiere. But if that's the case and if there is not any support to reopen McIvor and I understand you just don't do that by the stroke of a pen there has to be some negotiation with the developer who is involved in that earlier rezoning then you know we are faced and left with what we have here.

Without any disrespect to Councillor Lubosch or that Community Committee I think in this particular case Mr. Speaker I have to agree with the Property Committee that the recommendation for rezoning of this property is sound. It meets our policy objectives as I see it in Plan Winnipeg and certainly having looked at the site I don't think that it's appropriate to deny the rezoning on the premise that we don't have a Chief Peguis Trail and may not have one for four or five years because that's what our process is. So I will be supporting the rezoning here Mr. Speaker not with any great enthusiasm (inaudible) the process...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham moves for an extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: but I feel that based on the evidence that I have looked at that I am going to support the rezoning.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I think as most of you know that I give fair treatment to all representation of any Committee that I serve and these are always difficult issues. I think Councillor Eadie and others have all speculated on the mandate that we have on reviewing these kind of issues from the Community Committee.

You know if there is ever a case to be made for a planning and transportation commission this is it. I've been here now long enough to know, to watch how we try and get out of the my backyard syndrome to have fair understanding of all the issues to have a commission that would be responsible to task the administration to flush out details of transportation issues and zoning and make their choice to Council. And of course there would be an appeal process to the politicians. As Councillor Eadie says that might be for another day. But certainly I think our time has come to consider that seriously.

Look I don't know what to say anymore. This is a peripatetic issue. I'm not trying to be disrespectful of the Councillor but you know he did move it out of Plan Winnipeg out to 2020. We're now back in it's in it was in Plate B moved to Plate C. The Councillor talked about well really you know we should close Knowles but I don't want to do it until they clear up the Peguis Trail. But you know back in the North Kildonan traffic study and I've taken the opportunity to read this and to talk to the department you know in October 27th of 2003 there was some initial issues being presented that could have mitigated some of that traffic concerns there. That a partial connection of Sun Valley between De Vries and Lagimodiere be considered and put into the 05-09 Capital Budget. I don't see it there. That turn restriction, sort of closures on Lagimodiere Boulevard at Knowles, Bonner, McIvor not be implemented until such time as the Chief Peguis Trail be extended to Lagimodiere. That's the updated North Kildonan traffic study from '84 updated in '03. Of course we can close Knowles now because of opening Headmaster but no we really shouldn't do this subdivision because we are closing Knowles.

But the fact is Headmaster is west of Gateway is a collector street will be extended right through to De Vries right through to Lagimodiere and it will be a collector street. It is designed that way. Sun Valley is a collector street. McIvor should never have been closed. I mean that's what the department has always said. We know we have to filter traffic in and out of our communities. We all face the same thing. We have collector streets and subdivisions all around us. And I'm not trying to undermine or soft-sell the impact of traffic up in that area, but I do know that other areas of the City face the same thing.

So we are looking for a balanced approach here. And when we listen to the administration we look at other studies that have been done. We know that we have to rely with some sense of reliability on the administration and balance that off against the wishes of the Community Committee and the Councillor of the area. That's why it's a tough decision to make here. There is no question that we are pitting A against B.

But I see this in a balanced way. It's 155 homes in clause 1, another 20 homes at an R-1.5 or at an R, yeah 1.5 subdivision of 20 homes for a total of 175. Not an ominous development.

This development has been ongoing in that area for some time and the Councillor had indicated that you know the owner or the developer appeared from Victoria wants to do this but you know he did a development in that area just off Strongberg several years ago in which we lead to the closure of McIvor for some strange reason. And I know McIvor is a granular sort of surface with ditch drainage and I have no understanding why the community over all these years haven't done a local improvement to fix these things up. I guess they didn't want to do that. So some of it is self generated and some of the problems perhaps I don't want to be that critical but you know we are faced with this Hobson's choice.

We have a reasonable small development adding on to the value of that community, adding on to the value of Winnipeg and it seems to make a heck of a lot of sense for the Planning department's perspective and Plan Winnipeg. It makes a lot of sense to the transportation department if we had done all those other things we should have been doing. Now we have a bit of a problem but in their view it's manageable. It's within the art of manageability. And maybe with consultation with the area and with the Councillor we can find some other solutions until we can get to that famous Peguis Trail which we are going to build in Sun Valley Park. I can understand what will happen there.

So my views ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues of Council is that we consider this on balance as a reasonable development process and recommend to you clause 1.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Question on clause 1? A recorded vote has been asked for.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

Councillors Benham, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Smith, Thomas, Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 6.

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried. Clause 2, Councillor De Smedt.

Item No. 2 - Closing - part of De Vries Avenue at Knowles Avenue
File DAC 25/2004 [c/r DASZ 20/2004]

Councillor De Smedt: This is a companion to clause 1 which is a closing of De Vries and Knowles so I just move that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Speakers? Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise in the fog of the patronizing collegiality from my colleagues to the left and right of me only to be completely bewildered at how one can rationally conclude that it would be okay to close Knowles Avenue but it was somehow not okay to close McIvor Avenue, when both are granular surface roadways for at least one third of their stretch between De Vries and Gateway. When both of them are unimproved roads which haven't had and you may find this interesting and important Councillor Steeves and Councillor Eadie, both of them have not had the benefit of a local improvement or a development agreement to provide a concrete road or sidewalks.

I find it very interesting that one can justify on one hand closing Knowles Avenue for

yet another infill development which is good for the community which will bring hordes of new traffic from Lagimodiere trying to avoid Springfield Road, and yet one chastises the local area Councillor the Community Committee and anybody else for closing McIvor Avenue which was getting the hell pounded out of it by 4,000 vehicles a day between De Vries and Gateway, the unimproved part, sending people scurrying into the ditches not to be hit by cars. And 15,000 vehicles a day at Henderson Highway where a set of lights was installed not because it was part of the overall traffic plan of the area but because there is a shopping centre there which contributed to a portion of the cost of the lights tripling and quadrupling the amount of traffic that used that intersection at Henderson Highway over Bonner and Knowles Avenue at Henderson Highway which don't have the benefit of a signalized intersection.

I find it incredulous that on one hand we can justify it here and on the other hand we can chastise it over there. And what about my position on Chief Peguis Trail, does anybody around here understand that good policy makes good politics? That when I was elected in 1995 I was not about to approve and endorse a $25 to $30 million dollar Capital project without some semblance of policy attached to it, just because it's in a pretty picture doesn't mean necessarily that it's appropriate or valid. This was 20 years hence.

The fact is Mr. Speaker unlike a lot of people around here I took the time to have workshops with residents, public meetings, requested the administration provide traffic plans and traffic analysis which demonstrated very clearly that the Chief Peguis Trail should be and will be part of our Capital program in the very near future. To get, to continue to harp on about Lubosch took it out of the Capital Budget or Lubosch took it out of Plan Winnipeg Policy Plate 2010, what a bunch of crap Mr. Speaker. People should ultimately get over these musings and these pointless taunts and get on with life. Only an idiot doesn't change their mind and I can recall a lot of people around here changing their minds when it came to the smoking by-law which failed and failed and failed repeatedly for two, three, four years until Council suddenly nearly unanimously approved it. Well perhaps this is a similar situation where policy needed to drive a decision.

And the decision to work towards Chief Peguis Trail has not been an easy one. Even with Chief Peguis Trail I'll bet there will be some dissention in North Kildonan but ultimately for the greater common good. If I put my city-wide City Councillor hat on it's the right thing to do. And I defy anybody here to attest to this Council pulling Chief Peguis Trail out of Plan Winnipeg, out of the Capital Budget on the basis of a parochial North Kildonan decision. I can't imagine that anybody here who has been talking about this.

Mr. Speaker: Stop the clock Councillor Lubosch. You've had half your speaking time on the off topic and you deserve that time but back to De Vries with the last half of your speaking time.

Councillor Lubosch: Back to Knowles Avenue.

Mr. Speaker: Knowles, De Vries no we are closing part of De Vries at Knowles according to the clause.

Councillor Lubosch: We are closing Knowles Avenue.

Mr. Speaker: Your clock now runs.

Councillor Lubosch: Beautiful. Thank you. At least the clock runs.

Mr Speaker closing Knowles Avenue prior to providing either an ingress or egress at Lagimodiere at Sun Valley other than the gravel shoulders that people now have to decelerate or accelerate on in order to get onto Lagimodiere from North Kildonan or to come into North Kildonan from Lagimodiere, not committing to the Chief Peguis Trail, doing anything in North Kildonan that is going to create more consternation, that is going to restrict automobile traffic between Lagimodiere and Henderson Highway other than how it's moving right now is in my opinion not responsible and certainly not a balanced decision. We talk about balance here Mr.

Speaker. Going from three roads to two roads between Lagimodiere and Henderson, two residential roads between Lagimodiere and Henderson is not in my opinion and not in anybody in North Kildonan's opinion a balanced decision.

Choosing the interests of a developer who doesn't even live in Winnipeg, who lives in Victoria, over the interests of thousands of residents in North Kildonan, Transcona, anywhere in the northeast quadrant of the City, putting their interests behind the interests of a developer is not in my opinion a balanced decision Mr. Speaker. In fact it is anything but.

These people in North Kildonan whether they live on Knowles Avenue near De Vries or whether they live on the current Headmaster or whether they live on McIvor or Bonner or Ragsdill or Sun Valley or any of the other of dozens of streets in North Kildonan, their quality of life Mr. Speaker will be affected by this decision. Their quality of life and the safety of the streets in North Kildonan will be significantly diminished by this decision. There is no balance in that Mr. Speaker, not at all. I urge every member here on Council to vote against this clause. This is irresponsible, unsustainable and completely without thought or regard for the people who have contributed millions of dollars in property taxes to the City of Winnipeg and who deserve some consideration here. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Well thank you very much Mr. Speaker. What I of course did not hear is that there is a quid pro quo here in the proposal if we close that section of De Vries in which the applicant for clause 1 would like to, would like this land to incorporate into the other subdivision is some significant and if anybody has read this report I have never seen so many conditions laid upon a developer to produce a subdivision for 155 lots.

I mean it goes on and on and on but not just simple width of the concrete and depth of it but all the geometrics that he has to do. The inclusion of course is that he must construct Headmaster Row and connect it to Lagimodiere and it's going to be signalized so we are reopening a collector street which that community is designed for. The route was designed for that community.

So I regret that I can't see why we would deny this one while the other one is going to be opening up. We would then have another street that would be used by more people but there is obviously been some concerns on Knowles for years because the Councillor responded to the area residents and I do believe we have speed, famous speed bumps along Knowles if that's correct and having travelled it several times in the not to distant past I understand that. But there is a quid pro quo and that's what we are facing with, and it was the administrative view that this would make sense. So I am offering this again to you for support that I think on balance this will provide additional opportunities for traffic to flow east and west in that community. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. All in favour of clause 2. A recorded vote has been called.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

Councillors Benham, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Smith, Thomas, Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 6.

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried.

Moving on to clause 6, Mr. Clerk.

Item No. 6 - Subdivision and Rezoning - southeast corner of Knowles Avenue and Gateway Road File DASZ 45/2004

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. This is a subdivision for 20 lots that would be contiguous to a development, to the development that we just approved on and it is much larger lots to take into account the local community that's there. A very small subdivision, I'm not sure if the issues are the same but I would like to move it Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Without repeating the same arguments and comments that I have for the last two clauses the issue here is the same. It's another subdivision in North Kildonan without the appropriate sustainable roads and infrastructure to make it work. And although it is a small subdivision it's part of the whole. And I would ask that Council not support the recommendation of the Planning Committee, but ultimately support the Community Committee decision and the residents of North Kildonan and deny this clause.

Mr. Speaker: Do you wish to sum up Councillor De Smedt?

Councillor De Smedt: I just want to point out to Councillors that this 20 unit subdivision is dependent, was dependent on the 155 unit subdivision. Just the way water and sewage and stuff flow so the other one had to come first which we approved and this comes next. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. A recorded vote has been called for.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

Councillors Benham, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Smith, Thomas, Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 6.

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried. Clause 12, Mr. Clerk.

Item No. 12 - Amendments to Schedule A of The City of Winnipeg License By-law No. 6551/95 File EL-1

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to point out to members of Council that what we are doing is continuing all the existing licensing fees at their current rates through to either May 31/06 or December 31/06 as applicable. So this is sort of business as usual unless I'd like to hear from the Councillor what the issues are.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. I called this out because first of all this is two years overdue. Two years overdue. And there are things wrong, serious things wrong with some of the licenses. Amusement parlour license let me tell you this. There is a firm, this young fellow bought this firm on Portage called Magic Land. He pays over $4,000 dollars in fees to the City of Winnipeg. If his same business was in Regina it would be $50 dollars. If his business was in any western Canadian city it would be under $300 dollars, you know, there $100, $150 that level. Ours is over $4,000. Now he's paid that already for two years and now

you are saying he has to pay it for a third year. I thought this administration was an administration like business that were inclined to foster business and entrepreneurship instead of going ahead and imposing insurmountable burdens on them compared to other cities. So I'm against this delaying any further. I'm voting against this. And I would like a recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. Councillor De Smedt to close debate.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much. I would just like to move the clause, this is administrative business as usual so I so move.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of the clause please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Benham, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

Councillor Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 1.

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried.

Motions, none. By-laws Councillor De Smedt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT – CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor De Smedt: I would like to move that the following By-laws be read for a first time, 90/2005 to 104/2005, 107/2005 and 109/2005

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 90/2005, 91/2005, 92/2005, 93/2005, 94/2005, 95/2005, 96/2005, 97/2005, 98/2005, 99/2005, 100/2005, 101/2005, 102/2005, 103/2005, 104/2005, 107/2005, 109/2005.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that the By-laws numbered 90/2005 to 104/2005 both inclusive and By-law nos. 107/2005 and 109/2005 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 90/2005, to 104/2005 both inclusive, and By-laws numbered 107/2005 and 109/2005.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 90/2005 to 104/2005 both inclusive and By-laws no. 107/2005 and 109/2005 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Questions? None. Moving on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services the report of March 11th, Councillor Steeves, item 2.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MARCH 11, 2005

Item 2 - Mosquito Adulticiding Program, File PA

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Regarding report of March 11th, 2005 this report comes from Executive Policy Committee without a recommendation as such. I'll be recommending the Standing Policy Committee recommendation to file this report.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh so he's not introducing it then.

Mr. Speaker: He did it, he made all the comment, he can still close that.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, thank you, all right then, thanks. I just wanted to make a few brief comments on the record on this. It says, I didn't realize it was without recommendation, I thought it was concurring with the Standing Committee's recommendation. I'm not sure that there is a difference. Is that, but in fact I take it as concurrence but I'm not sure of for of it and need some clarification…

Mr. Speaker: Excuse me the motion before us is to concur with the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee, EPC doesn't get to make a recommendation for or against to Council.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay thank you I appreciate, I understand. I just wanted to make a few brief comments on this issue because I think it is an important issue to a lot of citizens and it's something that's upon us again too. And I am relieved that Council did not take the action although a couple of Councillors wanted to, did not take the action of eliminating buffer zones. Not everyone has the same, Mr. Speaker could we have some order in the chamber; I'm having a little trouble hearing myself. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I hope so. Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: Not everyone has the same views on pesticide use and it gives very little comfort to those concerned about the carcinogenic effects and the concerns of these chemicals to say that they are simply well are approved by our national regulators so therefore you know don't worry about it. There is a lot of people that are worried and will continue to worry about these issues, and many of you with good reason.

All sorts of substances that now have proven to be toxic were at one time completely approved and these things change and there are some valid concerns out there. The precautions taken that we need to take when spraying with Malathion does not really inspire a lot of confidence when you are told to take everything inside and bring your pets inside and all that stuff. When you suffer from chemical sensitivities or are breastfeeding a baby, etc. depending on your views. And we have citizens with different views who have these concerns and all of the concerns of our citizens are valid. And this buffer zone, providing this for those people with those concerns is a reasonable compromise that allows a balance of the rights of our citizens with different points of view and concerns.

I also would just like to clarify if there is any confusion that these buffer zones only apply when there is fogging for nuisance mosquitoes. We are not when the Province declares a health emergency due to the West Nile Virus the buffer zones are lifted. So this is not a health emergency we are talking about. We live in a world where very few cities still fog with Malathion without a medical emergency. And the new mosquito strategy this year makes a concerted effort to eliminate the call for fogging.

But we all know that even with these excellent efforts if the weather doesn't cooperate we will be faced with the usual dilemma. And when it comes to mosquito control we aren't going to make everybody happy. And my point in speaking today is that we need to show some political courage about this which I suppose we are doing by keeping these buffer zones in place. But I think when the decision comes about fogging this year we should be really viewing this as it says in our policy as a last resort and that there is no doubt that Council should, is wise to allow small and reasonable compromise to protect those citizens who feel endangered by these chemicals. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. I want to support keeping the buffer zones the way they are. But I would like to make an especial appeal to all the Liberals and Conservatives on this Council. You know these people that espouse individual rights and individual responsibility. You know I picked up a copy of the *New Yorker* and there was

this booklet *Make it Better.* It's put out be Timber Boots. It's about environmental issues. And they suggest that an individual can keep the mosquitoes away just by having a fabric softener cloth in their belt. You know so there is no reason why if people want chemicals they can get chemicals by doing that. They don't need to be sprayed. So I think you know it's just ludicrous for us to go ahead we've got a new mosquito policy and I think it is good and I don't think we may not even have to resort to fogging. So, but you know why even consider it at this point of time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I would like to say as one of those who was addressed by Councillor Smith if we all had ties like that there wouldn't be a mosquito within 50 miles of this City.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves summing up on the clause.

Councillor Steeves: I'm pleased again Mr. Speaker to stand shoulder to shoulder with my brethren Councillor Smith and Councillor Gerbasi in solidarity in supporting leaving the mosquito buffer zones in place. We at the Protection and Community Services Committee take great pride in always being together on all issues and this is just another example of that. And I am pleased to underline that yet again this show of constant solidarity because this is very very important. I just want people to be abundantly clear that by supporting our Standing Committee's recommendation that we will be, things will essentially stay status quo.

And just, I'm going to be brief I don't get the sense of this clause that this recommendation is any real jeopardy. It's my estimation Mr. Speaker that although from time to time inconvenient for us as Councillors and that it causes some rifts in the community it this is a policy that generally speaking seems to be working. There are certain areas of the City that for certain philosophical reasons have bounded together and I think they have caused larger areas in our City not to be sprayed and really to a large extent as far as I'm concerned that's fine.

If we have folks in this community who want to live that lifestyle then maybe it's for the best that we got, it's kind of coalesce that way and that people have that option. My sense of course is that by and large people in this community do for their own reasons I suppose support the idea when the time comes of adult mosquito fogging and that process does exist to allow for that in the larger context of course.

The buffer zones exist to provide for certain circumstances so people can be protected. And I just want to again underline Mr. Speaker that just because someone phones in and says they want their house avoided in terms of being sprayed that doesn't necessarily mean that all neighbours on either side of them don't get sprayed. The reason we have that buffer zone is because we understand that as we spray outside the buffer zone there is going to be drift of Malathion into that buffer zone but it shouldn't and it will get toward the subject property so it's not as though the adjacent properties are going completely without. I wouldn't want to state to this Council that probably there wouldn't be some slippage in terms of the neighbourhood properties, but the idea is to account for the drift that comes in from the neighbouring properties. So when you are talking to your constituents who may from time to time complain and say well my neighbour two doors down wants a buffer zone therefore I am not getting sprayed, that's not actually and factually true. The truth is we allow for the drift so we understand that Malathion will be coming into their yards and some kill will be occurring. Maybe not at quite the same level but it does exist. I'm talking about mosquito kills of course.

The, obviously the concerns are health related and for that reason I'm trusting that everyone will support that recommendation. It should also be said be in large Mr. Speaker that this Council in all likelihood doesn't have the authority to eliminate buffer zones. We could probably only make recommendations to

the Provincial government in that regard in any event so I don't want to sort of overstate our capacity here at Council. We probably don't have that power, so that what was only being contemplated. This might be a sleeping dog that's best left lying. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. All in favour of the clause? Contrary?

Councillors Clement, De Smedt and O'Shaughnessy asked to be recorded as having voted against the item.

The clause is carried.

The report of May 2nd Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MAY 2, 2005

Councillor Steeves: I'll move items 1 and 2 Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions, none. By-laws, none. Any questions? None listed. Standing Policy Committee on Public Works report of May 5th Councillor Eadie.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED MAY 5, 2005

Councillor Eadie: Thanks Mr. Speaker. I'll move that the report of Public Works from May 5th be received and that clauses 1 through 5 be adopted by Consent.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions, none. By-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS – CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I'll move that By-law 106/2005 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 106/2005.

Councillor Eadie: I'll move that By-law 106/2005 be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 106/2005.

Councillor Eadie: I'll move that By-law 106/2005, that the rule be suspended and that By-law 106/2005 be read a third time and passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Questions? None. Alternate Service Delivery, Councillor Magnifico, Consideration of By-laws.

ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE – CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Magnifico: Yes I would like to move that By-law No. 108/2005 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 108/2005.

Councillor Magnifico: I'd like to move that By-law No. 108/2005 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 108/2005.

Councillor Magnifico: I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 108/2005 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Steeves moves adjournment.

Roll Call.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Benham, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Wyatt.

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 4:06 p.m.