COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday October 26, 2005

The Council met at 9:34 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 Eadie.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have to welcome three pages this morning. We have Elaine Manipol of Kildonan East Collegiate who resides in the Transcona Ward, Michael Dwilow of Fort Richmond Collegiate who resides in the St. Norbert Ward and Tayva Pannell of West Kildonan Collegiate who resides in the Mynarski Ward. Welcome.

I would like to welcome this morning Duncan McMonagle and his class of journalism students from Red River College and also students from the Academy of Broadcasting. Welcome, thank you for joining us this morning.

Mr. Mayor I believe you also had an announcement you wished to make.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to take a moment to honour three City Councillors who have served 25 years plus at this particular point in time. Mr. Speaker that would be yourself, Councillor O'Shaughnessy, Councillor Eadie and Councillor Lazarenko.

You've seen six different Mayors in your tenure. The information that I have garnered so far is that when you were first elected, a bottle of Pepsi was a nickel, a salami sandwich was a dime and the movie was only 25 cents. Which would make me, I guess I would still be in diapers at this particular point in time.

But all kidding aside, you have a wealth, you are a wealth of experience. A great resource to our City. You've been on too many committees to mention and I think you've probably seen it all. And on behalf of Council and all our citizens thank you for your dedication and thank you for your hard work. We very much appreciate it. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Steeves: Twenty-five more years.

(Laughter)

Mr. Speaker: No sentence should be that long Councillor Steeves.

MINUTES

Councillor Steeves moves the minutes of the meeting of September 28, 2005 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Moving on to delegations. Councillor Gerbasi.

DELEGATIONS

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker I would like to request that Council waive the rules to allow one further speaker only for five minutes on the Rapid Transit Task Force Report and it's a Mr. Thomas Novack.

Mr. Speaker: Thomas Novack is that for or against?

Councillor Gerbasi: In support. In support.

Mr. Speaker: In support.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

First delegation this morning, Mr. David Leibl on behalf of Winnipeggers for Bus Rapid Transit, support of item 2 of EPC of October 19th. Mr. Leibl. Is Mr. Leibl here? Apparently not.

Councillor Gerbasi: Maybe, he may be a few minutes late.

Mr. Speaker: We'll call him again at the end. Also in support of that clause Stefano Grande.

Maybe they really don't support it all that much. (Laughter)

Thomas Novack.

Councillor Gerbasi: They're late. They're all late.

Councillor Lubosch: They took the bus.

Mr. Speaker: Bus is tied up, I know.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah they took the bus.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Novack.

(Laughter)

Councillor Wyatt: That's why we need rapid transit.

Councillor Gerbasi: I think I see Mr. Leibl walking up right now.

Mr. Speaker: You snooze, you lose.

In opposition to that…

Councillor Gerbasi: He's on his way up.

Mr. Speaker: ever so popular report, Mr. Nick Ternette.

Mr. Speaker: Nick. I knew you'd be here. Welcome.

Mr. Nick Ternette: Welcome Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz, members of City Council. One year later BRT, Bus Rapid Transit is put back on the agenda after having been rejected by City Council over a year ago. Why? To be honest, I'm completely confused concerning Mayor Katz's flip-flop on rapid transit.

Firstly you're going post BRT then he makes statements that seem to reflect the need of Winnipeg to have a light railway transit system. Then at other times he seems to reject rapid transit altogether indicating that perhaps all we need is to improve the current transit system. Which hat is Mayor Katz wearing today? I wonder.

Maybe it was a mistake for Mayor Sam Katz to put together a Task Force on Rapid Transit instead of possibility of creating a task force that could have determined what options Winnipeg really needed - a BRT, an LRT or simply an improvement of the current transit system.

If you review the final report on the Rapid Transit Task Force it seems that the Task Force was forced to decide on what form of rapid transit was the best way to go. LRT or BRT. In fact you know this past year a member of the Task Force said in an article that he wrote in the *Winnipeg Free Press* "that he harboured an alluring vision of a light railway transit system in Winnipeg but winds up endorsing BRT because in his view it makes financial sense and is affordable."

You know and I can't say I've heard this whole view that the matter is everybody prefers LRT but it's the cost factor. Well, you know as well as I know and the report indicates that, that the Minister of State Honorable Godfrey has started negotiations with the Provinces to invest over $800 million dollars over the next two years in specifically public transit. And this is not gas money that we are talking about. This is separate money that's coming, $27 million dollars.

Making as far as I'm concerned LRT just as cost efficient as BRT in the long run because as long as gas prices stay up as they do the Federal Government is going to pour more and more money into public transit because they want to get people out of the car and onto a, a public transportation system. So $27 million dollars is only the beginning. I guarantee you there is going to be a lot more money coming in therefore LRT is just as feasible as any BRT.

The basic reason for a rapid transit system in Winnipeg is firstly to drastically increase the use of a public transportation system. Specifically suburbanites. We need to stop generalizing the public transit system as something that only the

poor use. This requires a transit system that is fast, efficient and clean. Furthermore a rapid transit system would initiate redevelopment that would occur around rapid transit stations used for picking up and dropping off passengers.

And now I found something interesting, that a friend of mine Jeff Lowe helped me discover. On page 31 of the Task Force, and if you'd like to look at the Task Force, I hope all of you have read it, it states and I quote "LRT may be required to achieve certain developmental goals or public acceptance targets". What does that mean? Does that mean that the Task Force recognizes that more suburbanites will shift from a car to a train, than from a car to a bus? And that redevelopment including downtown redevelopment is more likelier to occur under an LRT system than a BRT system. That's your own report. That's your own recommendations, page 31.

If Mayor Sam Katz actually felt that the Task Force participants wanted a BRT he's kind of way off base. At this point first of all it is important to note that the majority of the participants were from the Fort Garry, Fort Rouge and River Heights area which are represented by the two Councillors who favoured BRT the most. And I'm not saying there is anything wrong with that but if you break down the statistical figures very carefully by taking note of all the comments made by participants out of the approximately 400 and so participants, 27% favoured BRT, 21% favoured LRT and 2% favoured a subway.

And in fact as I say those statistics are slanted because the participants came from areas which are obviously in favour of BRT. Those areas that favour LRT or those areas that favoured only improved bus transit system like the West End and Wolseley and others were significantly under-represented in the statistical breakdown if you look at those figures very, very carefully.

If one closely examines the details of the report one can examine, determine that there are two options, both of which were ignored by the Task Force. As I argued one is the introduction of a two rapid transit system. LRT which is smooth, quiet and quicker than a car downtown, as well as being environmentally friendly and efficient. To be honest and I said that to EPC I cannot fathom how environmentalists of any sort can possibly favour BRT over LRT on the basis of environmental considerations.

The other option would be to recognize that the car culture of Winnipeg is so entrenched that improving the present public transportation system and improvements are needed but not limited to for example, and this is just what the participants said during those periods that we had, including heated bus shelters built with Plexiglas so we don't have to, vandalism happening these days that you notice a lot of them do. Air conditioning in buses during the summer months. Buses here are built with air conditioning but are removed from those buses in Winnipeg but in Florida and so where those buses are shipped the air conditioning remains. Lower bus fares. Increased diamond lanes. I don't have a problem with that because I think we need more express buses on major routes. It's maybe that's all we can afford, maybe.

As you are well aware there has been a 21% reduction in bus services since 1986, fewer routes and fewer buses. If public transportation is to be improved then service and the number of buses needed are, have to at least equal or exceed the 1986 standards. 99% of the Rapid Transit Task Force participants, those who participated in all aspects at the rapid transit were in favour of improving the transportation system. 19.5% of participants believed that speed and reliability and frequency were absolutely critical. 11.5 % believed that lower fares and affordability were absolutely critical. And 11.1% felt that the system should be environmentally friendly.

To me again if you look at the statistical breakdown the view of it is the suggestion that BRT is carrying the day here is nonsense. It's absolute nonsense. The realities that we have, with the money that's coming in from the Federal

government relating to the high gas prices is that there are options for Winnipeggers that this Task Force didn't even bother to consider.

That the real options for Winnipeggers is to be looking at a real light railway transit system, an LRT system, and if you don't want to build an LRT system, if you don't want rapid transit, and there are people I know in this Council that don't want any rapid transit system, then scrap it all together and say let's put this money that is going to come in for public transportation and let's improve the public transportation system.

Because if nothing else, if you're not going to get the suburbanites to go on to the public transportation system then at least for those of us that live in the inner city, those of us who are penalized, those who are poor, those who have to use public transportation system, and I use the public transportation system, I do not own a car, therefore those of us would like to have a better transit system then we have at the present time that's continually deteriorating with service cuts and service cuts and increased bus fares that simply affect everybody of us who uses the public transportation system. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Nick.

Questions? Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I thank Mr. Ternette for his presentation. Mr. Speaker he, Mr. Ternette said and I've heard him say this before that he believes the bus rapid transit is not, he doesn't understand why it's defended on environmental grounds. The statistics used in the United…

Mr. Speaker: Question please.

Councillor Benham: Would he, would Mr. Ternette agree that taking 250 cars off the road, which is what a fully loaded bus does, that taking 250 cars off the road has environmental benefits?

Mr. Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker obviously any system that takes people off the cars, cars off the roads is environmentally safe. An LRT would remove probably 500, maybe 600 cars off the road system then a BRT system. An LRT system carries far more passengers at the same time, at the same speed as any bus rapid transit system. That's the problem.

There is no real serious comparison here between how effective an LRT system is in terms of removing cars from the system to a BRT system. The fact however is from all studies that I have seen, and that some of them are included in here but not all of them, the fact is that suburbanites in all major cities will get onto a clean and efficient train. A train they will take to go downtown to work then leave their cars at home or car park them as we do in Calgary where I was around when the LRT was built, and I know what it was like in 1982 to 1985 during Ralph Klein's period, thanks, then they would to get off a car onto a bus even if it is as fast, as bloody fast a bus then otherwise. So as far as I'm concerned yes, but environmentally even more productive is an LRT.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Wouldn't it be a significant improvement to the current transit system, as Mr. Ternette has called for, to provide busways so that the current transit system with current buses would move faster and more frequently throughout all areas of the City?

Mr. Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker well that's what some of our people argue that in fact that this is being recommended here at the Rapid Transit Task Force is not a bus rapid transit system. It's basically a significantly increased better improvement. In fact I understand that there are people who are very disturbed, those who had supported bus rapid transit from all the way on. Well Mr. Klassen has indicated that he doesn't feel that this goes far enough, that in fact this is possibly just an improvement in the public transportation system. It is not really a real bus rapid transit system. I'm not, I'm

not here to argue for or against what divisions are in the Bus Rapid Transit people are here. I just don't think that this is an efficient way of doing it. You can put more express buses on and put some more diamond lanes on major thoroughfares and most people would probably be happy enough with that.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you Mr. Ternette.

Mr. Speaker: Okay thank you Nick. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Ternette the main reason we're given is the, between the LRT and the rapid bus is the cost. And you seem to think that the Federal government will make enough money available for us to have an LRT system. With other cities also vying for money can you give us a little more information that makes it look more feasible to have an LRT?

Mr. Nick Ternette: Very good question Councillor Smith. Mr. Speaker the issue here is that if you look at, and this report itself if you'd studied it, indicates that nearly every major city over the size of 500,000 in Canada, I'm not even going to talk about the United States now, has an LRT system. Yes Ottawa has a BRT line. What is Ottawa doing with a BRT line? It's supposedly when it built, I'm trying to answer this, when it built this BRT line it claimed that it was going to be convertible into an LRT line.

And by the way the report here states that all this BRT lines are going to be eventually convertible into an LRT line. Well you know what they discovered? They wanted to convert it into an LRT now from the gas money that they were getting, separate from this $800 million dollars, and they discovered the costs were astronomical so they scrapped the whole thing. The BRT line is going to be abandoned completely and an extension of an LRT line is going to be built in Ottawa. And every major city is moving to use its gas money, except for Winnipeg of course because we don't have a rapid transit system, towards expanding the LRT lines because they know it's cost efficient.

Calgary for an example is so successful. I mean they have wind powered now. Can you imagine a LRT system that's not just electric but it's wind powered. Its electricity is wind powered. The cost is unbelievably cheap. You know and we have the cheapest electricity anywhere in this country and the United States.

So the point is talking about money. Yes the government is interested in environmentally Kyoto agreement type of rapid transit. I don't think that they are going to object to an LRT. They much prefer an LRT over BRT. They're not going to say no to a BRT I know that. That's politics.

But the point is if you came up with a better plan for an LRT and you show how you can develop it within the next three years, four years, instead of seven or 10 years down the line, then I think the money is there. The $27 million dollars is a good beginning. I think you can get a lot more than that and I think you can build an LRT with that.

And if you got the private industry and private developers interested into an LRT finally. They haven't shown any interest in rapid transit here. The Chamber of Commerce refuses to take a position. They've been asked by certain people, by bus rapid transit people to take a position. Do you support rapid transit or do you support public transportation? And they refuse.

And now further when the LRT first came up in 1982 the business community supported it with tremendous energy because they knew the amount of money that could be made around all the stations and redevelopment that would occur in the downtown of Calgary and they were prepared to help out in any way, shape or form. That's the difference of a business attitude.

You know we're talking about Winnipeg being unique and whatever else. A business attitude here that doesn't seem to care about public transportation versus

a business attitude all over the other rest of cities in Canada, especially Calgary, that has a full public transportation attitude. That's something we have to consider.

But yes I sincerely believe that the Federal government based on the fact that gas prices are not going to drop that drastically, it's going to put more and more money into public transportation because they want to get people out of the car and onto public transportation. The most effective way to do that is an LRT because people will get off a car onto a train. They will not get off a car onto a bus.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Nick.

Mr. Nick Ternette: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: We now have speakers on the other side of the same issue. The 10 minute slot, Mr. David Leibl on behalf of Winnipeggers for Bus Rapid Transit. Welcome.

Mr. David Leibl: Thank you. Good morning Councillors, Mayor Katz. I understand I was a bit late so I apologize for you accommodating me and I understand too when I walked in that the joke that I was on the bus was already made so I'll spare you that. I had a meeting across the street so I do appreciate your accommodation.

I appreciate having this opportunity to speak with you about something that I think is very important for the future of this City. The rapid transit debate is been going on for longer than I've been alive so it's actually quite exciting to think that we might be nearing the stage where we are no longer talking about building rapid transit but we're actually building rapid transit.

Mayor Katz the community group I'm affiliated with, Winnipeggers for Bus Rapid Transit, came together quite quickly when we started hearing rumors that you were going to go in a different direction than with the rapid transit plan that Glen Murray had initiated. A fellow named Kai Hasselriis phoned me up. I'd never heard of him before, I'd never met him and said he was having a meeting that night in his kitchen. There were about 40 of us there. Different people, different ages, different backgrounds, different interests but all really who loved the City. And who really saw this a something that could really move Winnipeg forward and put Winnipeg on the level of other cities. And it certainly felt for me that we were so close to taking that big step that would put us on that level but maybe we just couldn't find the courage or the will to do it.

Anyways, we made a big as stink as we could and we went out and we gathered 4,000 signatures and a teenager who I understand lived on your street Mr. Katz was so upset that he went out and he developed his very own bus rapid transit system. This is true. You can actually, you can actually view it online still.

We were quite disappointed and dismayed at the time but now certainly ready to move forward from the point that we are at today. And I appreciate Mr. Katz that you did set up this Task Force and I appreciate equally what the Task Force has recommended. I don't think it's a perfect document but I think it's very good. And I think it presents us with an opportunity to truly make an investment in this City that will pay dividends well into the future.

Governments and not just city governments are waking up to the fact that the way things have been done in the past are not the way that we'll be able to do things in the future. Gas that costs a dollar a litre certainly tells us this. Our understanding of climate change certainly tells us this. Desecrated lakes tell us this. And the dirty air that plagued so many other cities and we're lucky that we are not there yet, tells us this too. And if we are genuinely serious when we say that we want our kids to inherit things like clean air and land and water then we know that we have to make some changes.

It's a uniquely 21st Century challenge that we're presented with that we need to develop a means of creating prosperity and a good quality of life without bankrupting our natural capital for future

generations. We know we have to do this. We know we have to do it and no country and no region and no city is exempt from playing a role in doing that.

It strikes me as interesting, I was reading online a bit about what other jurisdictions were doing and it was interesting to note that some of the best work is actually being done south of border. And I admit to at times viewing the Unites States as a bit of a laggard because of Federal administration in the US that refuses to implement initiatives like the Kyoto Accord Protocol and often seems stuck in a bit of a Utopian past.

I look though at the example of the Seattle Mayor, Greg Nickels who on February 16th, the day that Kyoto Protocol took effect, announced the US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement which commits the signatories to starting at home in the streets of their own communities, in their own cities, to meet or beat Kyoto targets in their own towns. From anti-sprawl policies to urban greening projects to improving public transit. And as of last week 187 US Mayors had committed their cities to the protocol and this in a country while the Federal government refuses to play their part.

And we live in a country where the Federal government is doing marginally more. Public pressure has opened the door to new forms of funding that will flow to cities with decreased impediment provided the projects are sustainable and take the needs of future generations into account. And this has been achieved in a reasonably short period of time which is encouraging. And there is certainly more money to be had through a share of growth taxes and other means if civic leaders continue to negotiate and demand it and show that they are serious about putting money to good use in their own communities to break the type of economy that really takes the needs of future generations into account.

The better news is that we don't really need to look anywhere else though for inspiration. We know that we have the right answers and the right ideas right here at home. And we have the right people to be doing it. We have the skill here to create a prosperous growing sustainable city. And I say sustainable both in an economic and an environmental sense. Building an efficient, comfortable, reliable, attractive rapid transit system is non-negotiatably a key plank in Winnipeg's future. I think the Task Force's report is a significant first step and it's my sincere hope Councillors that you'll work aggressively towards its implementation and truly champion this project.

If you choose not to pursue it that's fine of course but I think the burden then falls to you to propose the Plan B. That if we're not champions then of bus rapid transit in the report that we have in front of us then what is the project and the initiatives that we will champion? Winnipeggers need to know initiatives that will be championed. The initiatives that we, they'll reinforce the knowledge that we don't have the luxury of just doing nothing. The status quo won't hold for the future. We know that. We need projects that can begin to reshape our cities. Make them less destructive. I'm sure they can become powerful engines of economic growth that don't take the integrity of the environment for granted. A brief tangent.

There is some more subtle indicators of underlying social troubles that bother me a bit and sometimes I wonder if these things are at all connected but increasingly I think they are. The fact that exclusively car centre developments like big box stores and strip malls aren't just bad for the environment, that part we know, but they also take away that sense of place, and that sense of community and the opportunity to create the type of neighbourhoods that we feel proud of, that we would want to bring people to when they visit our city and want to spend time in ourselves. And those are the kind of intangibles that we are missing when we allow that development to continue unabated. And I shop at big box stores too. It's just this example but certainly in this city we have great opportunity for a little more balance.

The fact that big problems like a desecrated Lake Winnipeg or the burden

of climate change often seems so momentous that individually we feel powerless and unsure where to start in confronting these kinds of things. And the fact most of all that democratic participation is declined to the point that it's reached an all time low. An all time low that we've surrendered our right, or surrendered this very basic element of democratic participation, voting, to the point that only 1 in 3 people my age voted in the last Federal election. And these are the kinds of intangibles that I think we need to worry about too. And of course I often think that they're not entirely connected with cities and these aren't city's issues but at the same time 85% of people in North America live in cities. So as cities we need to confront them.

I don't know where the solution lies but I'm reminded of something that Reg Alcock said at a speech I heard him give last year. And Reg Alcock isn't someone that I know or even see eye to eye to politically but something he was saying at the time certainly struck a cord with me. I'm going to paraphrase him shamelessly here but he was talking about Canada in the 1960's and his point that at the time there was a widespread optimism. There was a sense of genuine civic purpose that stemmed from the feelings he said that we were building Canada. That was his words. building Canada. A public spirit that spurred from a collective responsibility to grow something that people could be proud of. There was work to be done. That was the common sense that there was work that we needed to be done. We need leaders who can rekindle that sense of civic purpose because there is so much work to be done.

Our project in every community is to pull together so that we can inspire the public confidence about the direction we are going and we need to start making some changes to get us going in that direction. Building a rapid transit system is an investment. It's a collective good and it's also a substantial challenge. We live in a cold city. We all know that. We try and leave it in the winter. And we live in a cold city where most of us don't have a happy relationship with the bus.

And one thing that I found somewhat amusing in this report were the responses of Task Force participants when they were asked to name the strongest service attribute of the existing transit system. The number one answer was safety onboard vehicles and ostensively because the speed and frequency of bus and quality of bus shelters is so lacking there was nothing else good to say.

Even where the premium service is offered and this is my own example because I often take the 60 or 61 buses down Pembina Highway to where I work. Even where the premium service for the buses come frequently is still undignified and I wondered who would be convinced to leave the car at home if they have the choice, and take the bus if there is a good chance knowing that they would have to first wait a long time in the cold and second have to stand up with coffee in one hand holding on to the bar in the second all the way down the highway. It's not an appealing option.

Mr. Speaker: Your time is up sir. We'll take a brief statement to conclude.

Mr. David Leibl: All right. Very briefly I'll say I appreciate and understand the argument of the LRT people because I think certainly we need to build something that is much more an alternative to the bus. I like Councillor Wyatt, the report that the Task Force you chaired, the report that is authored. Certainly though I think that what's contained in the report are the very basic and bare bones fundamentals of a rebuilt rapid transit system. Anything less and we are talking about minor improvements, we've done that, we've been there, we've had things like Navigo and the telephone service and a few diamond lanes improvements.

We know that maybe existing transit users appreciate them but that doesn't convert any riders. To do this we need to do it right. There is great opportunity to do it. We know that there is some money from Ottawa. And certainly I think that this is something that we have the documentation for. We have a place to begin. So let's begin and please make the right decision. I know that the ideas

are here. It's a matter of political will and I hope that you will take this quite seriously and move forward with it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Leibl would you permit questions?

Mr. David Leibl: Of course.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your presentation Mr. Leibl. You mentioned in your presentation that leadership is needed from City Hall. Leadership is needed from the community. And leadership will come from up high or leadership can also come from below from the community, from the grassroots from folks like yourself. And I want to thank you for the work that you've done and also Winnipeggers for Bus Rapid Transit and all your members.

My question is this. There is a motion as to receive it as information today. EPC though voted to have, ask the administration for an implementation plan to report back in 90 days. Are you and your organization committed to following up and watching, being a watchdog and coming back to City Hall to keep hammering this issue back until we see some, a true implementation strategy for, as you indicated, a full rapid transit system not just minor improvements. Are you prepared to do that?

Mr. David Leibl: I think we are certainly very happy to that as much as we can. The reality of course about having people in the community taking part is that we have other responsibilities like jobs and school. And for example in my situation I'm taking a morning off work so I can be here and I think this is a tremendously important thing and so that's why I've come to speak with you today. But that's a reality for most people I think in this City and that's of course why at some extent we need to look to our elected officials because you're the people who actually get paid to be here. And we count on you to carry out those decisions.

But of course, yes, as much as possible I think that in everyway we can we'll be here because there, I think there is a growing concern about this issue and a growing sense in the community that we need to be if not for it at least paying attention.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you for your presentation this morning. I know your group contains a lot of university students and people from all over the City of course attend the university and take the bus from all parts of the City. Do you have sense, could you comment further on their view of this expanded proposal for, beyond what Glen Murray's original plan suggested in terms of building the busway all the way to the university, with bike paths, plus be getting the eastern corridor in the first phase. Are university students excited about the idea of speeding up their trip across the City? What kind of sense are you getting from the students?

Mr. David Leibl: Well I think it's, it's a good question. I think on one hand we're often reminded of the fact that if things hadn't changed that we would be watching work being done on a rapid transit system right now. At the same time you know myself, I acknowledge Mr. Katz you have a right as does any new elected official to bring forward their own policy agenda. Certainly that's one of the privileges of being elected to public office. So crying over split milk I don't think doesn't say anything at this time and really we are focused on this report because we think that this provides a framework now to move forward. But certainly I mean that's a primary consideration.

I mean the thing about bus lanes, or bike lanes right now, is that if anyone who's ridden down Pembina Highway knows you're put in a very adversarial position not only with cars but also with buses too. And it's, it seems something of a very aggressive policy that you would get two forms of alternative transportation against one another. And certainly with, with tweaks like quality corridors and not separate busways that don't have their

separate bike paths built in that you will again be pitting buses and bikes against one another. And that's not a very aggressive policy. And it's really a shame when people want to do a public good by commuting in a more sustainable way in this City that we make it difficult for them by having to suck diesel fumes while they are peddling down Pembina Highway or other places in this City.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Mr. Leibl.

Mr. David Leibl: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Stefano Grande. Stefano are you here?

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker I just wanted to acknowledge that I've heard from Mr. Grande and he says he was not informed that he was listed as a delegation, so he was in another meeting and wasn't able to make it. So I just wanted to advise Council that he did want to be here and he did come and speak in support of the report at Executive Committee.

Mr. Speaker: But of all people Mr. Grande knows when City Council meets and he's the one who asked to be put on the agenda.

Councillor Gerbasi: I believe he thought he'd be notified if he was able. There is only two speakers and he thought he would be notified. So I'm just advising Council. Thank you.

He's very supportive of the support as is the Downtown BIZ as they spoke at EPC if anyone is questioning that.

Mr. Speaker: The five minute slot Thomas Novack.

Mr. Thomas Novack: Good morning Mayor Katz, Councillors, my name is Thomas Novack. I'm here representing the Oblate Justice and Peace Committee. And I'm delighted to say that I'm really happy to be here today and that usually when I come to make a presentation like this I'm kind of grumpy and complaining and berating and it's so wonderful to be here today to thank you and to be in a very grateful mood.

I'd like to thank the Mayor first of all for launching this Task Force that has done such excellent work. I'd like to thank Councillor Wyatt and his Task Force for the very serious, thorough work they've done on this, on the Task Force and preparing the report. And all the Councillors that really never gave up on the vision of bus rapid transit and an improved transit system for the City of Winnipeg.

This report that I don't unfortunately have in my hands, but reports that I've seen, is clearly the most complete, the most comprehensive, the most creative, the most anticipated certainly, and above all the most realistic evaluation of transit that this City has ever seen. And the good news that I am happy to celebrate today is not only that the report is done and the report is so good but that through the course of their work the Task Force actually listened to the people of Winnipeg and to the people that cared enough to come out and participate in the process and speak to the, speak to the Task Force.

I remember when the first draft, you called it a draft, or the first preliminary report came out there was all kinds of cosmetic programs like a LRT trolley from downtown to the Forks that cost close to or more than $100 million dollars. And a lot of us who looked at the report were aghast thinking that so much of the funds that could be directed to building corridors throughout the City would be used for one little strip that was really cosmetic.

And it was, I was really quite amazed to see that this and other changes that, changes like this remained and the LRT trolley was dropped and the bus corridor concept was expanded. Because that's what the people at the, at the hearings were wanting. Better bus corridors, better access across the City to a rapid transit system.

So when we're talking as Mr. Leibl just said about the importance of participation when people know that they are being

listened to, is there any other way that's really a better way then of encouraging people to participate in a system then knowing that sometimes you're actually listening to us. So congratulations. I really thank the Committee for taking seriously everything that you heard.

I just came back from Ottawa where I, every time I'm there I ride the rapid transit system, the busway. It's the best way to get around the city. Sometimes I've taken the bus from downtown to out where my family lives there near a place called Lincoln Fields and if you take the regular bus it takes, in a straight line, it takes about 45 or 50 minutes. Now that I can get on the bus rapid transit corridor it takes under 20 minutes. And that bus, double bus, is packed full even though it runs every 4 or 5 minutes.

We encourage you to accept and act quickly on the recommendations of this report. We encourage you to move as many, as people have proposed to a 20/80 split. For every $80 dollars that is spent on road infrastructure that we spend $20 dollars on transit infrastructure. We encourage you to continue to earn the appreciation of Winnipeggers by acting on this report.

First of all low income workers, students, pensioners, and others who absolutely depend on rapid transit and bus transit and have really no other options. They walk or they sit home if they can't get a bus. The Downtown BIZ has made it very clear this is one of the key components towards the revitalization of our downtown.

Drivers who…

Mr. Speaker: Just give a brief summation if you would please.

Mr. Thomas Novack: will benefit from the reduced congestion and bike riders who as we know the, I ride my bike almost daily, the worst places in the world to ride your bike are exactly the places where a bus rapid transit corridor and bike path are proposed.

Lastly, I'll just make one more point. Above all Mother Earth will appreciate us as the last speaker just made very clear; we are facing a catastrophic crisis. We've heard even this morning as I was coming here that the Amazon is starting to dry up because of global warming leading, to lead to further catastrophes. That's why this is, I'm speaking here today, it's not just a question of economics or politics. This is an ethical question. So we encourage you, take this really excellent report, let's move ahead with it, let's get on with it, let's do it quickly. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt questions?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your presentation today. As you're quite right. A year ago you recall it was quite a divisive debate here on Council. We now have a report and we have a plan as you've indicated. Would you say that we should go ahead here, you are indicating implement the plan is what I'm hearing, not pick parts of the plan and implement parts of it over other parts whether it be short term on street improvements versus the overall plan? You would suggest that we implement the plan since we have a plan now before us. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. Thomas Novack: I think that's very well stated. It's, from looking at the process and my own dissatisfaction with the first draft of the report and my delight with the second draft, and one of the things that I delighted is that it seems to be almost as close as we can get to a consensus report of what needs to be done and what is actually realistic to envisage.

It would be lovely to have a subway, it would be lovely to have multi, or billion dollar LRT system, but this is something that we can afford. This is something that a lot of Winnipeggers can support and it, it's a, it touches the whole City. Everyone will be close to some kind of a LRT or a BRT system whether it's a corridor or whether it's a bus lane. I, why not why keep pulling it apart and debating when

we can't really improve on the consensus that we have?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Mr. Novack.

We have one more speaker on the same topic that the five minute slot on the opposite side in opposition, Mr. Ken Klassen. Mr. Klassen.

Mr. Ken Klassen: Mayor Katz your actual plan for a new Winnipeg pledged, you gave your personal pledge here, the decision-making will be based on the triple bottom line and that "not only must your decision make good economic sense it must also protect the environment and add to quality of life." It's something I strongly agree with.

However it is with regret today that I cannot agree with or support the final report of the Rapid Transit Task Force. Does anyone think the transit solution is far too timid? Far too timid. It is an alarming expression to see shrinking ambitions when it comes to integrating economic, social environmental considerations.

During the next several minutes I'm gonna try and demonstrate four things. It may take me a bit more then five minutes but less than 10.

Mr. Speaker: You won't get (in audible).

Mr. Ken Klassen: Public consultations (in audible) this report were inadequate. The quality corridors proposed in the report will result in major problems. At least one of them will. Its proposed plan severely undermines Winnipeg's ability to meet its obligations to reduce greenhouse gases and finally the report's recommendations do far too little to reduce Winnipeg's exposure to the high cost and uncertain future of mineral fossil fuels.

The public open houses that were held to present the concepts considered by the Task Force and feedback from citizens, they were really inadequate in their reach and not very representative of the general population. We've already heard some of that from one of the speakers. I note with interest not only were there geographic problems but overwhelmingly participants are male, 70%. We know that most of the riders on Winnipeg Transit are in fact females in most age groups.

There were no special efforts used to enhance participation from groups like Aboriginals or recent immigrants. These are the two groups that represent the future of Winnipeg, which represent our future population growth. We still really don't know what Winnipeggers want after spending $220,000 dollars and many months of effort.

There are really good guidelines in the United States of public involvement techniques for transportation decision-making. We need to do more than putting up posters, renting a room and getting a box of doughnuts. There are more sophisticated techniques to get people out and comment.

Second item, problems with the Kenaston "quality corridor". The rationale from the Task Force report is that some of Winnipeg's main streets have generous right-of-ways and wide centre medians and have a potential to be used for rapid transit corridors. It doesn't describe Kenaston. The right-of-way is only 99 feet wide. You cannot shoehorn in realistically, six lanes of traffic and they also have turning lanes at major intersections. The cost is grossly underestimated $13.5 million dollars. There is no money in there at all for noise attenuation, property acquisition or what have you.

The report, there is no reference at all anywhere in the report to, an earlier report from the Director of Planning, Property and Development which I've distributed to you, says that (in audible) Oak Point right-of-way presents initial opportunity to improve transit service on Kenaston. There is sufficient space to build a transit corridor, recreational path and noise attenuation. It recommends a study. There is absolutely no reference, why?

I'll skip ahead here, talk about greenhouse gas emissions. The City of Winnipeg has made a commitment through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities in accordance with climate protection to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions. There is lip service in this report but there is no targets. There is no analysis. There is nothing here that tells me what contribution will this bus rapid transit system and on street improvements have on meeting Winnipeg's climate change obligations. Basically Winnipeg will not be able to meet its climate change obligations with this system that you've proposed.

For most cities in Canada, the largest or second largest source against gas emissions is the transportation sector. And I don't see how you, how you can plan a rapid transit system and not do any calculations not even preliminary calculations on what impact that will have on your ability to meet your greenhouse gas emission targets which will be tied to a lot of Federal funding.

The last item I would like to talk about Mr. Speaker is the high cost and uncertain future of fossil fuels. I mean my background is actually in energy and I can tell you people in the energy business are deeply worried. When you see companies like Chevron taking out full page ads in the *Economist* energy will be one of the fine issues of this century. One thing is clear the era of using oil is over. We can wait until a crisis forces us to do something or we can commit to working together and start by asking the tough questions.

Looking in a *Report on Business,* I'm sure a lot of you probably read *The Globe and Mail Report on Business*. They had a special series earlier this year that talked about oil supplies peak this year and what's next? Warning about problems with the future price and supply of oil. There is nothing in this report at all that talks about reducing Winnipeg's reliance on important non-renewable fossil fuels. We spend more on non-renewable fossil fuels in the City of Winnipeg then we do on health care, on education. There is nothing in here that talks about lessening that reliance.

Another thing is I find it rather enlightening when you look at the United States the largest transportation Bill in US history was signed in August by President Bush who's not supportive of climate change.

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute to wrap up. A minute more.

Mr. Ken Klassen: It's very, very interesting to note that he committed over $50 billion dollars for transit improvements in the United States. He increased the budget by over 50%, for somebody who doesn't believe in climate change but is worried about energy security. What are we doing to secure a more secure future for Winnipeg in terms of energy supply and price? It's a $400 dollar prosperity tax that are being mailed out to Albertans this year are coming from a lot of people here.

I guess the last thing I want to talk about is, in wrapping up, is the issue of gasoline taxes which is a very, very sensitive issue. What city in Canada has the lowest gasoline taxes outside of Alberta? Winnipeg. We pay 11.5 cents per litre. It's up to 9 cents a litre less than other Canadian cities. It is fixed. It is going down in value because of inflation by 2 or 3 percent per year. If you look at the population we had averaged in gasoline prices in major cities across Canada we should pay about 4 or 5 cents a litre more.

Mr. Speaker: Time is up (In audible)

Mr. Ken Klassen: And if we did…

Mr. Speaker: That's it Mr. Klassen.

Mr. Ken Klassen: Okay one sentence.

Mr. Speaker: One sentence.

Mr. Ken Klassen: If we pay that we would have $40 to $50 million dollars, we would have more than enough money if we split it to fix roads and build a more aggressive rapid transit system that will meet our objectives of energy security, that will meet our objectives…

Mr. Speaker: Sir your sentence is longer than Portage Avenue. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ken Klassen: You're welcome.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions? No. Thank you so much for your time. Is there a question? Oh I'm sorry, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Are you suggesting Mr. Klassen that we in effect not support the clause today?

Mr. Ken Klassen: Well this report talks about implementing a rapid transit in the city for the City of Winnipeg over 12 years. And then after 12 years thinking about what more we can do beyond what's in the current report. What I'm suggesting to do to you is that the City of Winnipeg made a commitment to set a greenhouse gas target by the end of well by 2004, end of 2005. Here it's the end of 2005 now, we haven't even begun the process.

If you go and set a greenhouse gas emissions target for the City of Winnipeg you're going to find that this plan is far too timid. You need a more aggressive plan and a more aggressive schedule. That's why I don't support. I support a lot of the elements in there. The bus rapid transit, a lot of the improvements and so on. I guess what I'm you know speaking to here is the timing of it and the scale of it. I think we need to compress it, accelerate it and do a lot more. We need to get phase 3 not 12 years from now. We need to get there in 3 or 4 years from now.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: I'm asking you, if you were a Councillor would you support it today or would you vote against it?

Mr. Ken Klassen: I'd vote against it.

Councillor Smith: Okay I want that clear.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. Thank you Mr. Klassen very much. We now move on to the report of the Executive Policy Committee of October 12th, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 12, 2005**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of October 12th and move adoption of Consent agenda item 1.

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

The report of October 19th.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 19, 2005**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent agenda items 1 to 3 and 5 through 6 and refer 4 back to EPC for further review and information.

Councillor Gerbasi: Number 2.

Mr. Speaker: We'll do those separately. Item 3, Item 2.

First of all the Consent agenda items 1, 5 and 6.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Referral of item 4 back to Committee.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 2 Madam Clerk.

**Item No. 2 – Rapid Transit Task Force – Final Report
File TT-5.1**

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I think this is very evident what it is. I think I'd love to hear from members of Council and see if I can address any of their concerns or issues.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to be able to rise today to speak on this issue. I want to again thank the Mayor and members of Council for the opportunity to have chaired this Task Force that has brought forward the report for our consideration and discussion.

And I also want to take this opportunity to again Mr. Speaker thank the members of the Task Force of Council who through their hard work and dedication made this report possible. Councillor Michael Pagtakhan, the Deputy Mayor, I thank Councillor Pagtakhan for his hard work and dedication on the Task Force and participation for building this report. And also Councillor Jenny Gerbasi. I want to thank Councillor Gerbasi for her hard work and her many hours she put in in the work of a Task Force amongst all the other duties we have as a City Councillor. So thank you very much Councillors.

And also they're not here today but again thank the citizen members of the Task Force: John Mann, Dr. Barry Prentice, Dr. Jino Distasio, Sandy Hopkins, Russ Malkoske and Deborah Goodfellow, all who worked very hard with regards to the Task Force over the last number of months.

The process Mr. Speaker was a very aggressive one. We brought this report forward in a relatively short order of time and within the budget that we were given by EPC. The challenge we had was great. I think it's easy or I don't think it's hard to emphasize or to put too fine a point on this that exactly about one year ago, one year and one month, there was a huge debate of the floor of this Council with regards to the future of bus rapid transit and rapid transit in general. Council was divided. Council voted a majority not to proceed with the existing project but at the same time voted to establish the Task Force.

At that time I would suggest that not only Council was somewhat divided but the entire population of the City was divided over the future of where rapid transit was in the City of Winnipeg. What that vision would involve and where it would go. And I would like to think that today by in large though you will never ultimately build a system or portray a vision which will have total support. But by in large we were able to build a consensus with bus rapid, with the proposal and the report before us today.

I kind of liken it to ice cream Mr. Speaker, through going through this process, everybody likes ice cream but everybody has their own favourite flavour. And your flavour may not be my flavour and my flavour is the best flavour and that's kind of rapid transit. Everybody likes it but a flavour can be somewhat different for everybody. I think, believe it or not, we were able to bring some flavours together and for the ice cream to still taste good here with regards to our *Rapid Transit Report*.

We have a vision which gives us that consensus. I think that is crucial. And I don't think we should underestimate that, the importance of that today. We have before us the wording of the motion is actually to receive this as information. Which is fine. I would of preferred to receive it and adopt it in principle but nevertheless to receive it as information we do have for information noted that EPC on October 19th voted to have the administration review the *Rapid Transit Report* and to report back within 90 days on an analysis and options and advice with respect to the implementation of the report, with respect to the priority list of short term improvements that can be undertaken in '06 of '07, with respect to timelines for potential implementation, with respect to costs of options being recommended and funding options for potential project costs. It's a lot of information.

My first reaction would be I welcome the initiative by EPC and I welcome the work that the administration is going to be doing over the next 90 days to report back to EPC. Again I want to emphasize as I mentioned with the question to one of the previous speakers, we have a plan now Mr. Speaker. Over and over and

over again this Council has been criticized because we don't have a plan for this issue, or we don't have a plan for that issue. We now have a plan with how to implement a rapid transit system for the future of our City. It would be a shame to be able to turn around now and take this plan and pick and choose what we want to do in the plan based on political interest, based on political conveniences, based on what will get some, score some points, what will score some headlines today or tomorrow.

We have a plan Mr. Speaker which I believe is a solid plan, to implement rapid transit. I want to thank Mr. Speaker as well the administration, who worked diligently with us, in coordination with the committee with regards to the rapid transit recommendations. These recommendations just didn't pop out of the air, they came from a process of listening to and working with the various so called experts in their field but I could tell you at length with our administration and specifically with the department of Winnipeg Transit. We have a plan that they feel is doable and workable. We have noted that the different corridors in the plan, beyond street improvements and the dedicated busways, some of them are still subject to functional design studies and that work still needs to be done.

But we have plan, I don't know how many times I can say that because we have a plan. The reality is Mr. Speaker, and on top of that we have actually a formula for adopting that plan, what we call next steps or an implementation strategy within the document within the report. If we want to go forward with this and if we want to have the credibility as a Council to go forward with it, I think it's crucial that we live up to the spirit and the intent and the content as closely as possible to this report. If we start to deviate, if we start to pick and choose, I think we will only hurt ourselves and we will see again the debate that was so divisive before open up again. That I don't think would be positive.

Mr. Speaker, city after city after city in this country is building and investing in rapid transit systems. We know that. We are the last major city in Canada, a population over 500,000 people, to invest in rapid transit. For years we've debated this on the floor of this Council and I don't think it's an issue of right wing or left wing. It's not an issue of, of necessarily economics at this point because we know the kind of dollars that are coming forward. It's an issue of whether we have the courage and the will to do what we know is right. And to start to implement this. I think the public support is there. I actually believe the public is further ahead of us on this issue than we are.

Let's go forward. Let's implement this plan. I will be watching closely what comes forward from EPC in 90 days and I encourage all members of Council to be watching closely what comes forward from EPC in 90 days. And if it comes back that we're just implementing parts of this or if it comes back that we cannot go ahead with the report at this time because of financial considerations, I think we will be unfortunately, floundering again when we have an opportunity here to be united and stay united on this issue.

Mr. Speaker I thank you for this opportunity and since it's just received as information of course I will be supporting that and encourage all members of Council and thank all members of Council for participating in this process. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I would first of all like to thank Mayor Katz for appointing me to the Task Force. It was quite an experience and I assure you at the beginning of the process the group of, the dynamic group of people that were brought together were certainly not on the same page but we took the Mayor's advice to keep an open mind and spent many hours studying all of the different options as thoroughly as possible within the timeframe we had.

It was fascinating to see the Committee evolve into a unanimous conclusion. A near miracle. And I think that it just emphasizes that when you sit down and

work hard and look at the facts you can come forward with a practical plan that we can all agree on. And I think that's a really exciting day and a really significant thing when that happens.

What was accomplished was a 100% consensus around this plan among the committee members. One thing that the report does that's very important too is that it reaffirms *Plan Winnipeg's* overall vision of a rapid transit system for Winnipeg. It's a specific detailed plan although the detailed design studies need to go further into the details. But it's an outline of what we should do in the next 10 to 15 years and it doesn't erase what's already in *Plan Winnipeg.* It's an immediate plan and then we continue on with the next stage of building a transit system as every city does. We continue to build our road system. We continue to build our transit system.

But this is a hugely important first step and we've got to take it. It's clear that we need an alternative to the automobile for people. Gas prices are becoming an impetus for people to be demanding other options of all incomes. Gas is a limited resource and you've heard some really good arguments from the citizens that came forward this morning about the environmental benefits.

There is some other benefits of moving forward now with this rapid transit plan. The Federal and Provincial government are placing huge emphasis on meeting Kyoto requirements right now. They are virtually throwing money at cities to move forward on these sort of initiatives. There really is no better time to act than now.

The economic spin-offs of investment in transit infrastructure is another aspect that's often not celebrated as much as it should be. The new construction brings jobs and dollars to all levels of government, to our citizens and our businesses. The spin-off investment of this particular report would be amazing and I would like to give you one example.

The potential Fort Rouge yards development. This is a $100 million dollar housing investment with hundreds and hundreds of new residential housing on a 25 acre infill site. The schools are there, the parks are there, the transportation infrastructure is there. And this is the ideal development and business opportunity for our financial bottom line as a City and that would happen in conjunction with the busway being built, one part of this plan being built. Revitalization of, and that's only one, there is many others, but that's really a obvious example.

Revitalization of downtown is another important function that this investment in rapid transit plays. And I know that the Downtown BIZ spoke very eloquently at Executive Policy Committee and are very strongly actively in support of seeing bus rapid transit come to Winnipeg.

Another important result of this report is that it should put to rest and of course it never will because as Councillor Wyatt says there's always some people who are going to want something else. There is not going to be ever be a satisfactory answer for every citizen. But this report when you really look at what it's saying is that it should put to rest the discussion about which it should be whether it's LRT or train or BRT in our City right now.

LRT could potentially happen some day in the future but it's quite clear from everyone who studies this issue that it simply isn't going to happen today. Steve Juba wanted a subway. Bill Norrie wanted LRT. And even Glen Murray at first pushed for LRT. But in the end all of them came to the same conclusion that bus rapid transit is the option that makes sense for Winnipeg and meets the needs of why we want a rapid transit system in Winnipeg.

The rail option using existing tracks was something that was talked about earlier in this process and it was studied thoroughly by the same company that built the O-train in Ottawa. And it was determined not to be practical in Winnipeg which is clearly explained in the report.

What this study does do is it goes beyond the original Glen Murray plan which did get started. Which would have been

good. But it maps out a clear plan from what we can realistically do in the next 15 years. It's utterly doable to put the amount of funds required in our Capital Budget to do the design studies needed and then to get the money from the other levels of government. They will be there, this is a reasonable request.

The on-street improvements make a lot of sense in conjunction with the separate roadways for buses which would include bike paths because there are places where you cannot achieve speed and reliability simply with on-street measures.

And the bike paths are something our citizens are demanding. And it makes a lot of sense to build them at the same time as the busways as we all know the construction is going on, it's very little cost to build a separation from the rail lines. We could build these bike paths at the same time as we build these busways and it would just be fantastic for our citizens.

And I would like to emphasize this will be something people will really notice and they will really appreciate it. It really will change our city. And I think we sometimes lose that message in all this debate. But this plan would be really exciting if it were to really happen and I think we've lost some of that excitement in all this exhausting debate. So I hope people remember that.

In regards to speed, if it takes an hour and a half to get to school in the morning, as it does for kids in North Kildonan, that is unreasonable to get to the University of Manitoba or from the far flung suburbs, that's unreasonable. And yet we know many students depend on the bus. Others would take the bus; city-wide people would take the bus if they knew that they could get to their destination under 35 minutes and they knew that the bus would arrive on time.

Reliability is compromised when buses are slowed down by bottlenecks of congestion such as the Donald Street Bridge and Confusion Corner. When people, when buses are running 10 minutes late and people don't know when their bus is coming it really discourages ridership. And the only way to achieve speed and reliability is to bypass congested areas by separate busways or to move quicker through street transit priority measures although there are spots where you can't do street priority measures like the Donald Bridge.

Buses also remove, busways also remove buses from car traffic lessening traffic congestion and the bus rapid transit systems can reach very high speeds similar to that of light rail transit. Comfort is also important to people. Transit improvements. All those things are included in the report but alone are not enough to increase ridership. If we just pretty up bus stops and we don't get the buses moving fast and reliable we won't be increasing ridership in any significant way.

I'll try to get all this in. With Waverley West and the growth in south Winnipeg something must be done to relieve car congestion and to give citizens an alternative. We know that Pembina Highway for example will simply be more and more intolerable once Waverley West is built. We've learned that in the reports on Waverley West. Without this system I can't even imagine.

We will never fix every single pothole in Winnipeg but if we invest our capital dollars in a balanced way we can have better roads, which we need for buses and cars, and we can also provide our citizens with a viable alternative. It's not an either or situation and that's the big mistake I think in framing this whole discussion. We can make a balanced investment and we have a responsibility. You don't make a top one or two popularity list and then ignore all those other issues that aren't the number one issue. We have to have…

Mr. Speaker: Extension has been moved by Councillor Benham.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. We have, we can take and we are obligated to take as leaders of this City, a balanced

position that addresses transportation planning for cars and other alternatives.

I just wanted to briefly touch on the policy recommendations which are, there's some good policies in here, one of which is acquiring all abandoned rail corridors. Currently we do that on an ad hoc basis. It's a tragedy when we let these opportunities slip by and I'd like to point out right now the Marconi line is an issue right now in Councilor Wyatt's ward and I hope to goodness that this Council is going to purchase that line because we need it for the future. This plan doesn't specifically speak to it but it's just a no-brainer that it's needed for transportation purposes for cars as well as buses. And it would be a huge mistake that we're passing on to our grandchildren if we do not acquire that line.

And that's just one example. There's other mistakes that have already been made in the past and I hope we're not going to make those kind of mistakes. And this report recommends that we have a policy of acquiring those and also lobby the Federal government for policies on that as well.

There is some stuff in here about governance issues in the report. That's well and good to consider those things but let's not sit around for five years discussing governance. It's time to act. We need to get moving immediately with the capital funds to do the study, the detailed design studies so we can go after the funding. It's going to take several years to get anything in the ground so we need to start now and if we dilly and dally it will be another decade with no progress in Winnipeg and I think that would be a real tragedy.

Halifax and Saskatoon are beginning their bus rapid transit plans. Winnipeg really needs to show some leadership on this issue and I thank the Mayor for reconsidering this issue. I really appreciate that's a difficult thing to do and I trust that he will provide the leadership that we need to provide a balanced transportation system that really moves our City forward in so many ways and is so important to our citizens. So thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I'd like to begin by congratulating the Mayor on appointing the Task Force in the first place and for the quality of people he choose. I was skeptical and critical. But the people who were appointed understood their task and accomplished it. And this Council needs to thank, and I will thank and congratulate and join in that, Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor Gerbasi for their hard work on this Task Force and the citizen members already recognized by name by Councillor Wyatt but I will join in that as well, Deborah Goodfellow, Barry Prentice, Jino Distasio, Sandy Hopkins, Russ Malkoske and John Mann. As well the consultants McGowan Russell deserve credit for a job well done.

We should also recognize the hard work put in by members of the public, many of whom it's true were from River Heights-Fort Garry and I'm proud to say that constituents of mine took an active interest in this issue and others came out to the public consultation sessions to let us know, to let us as City Councillors and the Task Force know, what they wanted to see in an improved public transit system.

Good people worked hard and produced an excellent report with good recommendations which I will of course be supporting today. But Mr. Speaker why was it necessary? Mr. Speaker why did the taxpayers of Winnipeg have to shell out nearly a quarter of a million dollars to duplicate reports that go back more than 35 years?

The most recent examples of course *Plan Winnipeg* which clearly lays out the plan for rapid transit on Plate B and in my favorite City Council report of all time Mr. Speaker, *Directions to the Future* which I've already referred to in previous debate, chaired of course by Councillor De Smedt and including Councillors Eadie, Lubosch and Gerbasi.

We all knew last year that bus rapid transit was the only option that made sense for Winnipeg. Five of us stood, Councillors Gerbasi, Thomas, Smith and I along with Councillor Angus who has since retired, stood in our places to support bus rapid transit. But 10 Councillors, Councillors Eadie, Lazarenko, Clement, De Smedt, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, O'Shaughnessy, Steeves and Wyatt, voted to stop the construction of bus rapid transit and set up yet another task force. Three of those Councillors had sat on the previous task force.

Councillor Wyatt has more than redeemed himself with his support today. He's looked at the facts and he supports a new, improved and invigorated public transit system. But the other nine Councillors who voted to support the Mayor that day Mr. Speaker, some of them admitting in Hansard that they were voting that way only because the Mayor had told them to. Those nine Councillors better think hard about what they will be telling their voters in October 2006, one year from now, about their stand on bus rapid transit.

If those Councillors had simply done no harm Mr. Speaker and allowed bus rapid transit to proceed, the system would be under construction now. In fact it would be about half done. Councillors would have been able to go to their voters taking genuine pride in this accomplishment, talking about how the new system is serving their residents. Talking about how it made it possible to leave their cars at work and use public transit to get to and from work at the very least. How that was reducing road congestion, reducing the need for costly repairs and road widenings. How that was helping us and our children and our grandchildren to breathe cleaner air because of reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

And you might have been able to tell a story about how those busways had saved the life or lives of one or many of your constituents because those busways will allow our Police and Fire and Emergency vehicles to be able to use the busways to get to their destination more quickly and save lives.

What do those Councillors have to show their voters now Mr. Speaker? Nothing. Nothing at all. And it is unlikely, very unlikely because of their actions that there will be shovels in the ground by October of 2006. And why Mr. Speaker? What in the final analysis is the difference between the busways proposed in the new plan and the busways proposed in the old plan? Very little Mr. Speaker. They're the same busways. They run beside the same streets.

Mr. Speaker the real clue as to why the taxpayers of Winnipeg are on the hook for a quarter of a million dollars for another study came in one comment from the Mayor as he announced this report and released it publicly. At the news conference the Mayor said "the previous plan was the pet project of one person".

Gone. Gone was *Plan Winnipeg.* Gone was *Direction to the Future.* No Mr. Speaker this was all about not paying attention to the 35 years of debate we have had on this topic. Not giving credit to those who have gone before and simply pulling down the statues of the previous regime. I think that's a pretty poor reason for spending a quarter of a million dollars Mr. Speaker. Every one of us knows what that money means. I have a block of Yale Avenue in my ward. Those people were promised reconstruction but the City ran out of money. Well Mr. Speaker, this that would have been a better use for the money then this study.

But the study has come forward. We've spent that money to convince the current Mayor that every other study that had been done was right and we should finally get on with it. Did it work Mr. Speaker? Is this Mayor in fact committed to building busways as part of a solution for the public transit system in Winnipeg? Or is he going to slough this off until after the next civic election? And if so will those 10 Councillors help him do it Mr. Speaker?

Fortunately Mr. Speaker there is a very simple way that the voters will be able to test the sincerity and good judgment of all members of Council. They will be able to tell if the Mayor and his supporters on

Council have sincerely been converted on the road to bus rapid transit. Three tests Mr. Speaker.

First are the Mayor and his supporters on Council prepared to spend up to $2.5 million dollars in the 2006 Operating Budget for the engineering studies made necessary by the delay they themselves caused? Are they willing to spend that money to set their mistake right?

Second are the Mayor and his supporters on Council prepared to set aside $5.5 million dollars a year for the City's share of the Capital costs beginning with the 2006 Capital Budget? In other words are they prepared to make 2006, year 1, as envisioned in the report?

Third are the Mayor and his supporters prepared to negotiate new Federal and Province funding for building the busways and have those agreements in place before October 2006?

If they are prepared to meet these three tests Mr. Speaker the voters may forgive them for that terrible mistake on September 29th, 2004 when they halted bus rapid transit. But Mr. Speaker if we not only pass this report today which is easy because we are just accepting it as information, but if we resolve together to begin building busways as an essential part of bus rapid transit then we will have made at least some genuine progress. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Benham. Councillor Steeves followed by Councillor Swandel and Councillor Smith. Councillor Thomas you had your time.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief. I just rise in support of the report, the work that was done. I too want to echo the sentiments of many people who have spoke before me and congratulate those involved in this, in this report, specifically Councillor Wyatt with the support and assistance of Councillors Pagtakhan and Councillor Gerbasi and of course all the volunteer members of the Committee who did yeomen's work in moving this project forward.

Which the first thing we should acknowledge I suppose is that it is different than what was proposed earlier. In the evolvement of rapid transit in Winnipeg this group got together I suppose and for whatever reasons and for whatever discussions came up with a plan that regardless of how you feel about past transgressions, real or perceived, is definitely different than what is being purposed before. I'm not sure of the reasons for that but this group now has a plan with this Council that they feel more confident in.

And it's marketable different than what we saw before and I'm not an expert on this plan, I've reviewed as much as I could review of the lengthy report and looked at the numbers but if that is the plan that's come forward by the folks that have done the work then I'm comfortable with that. A little bit concerned Mr. Speaker with the, I suppose the acrimony that's involved by virtue of some of the people that have spoke with respect to past transgressions, again real or perceived, and moving forward.

This project if it is to proceed, just so we're 100% clear here, is going to require if I am reading the numbers correctly, between year 1 and year 9 for Phase 1 in the environment of $170 to $200 million dollars for Phase 1 and for Phase 2 around $105 million dollars plus from year 6 to year 12. That's a lot of money. And that's going to require a lot of cooperation on the part of Council.

And I have to say I'm always a bit disappointed when I hear words like will the Mayor and his supporters, as if there are two teams that exist here on Council. I've never been comfortable with that. I don't think that's appropriate. I don't think that's constructive. We shouldn't really think of ourselves on this Council floor as being part of one team or another.

Sure there is going to be times on different issues where we are going to take different sides. But there is no two teams here competing against one another. That's the most important point I want to emphasis as I stand here speaking before the gallery and before

this Council. If indeed this huge sum of money is going to be found either in our Capital Budget or by virtue of securing funding from other levels of government it is going to have to be done together.

And I would caution, I would caution anybody and I say this with the utmost a bona fides in good faith. I would caution anybody who makes the assumption that the entire citizenry of the City of Winnipeg is completely understanding or completely onside with the idea of spending money on bus rapid transit. There still is work that needs to be done in this area. A lot of work that needs to be done in this area. Our citizenry was I think well represented through the course of the public open houses as held through this Task Force. But really the numbers were quite small if we consider the totality of the citizenry of this great City.

There are a lot of people who at this stage of the game frankly are not familiar enough with this project, very, very positive project. Nor are they familiar enough with the financing that it's going to take. Those things have to be done. When I emphasize things like working together that is exactly what I'm talking about.

My personal belief Mr. Speaker at this stage, is that if this plan is to have any real hope of implementation, it is only going to be done through a collective effort of this entire Council working together. Because we all know, when the Capital Budget process rolls around this will be one of many priorities. And we know how it works. If people want to see this as a priority for the citizenry of the City of Winnipeg and I hope they do, it is only going to be by collective agreement. And that Mr. Speaker is what people should be striving for at this table. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Councillor Swandel.

Councilor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak to this specifically on Councillor Wyatt's comments that we shouldn't be looking at this as opportunities to parochialize dollars or to bring them into our own territories and to have debates in public that may be just for the sake of getting headlines. And I don't say that to impugn my colleague or to suggest that he likes to grandstand in the headlines. I say that because as this moves ahead we will have to have discussions about prioritization of dollars.

And as I listened to the speakers this morning there was a very diverse group of speakers. There was a young man who spoke about us having to show leadership and prioritize our dollars for the sake of this great nation going ahead.

There was Mr. Klassen who was very articulate in speaking to the fact that we need to have measurable deliverables when it comes to greenhouse gas emissions. And we need to have accountability and we need to be moving ahead forward.

What I wanted to get to was the importance of planning to succeed. In this plan as I suggested to the Task Force probably the most important thing that we can do is to ensure that we do not do anything to pit the car culture against the bus culture or the transit culture. And that dedicated corridors like the one that would go all the way to the University of Manitoba represent a plan to succeed.

At the University of Manitoba we have tens of thousands of people going there everyday to learn or to work and for many of them, many of them are young people who will choose a good rapid transit system as a mode of transportation for life. And they will in fact represent a decrease in greenhouse gas emissions and a great improvement in what this City does environmentally in the years to come.

There was also comments about fossil fuels and there was, and I'm not entirely sure but I believe that part of the conversation here is the use of alternative fuel sources in our new rapid transit buses. That will also go a long way to address Mr. Klassen's comments regarding greenhouse gas emissions and a reduction in the reliance on fossil fuels.

The other component in that area that has to be done is the creation of dedicated bicycle paths or bicycle paths along the dedicated transit corridors which will represent sort of the 40 and 50 somethings getting out of their cars and onto their bicycles. You'll probably get people of my age more interested in getting on their bicycles to get some exercise. 56 that's right Councillor Steeves.

Right now along Pembina Highway and I think it was Mr. Leibl who spoke to it, it is, it's shocking to see cars competing against buses and bicycles. Or bicycles competing against cars and buses in rush hour traffic as they move along Pembina Highway. And I truly believe that the creation of bicycle, that bicycle paths in conjunction with a dedicated bus corridor along Pembina Highway will get more people of an older generation out of their cars and into alternate transportation methods than simply having the bus rapid transit system. Those are my comments Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. I'm going to be supporting this but not very enthusiastically. Because I really think that the LRT system is a system that we should be looking at seriously. In other words this is a compromise. So is Glen Murray's proposal a compromise. I would far prefer us going ahead and saying what is ideal and then showing leadership presenting to the Federal government what we require from them to make it be achieved. It's so simple.

I, I, this is the best we can do with the framework that we have financially. And that's why I'm supporting it. It's an improvement. But we could do far more if we had gone ahead and said look at let's go for the ideal. Let's make representation to the Federal government and see if we can secure funding. Especially with Kyoto, I mean it's before us and we have to meet, we should be meeting our, some objectives at reducing emissions. So I'm supportive but not enthusiastically.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. Mr. Mayor summing up.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I am going to be brief and I do thank everyone for their comments and being sincere. I must confess that I do take exception to some comments and I think Councillor Steeves addressed them very eloquently and much nicer than I probably would have.

So I will reiterate one thing. The decision made by Council over a year ago was probably one of the most astute things we ever did. It was anything but a mistake. When you hear comments such as work would have already started, that's absolutely not true. Even in this comprehensive plan it shows that shovels would not dig for at least three years.

When you hear it's the same as everything else, absolutely not true. This is the first comprehensive plan we have with public input. And when you hear there was money there, once again, absolutely not true. It appears there are some people who have a great future in maybe writing fiction or telling fairy tales. What it is is what it is.

I want to thank Councillor Wyatt for chairing it. I want to thank them for coming to a conclusion. And as we see here today, even members in the gallery who made delegations are still split on this issue. But at least everybody knows what their favourite ice cream flavour is and thank you for pointing that out to us Councillor Wyatt.

So I think there is a motion on the floor and I'm hoping we'll call the motion and that should be the end of this. And I can tell you that every member of Council, in my humble opinion, is sincere, does what they believe is best for all the citizens of Winnipeg not just their own wards. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Katz. Councillor, Mr. Mayor, I apologize.

On clause 2.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Move on to clause 3. Madam clerk.

Item No. 3 - Aboriginal Scholarship and Community Service Award Program File CR-4

Mr. Speaker: Did you wish to introduce the clause Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Very briefly, I'm actually surprised, but this is a proposal that's been brought forward. It's a joint program between the City Property, Planning and Development and Corporate Services along with Winnipeg School Division No. 1 which will take place over a period of seven years.

A total of seven scholarships and two service awards along with summer employment opportunities will be awarded to each year to students in grade 6 through 12. It will create links between the City and the Aboriginal community. It will increase Aboriginal representation in the City workforce. It will enhance opportunities for Aboriginal people in Winnipeg. It will build on the MLUs recently signed with the AMC and the MMF and it creates partnerships between the City and outside organizations to enhance the quality of life for Aboriginals in Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't know. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I asked that for this to be stood down not to speak against it, I actually wanted to speak in support of it. But I wanted to speak to a particular item that is missing in this report.

In 2003 or early 2004, when we adopted the *Pathways First Steps* document on Aboriginal initiatives, urban Aboriginal initiatives, there was strategic initiatives put forward and statements about action plans for delivering on those initiatives.

To date we have seen nothing come forward on these action plans. Some of them were time-lined for 2004, some of them were time-lined for 2005 and some were time-lined for 2006. In this report where we now have some action coming forward, it still does not make reference to any of the action plans.

Now I don't know if it's appropriate or if Councillor Thomas will be able to speak to it as the Councillor responsible for Urban Aboriginal Opportunities, but I think we need to look at this in the context of the action plans and the strategic initiatives that are to be brought forward from the *First Steps* document and that's why I asked for it to be stood down and hopefully we can get some explanation as to where that's at.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: As the Mayor previously stated there are four action plans: *Plan Winnipeg, The Human Resources Strategic Plan, The First Step - Maps* and the *Aboriginal Employment Partnership* which was a memorandum of understanding signed with the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs and the Manitoba Métis Federation and this makes a significant impact on moving forward on those.

In two of the *Maps* initiatives having to do with both economic opportunities and education and training opportunities just a little bit of background. We have about over 60,000 people who are of Aboriginal descent in our community and one third of that population is under the age of 14. So it's really important to start with a program that catches youth right at the beginning and gives them the opportunity.

If you look at our universities and colleges, you find very few Aboriginal people still, even with the amount that the Aboriginal population have moved forward in this City, very few are finishing high school and even fewer are getting the opportunity to go to university and college.

What this does, for a minimal amount, I don't know if you will look at the end of your report and see that this is actually costing us about $12,000 per year. For that amount, 54 youth get an opportunity to be mentored, to have an understanding of what different processes are within the

City of Winnipeg and it's, this could be a model.

If every business that has 100 people or more just employs one person in the summer in these kind of mentorship programs this would go a significant way into improving the career path for our Aboriginal citizens.

Just going back and looking at the statistics that you will find in the report here that state not only do a significant number of people, a third of the population, less than 14, but most of the population of 40% of the Aboriginal populations are living in the areas that are rehabilitation areas or are considered major improvement areas.

So we, two thirds are from single parent households and are overcoming higher barriers to education and meaningful employment, lack of opportunity, lack of income. There are so many things there. And 54 people, when you consider a third of 60,000, no, it's not everything and doesn't solve everything but it's a significant way and it's a minimal amount of money for our organization.

And let's not forget that these people are a resource to us as well. While we're mentoring them and training them for a very minimal amount of money, we have young, eager people who are learning about our City, giving us a unique perspective when whether they're assigned to Planning, Property Development or Community Services.

This is also done in conjunction with the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 and I've actually had a couple of meetings with the Winnipeg School Division and they were looking very much forward to seeing this clause on the agenda today and they're very excited about it.

There are many more things that we need to act on and I'm well aware of the fact that there are many more things that we need to act on within the *Maps - The Municipal Aboriginal Pathways* plus the other protocols that we've established through the years on Council. But I think this goes a long way for very little effort on our part on securing opportunities for our Aboriginal youth. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Did you wish to add anything Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I think Councillor Thomas addressed the issue very efficiently. Thank you Councillor Thomas.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question on the motion.

All in favour of clause 3? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Thomas: Can we show it as unanimous?

Mr. Speaker: I have no idea. It is. It will show as unanimous.

We have Notice of Motion. The motion of Councillor Gerbasi. (in audible) to introduce the motion now?

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Motion
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Benham,

WHEREAS the Mayor, City Council and Winnipeggers desire to maintain and enhance the value of Assiniboine Park;

AND WHEREAS on July 21st of 2004 Council approved the following resolution: "That the Assiniboine Park Framework Plan be received as information with the understanding that Administration will, through business case analysis, test the feasibility, sustainability, capital requirements and fundraising potential of the Plan and present final recommendations for Council consideration."

AND WHEREAS there has been no report forthcoming to date;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a council seminar be held as soon as possible to update Members of Council on the status of this business plan;

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that a report from the administration as requested by Council in July of 2004 come forward to Executive Policy Committee and Council within 30 days.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce this Notice of Motion which was spurred on by the discussion we've been having about the Assiniboine Park. And although there's a lot of controversy about the idea of the condos in the Park, it certainly has got people focused on Assiniboine Park as an issue.

And once that attention was focused onto Assiniboine Park and the work that needs to be done there, it came back to our collective memory that Council has already set a process in motion to develop a comprehensive plan for the Park. This plan is inclusive in that not only the City administration but all the community stakeholders and volunteers in the Park have been partners in this endeavour.

The idea was to bring forward a business plan which would reflect the vision of the citizens of Winnipeg about the Park and that vision is spelled out very clearly in the document passed at Council in July of 2004, *The Assiniboine Park Framework Plan*.

Further, and what was, as it says in the motion that Council in July of 2004 approved the following resolution, that *The Assiniboine Framework Plan* be received as information with the understanding that the administration will through business case analysis test the feasibility, sustainability, capital requirements and fundraising potential of the plan and present final recommendations for Council consideration.

So with the discussion of the condo idea coming forward, it's of a concern to many people that we would look at that one project which the administration is off looking at in isolation from our overall plan from the City Park and without meaningful input from those citizens and others who have invested a lot of time and money in the Park and I'm referring to the volunteers and the private citizens here.

For example, the new gateway to the Park planned as part of the Zoo expansion cannot happen if the condos are situated in that spot. So I'm very concerned, which is what spurred this motion, that citizens haven't had a chance to look at this possibility of changing the Zoo vision in a public forum.

For 15 months we've been waiting to get this report back. We've hired somebody at significant expense to write this report and I think if we had that information we could look at this new idea of the Mayor's in a proper context. And it really does concern me to look at one option without looking at all the options. I mean the staff have been asked in partnership with our partners to look at funding options and at revenue options and ideas for the Park and how to raise those capital funds which is exactly what we need.

And I think it's only common sense to look at a range of financial opportunities and possibilities before landing on one particular idea or looking at one particular idea in isolation.

So all I'm asking with this motion is that a Council seminar be held as soon as possible with regarding the business plan and that that report actually would come back to Council within 30 days so that when we get the other report on the condos or even before that report is done, it's looked at within the context of an overall plan. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Benham to speak on the motion.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I thank Councillor Gerbasi for moving the motion. I am seconding it and of course supporting it. And I completely agree with everything Councillor Gerbasi has pointed out which is that this really is an issue where the kind of consensus building that Councillor Steeves just referred to a moment ago, the kind of frank discussion among ourselves can take place at a Council seminar is the kind of forum where this can occur.

The Mayor does deserve credit and I've given him credit publicly and at Executive Policy Committee for bringing forward a new idea regarding financing the Park. That idea of course is the subject of a separate report from Executive Policy Committee that will go through the mill.

But what Councillor Gerbasi and I are suggesting and I hope it rings a, strikes a cord with other members of Council here is that we've had too many one-off solutions or let's do one bright idea here or there and what we need is some kind of consistent, systemic approach to the problems faced by Assiniboine Park and the Zoo.

It was good for the Mayor to focus public attention, as only a Mayor can, on this issue. It was good of the Mayor to produce his own idea and to put it out there and it showed some political courage to put it out there for debate but it's only one idea. In my opinion it's not a particularly good idea and I think other ideas could come forward at a Council seminar in that kind of situation. I've talked to other Councillors and I know they have talked about that sort of thing before.

Most importantly I think, Mr. Speaker, and this is not included word for word in the motion but I hope we would include it. That if we went to a Council seminar situation, I hoped that we would invite, as our guests, representatives of Partners in the Park, The Zoological Society of Manitoba and Friends of the Conservatory.

These are three stakeholder groups of our citizens. Citizens who could be doing something else but they have given up their valuable time because they believe in Assiniboine Park and they believe in the facilities there and they want to be part of the planning for the long term future. And they have mobilized a great deal of capital and a great deal of operating funds over the years and we as City Councillors need to be grateful to them. We need to say thank you to all three of those partner organizations involved with the Assiniboine Park and the Assiniboine Park Zoo and need to include them in the process.

Instead of just reading a headline that says oh we've solved your problems for you, we're going to build condos right where you were planning to build a new Zoo entrance. Mr. Speaker I don't think that shows true respect for people in the community. I don't think it shows a willingness to consult.

So I urge all members of Council in a very consensus building effort here to support unanimously the motion that Councillor Gerbasi has introduced. A motion that I think could lead to some genuine discussion, dialogue with the community and some real solutions with lasting impact to help preserve and improve Assiniboine Park. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker I rise to also support this Notice of Motion. I think it would be worthwhile to have a Council seminar. You know if, if there's a issue with regards to the 30 days to report back, the administration report with regards to the actual motion of July of '04. If there's more time needed on the 30 days, I'm sure EPC could sponsor an amendment to that if necessary rather than simply just vote this down.

I think it's worthy. I for one spoke at EPC with regards to the issue of the condo plan in the Park and I'm not necessarily against any one-offs Mr. Speaker. I think we shouldn't be hamstrung by you know, administration processes. After all you know we're here to get things done and process is best left to administration. They're the experts on that.

I would like to see the business plan come forward. I think the business plan is you know something that obviously has been worked on by our administration. We have a Chief Administrative Officer for the Park itself who's spearheading this. I think it's something that obviously a lot of energy has gone into. If it's not ready now it would be I think good to get a seminar to find out the status of it and whether or not the issue of the resale or rezoning, pulling out land out a regional

park is part of their actual plan or not, it would be interesting to see that or whether they've considered it at all.

But I'm concerned that we, we'll go down a path here of you know doing again you know one part or one person's idea without looking at the overall goals and the overall objectives that we've set out, that we voted on as a Council to hire a CAO whether we wanted to do this or not for the Park and to have an administration in the Park to bring forward a plan and hopefully a sustainable plan.

So it would be my hope Mr. Speaker, that we could have a Council seminar. I don't think it's a lot to ask for. I don't think this motion is that radical. I think it's quite reasonable. Again on the issue of the 30 days if EPC wishes to move an amendment to that, if that's not enough time to bring forward the actual report, maybe that can be entertained by the movers I don't know but I think this is something that's worthy to consider.

And with regards to the condos in the Park it's an interesting idea but you know Mr. Speaker, it's our regional park and it's the biggest park, it's the jewel in our crown of parks in the City. I think we have to be very careful when we start to talk about the commercialization of our beautiful parks, especially our Assiniboine Park. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

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

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I have to concur with Councillor Wyatt. This is not a radical motion. It's just not a logical motion. And the reason it's not a logical motion is number one you have the same administration working on governance as well as the potential idea of housing on a parking lot.

But most importantly, administration has told us, and if there's a question, as you know there is Question Period, administration has informed us that they are nearing completion of their report on governance and on top of that, they expect to have a full business plan sometime approximately March of '06.

Now I think you know that I am the one who champions Council seminars. As a matter of fact some people accuse me of calling them too often but the facts of life are you want to have Council there to assess information so they can make a wise and astute decision because that's what we are here for. I would like to ask you with no report, with no governance model, with no business plan, would you not consider that that to be premature because there's nothing to discuss at that particular point in time? So I will not be supporting this motion Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

Councillor Steeves: I was going to say similar in that without the report, but in principle I have no problem with the idea of a Council seminar. I want to start off by saying that and I think we should be doing that. I would concur with the Mayor in that I think it makes sense with respect to the second part, the second resolution to have that before we go to the seminar. That would just seem to make logical sense to me.

So I guess with the information the Mayor just provided, vis-à-vis the report, I think that's the process we should follow and then we should go to the seminar which I want to state categorically I have no problem with it and it's the way this Council should operate. So I think while the motion might not particularly work this morning, the idea I think is one that certainly can survive and I can commit to that which I think, which I think makes sense.

I do want to congratulate and thank Councillors Gerbasi and Benham for the method in which they went about this particular matter. I think it makes for better discussion. A Notice of Motion so everyone has a little bit of notice so we can discuss it and I am often critical of folks when they don't do that. I think I should probably be congratulatory when it is done. So I thank that that step has been done and I think I want to take to deal with administration and get that report forward as soon as possible and

we will set up the seminar. Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker and let me begin by apologizing for snapping my fingers to get your attention. I thought that you were in deep thought and I was becoming very enthusiastic on the heels of the Mayor's comments regarding what I think is a fairly sensible and constructive Notice of Motion.

I'm going to support it Mr. Speaker and I'll tell you why. I've been around here since 1995 and I've seen a lot of reports like our *Zoo Master Plan*, which is winning international design competitions around the world, with it's accompanying business plan sit collecting dust in File 13 because the previous Mayor Murray, told me himself, that he wasn't really a big fan of zoos and that this was not something that was on his radar screen.

I've seen other reports, like our *Transit Improvement Report* sit in the archives of our offices and of the administration's offices because we believe we don't have enough money to get even an additional bus or an additional bus shelter into the mix.

We've been waiting now for 15 months Mr. Speaker for a report to come back and I would suggest to you and to all members of Council that if in 15 months something can't be put to paper, then perhaps a Council seminar is long overdue so that some ideas can be generated and some of these ideas could at least be put into the collective mix.

To sit here until March and dither and do nothing like this Council has done, in my opinion, on most issues since 1995 Mr. Speaker, to continue the status quo, to watch as our infrastructure crumbles, to now wait 250 years to replace a sidewalk based on our maintenance schedule. To wait 150 years to replace a residential street on our maintenance schedule. To wait 35 years to plant a new tree on a boulevard or even prune it based on our maintenance schedule. To continue to, to promote the tax cutting agendas that really got very few of us elected in the first place and do nothing but wait for expensive, high priced help to generate reports, Mr. Speaker, is in my opinion, a waste of our collective time.

I don't see any danger or any threat. I only see a positive outcome in at least getting together to talk about what we're doing with Assiniboine Park. Whether you like condos or not on Corydon Avenue beside the Park is really quite irrelevant. What is concerning to me Mr. Speaker is that there are nonprofit organizations like Partners in the Park, like Friends of the Conservatory, like the average citizen coming down to Assiniboine Park wanting to see positive and creative changes going on there. While we're sitting here dithering, waiting for reports, our staff are out there piecing together equipment from one machine over here to another machine over there so that they can build a lawnmower in order to cut the grass Mr. Speaker.

I'm very concerned that we've spent far too much time here hung up on the same red tape and processes that we vowed to try and change and improve. And policy in this case has absolutely nothing to do with it. I have the utmost respect for the administration and the tasks that we charge them with, the governance model, etcetera.

But getting together collectively to talk with our stakeholder groups as Councillor Benham suggested, to try and brainstorm some ideas about how we can make some improvements in Assiniboine Park, with all the amenities included, is in my opinion, a good idea. And I would hope that all members of Council would see it as an opportunity and not as a threat to derail the status quo. So I'm hoping that we can support this motion and come together and work together. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to say that I will be supporting this for one simple reason.

We as Councillors, all of us together entrusted with the stewardship of these park lands, and you know I've called them sacred and been laughed at before for calling them sacred, but I think it's important that we all have the opportunity to have input in any report or business plan that comes forward and we're provided with all the documentation including the business plans for the existing entities, the report on the Assiniboine Park Enterprises Reserve that makes up part of our budget that's coming forward and that we're able to voice our concerns to the administration members that are preparing the report before anything, any ink gets put to paper.

Which may represent a bit of a self fulfilling prophecy, because as reports get generated they don't always represent the view of the entire make-up of this Council, but sometimes they tend to become focused on the direction of some of the more powerful members of Council or maybe the Mayor's powerful Executive Policy Committee.

So I just want to say that I will be supporting the motion and I think it's important that we have that opportunity of input with the administration in a seminar before any report is generated. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Councillor Gerbasi summing up.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, just briefly Mr. Speaker. It's nice to know that a date for when we are expecting the report because that wasn't information that the rest of Council had. So if March is in fact the date for the business plan to be released that sort of sparked another concern for me. Is that EPC asked for the report on the condos within, I don't know if it was 60 days or 90 days, which is well before March.

So we could actually have, I'm not sure I don't have it in front of me how many days it was, but the point it brings forward is that this is going to be awhile before we see the overall plan for the Park, the overall business plan. And yet we are going to have a report from the administration which may recommend proceeding with the condo idea or not, I don't know what it's going to recommend, outside of the context of the overall plan which is my point.

And that if the report isn't ready certainly a briefing with the CEO of Assiniboine Park Enterprises, obviously the Mayor and informal EPC get these briefings, they know when the report is going to be ready and so on. The rest of us don't. This is a decision for all of Council and we should all have the same amount of information.

That's all we're asking for and to vote against that is, seems to me just simply shooting down anything that's coming from opposition Councillors because it's an absolutely reasonable request that I can't understand why we wouldn't agree to it. The Mayor supports Council seminars so I just don't understand. I'm completely baffled why this request would not be approved. I just would seem to be done out of spite and nothing else because I can't see any rational reason not to have all members of Council informed on an issue as important as this. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. The question on the motion. A recorded vote has been asked for and a separation of the two results has also been asked for. So all those in favour of the first resolve that the Council seminar be held, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 6, Nays 10.

Mr. Speaker: The first resolve is defeated.

On the second resolve that the administration report within 30 days. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 9.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is defeated.

Moving on to EPC motions.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Steeves,

WHEREAS street racing is becoming an increasing problem in many Canadian communities;

AND WHEREAS street racing has been the cause of serious injury or death to innocent citizens in Canadian communities;

AND WHEREAS the penalties contained in various provincial/territorial laws do not appear to be a sufficient deterrent in reducing street racing occurrences;

AND WHEREAS on September 28, 2005, the federal Minister of Justice introduced to Parliament Bill C-65, an Act to amend the Criminal Code (street racing);

AND WHEREAS the intent of this legislation is to amend the Criminal Code by defining street racing as an aggravating factor during sentencing for the following offences: dangerous operation of a motor vehicle causing bodily harm, dangerous operation of a motor vehicle causing death, criminal negligence causing bodily harm and criminal negligence causing death;

AND WHEREAS a further intent of this legislation is to provide for a mandatory driving prohibition order if street racing is found to be involved in one of the aforementioned offences;

AND WHEREAS the principles of Bill C-65 are supported by the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police on behalf of municipal police services across Canada;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities indicate its support in principle of the intent of Bill C-65;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities join with the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police to work together with the Government of Canada to make any improvements necessary to Bill C-65 to guarantee its effectiveness and to subsequently lobby for the bill's enactment into law at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: We have one motion, Motion number 1 by Councillor Eadie. Is there a time factor on this that should…?

Councillor Eadie: I'd like to move Mr. Speaker that the rule be suspended so that we can consider the motion now. It is, the Bill, is on its way.

Mr. Speaker: Because the Bill is on its way to Parliament with its timing all in favour of suspending the rules to deal with Motion 1 now? All opposed? Carried.

Councillor Eadie introducing your motion.

Councillor Eadie: Yes Mr. Speaker and I thank my colleagues for suspending the rule to permit this motion to be considered now. I've been advised the motion or the Bill was received second reading in the House of Commons last night and has been now referred to Parliamentary Committee, so I think time may be of the essence. I don't know how fast their Committee process works.

But to go back to the beginning Mr. Speaker, earlier this spring, I think it was, there was a fatality actually in my own neighbourhood where the alleged cause was street racing. I make no further comment on that specific issue or accident because I don't know where it is in the judicial system and my intent wasn't to speak specifically to that.

But I started doing some research at that time to try and find out more about what is happening with this type of activity in so far as penalties and sanctions are concerned and it came to my attention that a Private Members Bill had been introduced into the last Parliament, the 37th Parliament, by a member of Parliament, Chuck Cadman, which would have the effect of amending the Criminal Code to add street racing as an aggravating factor in sentencing. In that Parliament the Bill, which is unusual for a Private Members Bill, actually received second reading and got referred to a Parliamentary Committee for review.

Unfortunately for that Bill, that Parliament was dissolved for the 2004 election and everything of course before that Parliament died on the order paper as they say. So after the election the Bill was reintroduced a year ago, this month by Mr. Cadman, and it never moved. It didn't make the lottery process they use there for consideration of Private Members Bills.

In July of this year Mr. Cadman died and I wrote to the Minister of Justice, not on behalf of the City but just simply as one member of Council, and I wrote to the Minister and asked the Minister if the Government of Canada was prepared to take on this legislation as a Government Bill therefore moving it up the chain and giving it higher priority.

The reply from the Minister is attached to the documents that have been attached to this motion indicating that yes the government was going to take the intent of the late Mr. Cadman's Bill and make it a Government Bill, which was introduced for first reading on September 28th, which was the day of our last Council meeting.

Since then Mr. Speaker, the Bill has had second reading debate and as I indicated at the beginning, last night the House voted to, the House of Commons voted to pass the Bill at second reading and refer it to a Parliamentary Committee.

And the purpose of my resolution which would be an FCM resolution is to encourage the FCM to work with the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police to see if and to lobby Parliamentarians to adopt the Bill, work to improve it in whatever form is deemed appropriate and to get this Bill passed into law, to give our law enforcement agencies some more, another tool in their arsenal to fight this crime.

The intent of the Bill Mr. Speaker, and I'll just read the preamble, is to define street racing, and be specifically, by specifically identifying the involvement in street racing as an aggravating factor during sentencing for the following offences: dangerous operation of a motor vehicle causing bodily harm; dangerous operation of the motor vehicle causing death; criminal negligence causing bodily harm; and criminal negligence causing death. It also provides for a mandatory driving prohibition order if street racing is found to be involved in one of those offences.

Mr. Speaker currently every province and territory has its own version of our Highway Traffic Act where there are various penalties included in those Provincial Statutes for conviction of street racing. In Manitoba the Highway Traffic Act has anything ranging from driver licence suspension to fines and potentially imprisonment depending on the results of any accident caused by street racing, if bodily injury or death is

concerned. But the sentencing or the penalties are not consistent and they don't seem to be a deterrent.

Adding street racing to the Criminal Code makes it a criminal offence right across the country because the Criminal Code is part of our National law and it applies equally to every province and territory. It also makes it possible if this Bill becomes law that a driver who may have been convicted in some way, shape or form in his or her home province for this offence, if they move to another province, the criminal record now follows them. So that there's driving prohibition that's been put on and over and above whatever penalties provide, that are provided for in Provincial law, the criminal aspect of this offence follows them no matter where they might move in Canada.

So if members of Council think that this is a good process that we should follow, and I might add it's supported by the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, who's President right now is our own Chief Jack Ewatski. If members of Council believe that this is a piece of legislation that we should be lobbying for on behalf of our municipal police forces here in Winnipeg and across the country, then I would ask that members vote for this resolution in order that our national organization, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities can take it under their guidance and do the lobbying that is required of Federal Parliamentarians on Parliament Hill, make whatever improvements are necessary to the legislation. If some believe it's not strong enough, then lobby for effective amendments while it's in the Committee stage and let's try to get this Bill passed into law at the earliest opportunity so that our Police forces have another tool in their arsenal to try and crack down effectively on this ever increasing crime on our streets. Thanks Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Speaker, I rise, I thank Councillor Eadie and Councillor Steeves, Councillor Eadie for the mover and Councillor Steeves for the seconder for this motion. As the representative of the City on FCM, I encourage all members of the Council to support this motion unanimously and be more than happy to take this and encourage it every step of the way with regards to the colleagues at FCM.

Mr. Speaker I happen to sit on the standing committee with regards to crime at FCM and would definitely advocate strongly that this come forward. I think the crucial thing as Councillor Eadie rightly pointed out, the legislation is crucial that it be adopted as soon as possible, especially in light of the fact we have a right now a minority Parliament and the risk always is that if that Parliament should fall or dissolve and go to an election the legislation could die.

So I think it's crucial that they move quickly and definitely encourage all members of Council to support this and on behalf of the City I will advocate that at the FCM every step of the way. So thank Councillor Eadie for the hard work that he has done on this matter. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Are you fine Councilor Eadie?

All in favour of the motion? Opposed? Motion is carried, again unanimously. We are united.

Bylaws second reading only. Your Worship.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would move that By-law No. 131/2005 be read a second time.

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

Questions? Councillor Magnifico, Gerbasi, Swandel, Wyatt, Benham. Councillor Magnifico.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Mayor, a few months ago, you, your *Red Tape Report* with 30 recommendations was tabled and where are we today with the implementation of this report?

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

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. Thank you Councillor Magnifico for that question and I will try and update you with some information on the status of the Red Tape Commission.

As you know Council has endorsed recommendation No. 6 this summer. As a result the use of Provincial Companies data base to track business is on our agenda for upcoming discussions with the Province.

We have now received the administration report on an easy pay policy, better front doors, a single permit for regular special events, as well as 311.

Recommendations No. 5, No. 19, No. 24 and No. 25, bringing those forward for Council consideration is now a simple matter of scheduling EPC time over the next few weeks.

We also have a working group on the new Zoning By-law. And also praise the Commission's finding and is designing the new draft by-law to factor in the Commission's suggestion.

There's been a lot of work done on this. I can tell you that we are very committed to the recommendations that have been brought forward and the key thing is is that we want to make sure it's done right. And yes we want to make sure they are done as quickly as possible.

I'm also told that we're close to a proposal for recommendation No. 7 which is to simplify Entertainment Tax and it appears it all is in process.

It may not move as quickly as some would appreciate but I can assure you this is a priority to me and we will do it right and we'll do it as quickly as possible.

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

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Mayor I appreciate the complexities of some of the recommendations and the implementation of them but there are some fears that the meat of this report will be buried and become one of those reports that shall we say are stifled because of a status quo is fine attitude that may or may not exist.

Mr. Speaker: Your question Councillor Magnifico?

Councillor Magnifico: I would like, could you give us your assurance again that the implementation of what some, some have billed a template for the rest of Canada, is still a high priority for you.

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

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I have said many times that I believe the recommendations that have come forward regarding red tape will be something that will be embraced by others right across Canada and we would become the model for eliminating red tape. I am not aware of where these concerns are coming from that Councillor Magnifico has pointed to, so the only thing that I can say to Councillor Magnifico through you is that:

1) We believe in all 30 recommendations;
2) Administration has endorsed the majority of those recommendations, the vast majority, Mr. Speaker;
3) We do have to get input from the administration as Councillor Magnifico said.

Some of them are very simple. Some of them are more complicated and I would like to make sure that we do do our due diligence and we will move along, we will move the process along as quickly as we can. And I can assure Councillor

Magnifico that that definitely is my agenda.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It was printed in both newspapers that the City of Winnipeg is in negotiation right now to bring a massive hog processing plant, for an estimated about 2 million hogs being processed within the City of Winnipeg, in the St. Boniface area.

It's been said that there is a heavily subsidized package being put together from the City and the Province and I certainly would like to have a better understanding of the environmental impacts of this. And I guess my question I was going to ask for a Council seminar and private briefing so that we would understand the implications of such a decision. Unfortunately, that was shot down earlier on something much straight, more straight forward.

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Councillor Gerbasi: So my question is I guess, is the Mayor himself at all concerned about the potential environmental impact of bringing a massive amount of hog processing into the populated area near new suburban development in the City of Winnipeg and how are we going to pay for it? The subsidies?

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. First of all the report I guess is partially accurate. There certainly has been conversation with the two levels of government along with the proponent. This is a massive project that would inject hundreds of millions of dollars into our economy and employ a significant number of people. While there is discussion I don't want to divulge it, all the information.

The facts are is that no deal has been concluded as we sit here and speak number 1. Number 2, I am very cognizant of any impact on the environment and I can assure you unless we felt they could all be addressed I would not support this project. And in addition to that I believe that all Councillors will probably feel that way.

And if Councillor Gerbasi ever wishes to speak to me, I've said to her on many occasions, my office door is open, I would be happy to discuss any concerns that Councillor Gerbasi has and thank you for this question.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much. I appreciate that offer to discuss this with you. My second question is on a different matter. What happened to the Urban Transportation Showcase program? It was supposed to be, it was negotiated and we are waiting to hear back about the $11 million dollars for environmental Kyoto Accord related issues relating. Long past when we were expecting to see it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. That is a, a project that administration has been working very diligently on. A lot of hard work has gone into there. I believe that we have the support of the senior levels of government and I believe very shortly a plan will come forward to all of Council that I believe each and every one of us will be very proud of and be very happy to support.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. My final question is on another topic on the Portage and Main. We were excited about the new Asper development and I am wondering will the Mayor demonstrate some enthusiasm about the other plan that the, for Portage and Main, for transforming the Portage and Main of our City with a design competition proposal that we won, that was won, that was held and there was a very… I'm sorry Mr. Speaker I'll…

Will the Mayor indicate his enthusiasm about transforming Portage and Main, as was suggested that there was a little bit of a lack on enthusiasm and we haven't heard anything about it for awhile, so maybe he can give us an update on that?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I may need your wisdom on this but I don't think that I would be allowed to dance on the table here to express my enthusiasm, so I'm not sure what enthusiasm or the definition of enthusiasm is.

I can assure Councillor Gerbasi that I have always said that it would make more sense if we are having, if we are investing dollars and cents to make sure that we can do something. We invested dollars and cents in a prize competition where we could not do anything regardless of what the end result was because we do have legal obligations.

Since that point in time, letters have been written to the six stakeholders. I have spoken to those stakeholders and as a result of that along with work from Property and Planning we now have an open mind for them to say hey let's see what's on the table and let's discuss it.

I'm not sure what more we could do at that particular point in time. At least we have communication where as before the door was closed and everybody is listening and on top of that they have also put up their own money. I call that enthusiasm. But if Councillor Gerbasi wants to come to my office I will gladly do the dance. Thank you.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ask through you to the Mayor some questions regarding the recent announcement of Operation Clean Sweep to address crime in the inner city of Winnipeg. In hearing the announcement and we are all of course supportive of reduction of crime in our City, there is the old Shakespearian phrase of a festering lily can be, can smell worse than a weed, and I would like to ensure that this has some legs to it.

My question is, in light of the Mayor's office announcement regarding new spending to combat crime in the inner city, what funding source will be used to pay for this new policy?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Swandel. I'm sorry Mr. Speaker I was still thinking about the lily as I stood up and I hope it's not festering.

First of all I should like to tell you that as everybody sits here today we probably are very cognizant of the fact that we are looking at a $17 million dollar deficit. So no matter what we're going to have a problem to solve. As was announced earlier there are new monies addressed to this issue.

The key of the thing to me is I think it's time for Council to act on a problem as opposed to ignoring the problem. There is a problem. Statistics prove there is a problem. We are the murder capital of Canada. I hate saying that Mr. Speaker but that's what statistics say and it's also on the front page of newspapers across Canada. I cannot stand by and accept that as a status quo. I believe we have to change it.

So that's why we are deciding to take action. I'm very happy that the Police Chief supports it, the administration supports it and I'm glad to see that Councillor Swandel supports it.

The bottom line is we always have to make tough decisions. And you know what, every year we deal with the Police department and there are over-runs, we find the money. This is a situation we will find the money to do the right thing. And I do believe this is what our citizens want and that's it Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Swandel: As a supplemental Mr. Speaker I would like to ask the Mayor

through you, and if you can let us know where the current contract negotiations are, the arbitration process with the Police is at, if it's been resolved yet?

Mr. Speaker: That is not a question that is allowable in this chamber. Contract negotiations cannot be discussed publicly in this chamber or their status. Is there any answer the Mayor could give that would not contravene negotiations? No. Is there an additional question?

Councillor Swandel: A final supplemental then perhaps Mr. Speaker the Mayor could let us know whether or not Police overtime is mandatory?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I'm trying to understand, Police overtime and mandatory? I'm happy to discuss of Police overtime. Every year Mr. Speaker we have Police overtime. As a matter of fact it's probably been rising. I just happen to have some numbers here but there is no point going through them.

It's a matter of if we are trying to solve the problem we use the resources we have and if that means having to have overtime because we probably know criminals do not work 9:00 to 5:00, they work 7-24 and unfortunately that is just the way it is. In order to address those problems overtime is part of that solution.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. As your one question was ruled out of order did you have another supplemental Councillor Swandel or you're done?

Councillor Swandel: No that's fine.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise on the same question or the same subject actually. With regards to yesterday's announcement of Operation Clean Sweep, a year ago I requested information at that time from administration with regards to the state of our enforcement with regards to the drugs. The concern I have, or the question I have Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the special Police unit to carry out Operation Clean Sweep, is this an additional, are we adding new officers to our complement? Right now the actual complement authorized by the City is 1,229. Are we actually adding more officers to the entire complement of the City or are we simply pulling officers from existing duties and putting them onto this duty? And if that is the case what…

Mr. Speaker: One question at a time Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, I've got a lot of questions Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: You have other opportunity. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. It is my understanding that as of September 30th our complement is 1,245. That includes 23 officers that are in a recruit class which will be graduating November 4th which is next week, plus 45 officers will become operational in field training roles in mid-December.

To specifically address Councillor Wyatt's question is that there is a combination of the two. Number 1 you can't add officers. You just don't get up in the morning and say I want more officers. There are recruitment classes as I mentioned. Some of those will be coming through within a week or two, actually less.

In addition to that yes, there will be re-deployment of officers. That is certainly part of it. It will not be a, part of it will be similar to exactly what we did and with Councillor Eadie who addressed that issue with, with dragging down Portage Avenue, we had a serious problem. The Chief knew how to use his resources best. He did re-deploy them and obviously, thank God, there were no causalities. And although people complained, and they complained very loud, okay, we were solving the problem and addressing it. And we tend to do the exact same thing.

This program is "get in your face". We are not tolerating or accepting crime. We know where the problems are. We know who the offenders are. We know where the crack houses are. And we are going to get in there and do our job. In order to do that the Police need more resources.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Speaker, the authorized 1,229, the actual 1,245 and it goes up and down is quite right by the Mayor.

Mr. Speaker: No preamble.

Councillor Wyatt: The question I have is what areas of the Winnipeg Police Service are going to be directly impacted by the reorganization of this, of this service, or the re-deployment of officers? Which divisions will be impacted by this?

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

Mayor Katz: Councillor Wyatt thank you for that question. I'm not in a position today to tell you which districts would be impacted. I certainly can assure you that no district, including your ward in Transcona, will be impacted in a negative way. I believe the Chief knows how to use his resources to basically attend to this operation and I believe he will do it in a proper, diligent way making sure that no one else is left out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Final supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Speaker, so a question of clarification. Before with the reorganized units that occurred in May of 2000 there was approximately under 30 officers total working. Is these, are these 40 officers in addition to the existing combined unit strength that was being worked on with regards to gangs and organized crime?

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

Mayor Katz: I do not believe that all 45 are in addition. I believe part of them will be an addition. I believe that part of it will also come out of what we all call overtime which is obviously a category that's been used before. But you can't have new officers come on board instantly and I said the next class does not graduate till November the 4th. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker. On a Point of Order Mr. Speaker.

(Point of Order)

Councillor Eadie: Just looking at the clock I would, I would propose that the rule be suspended and we sit beyond 12:00 o'clock to complete whatever questions are left in this Question Period and then recess for lunch.

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

Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I have a question to the Mayor on the same topic, slightly different angle. The Mayor has talked about both a task force and the administration, the Winnipeg Public Service, getting at the root causes of violent crime. He's also talked about involving the community in this process.

Since every expert agrees that violent crime is related to poverty would the Mayor agree that the proposed Poverty Action Committee under the leadership of the Social Planning Council and involving the Province, the Police, City officials, Councillors and other community organizations, would the Mayor agree that the Poverty Action Committee is the right place to begin that process of consultation?

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

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the press conference, we specifically said that this was the first step, just the first step. The second step is exactly what Councillor Benham referred to. Going to administration and asking to prepare a report that addresses the root problems that Council can debate thoroughly and come to a conclusion on.

There are many aspects of that. Education is an aspect. Poverty is an aspect. Recreational alternatives is an aspect. It goes on and on and I believe they should all be addressed. They are all important Mr. Speaker. And that's what I'm hoping administration will do and I'm sure they will. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. If the, if the proposed Poverty Action Committee is accepted by Council will the Mayor refer the report that he just referred to, the administration report on the root causes of crime involving as he said, education, poverty, recreational alternatives, will he refer that report to the Poverty Action Committee for advice and action?

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

Mayor Katz: Councillor Benham is way ahead of us here but I would say that number 1, once the report is complete I believe that they should be part of that process. And at that point in time if they've already been part of the process and made a contribution, which I'm sure they will, we can all look at it together and try and make intelligent decisions on which direction to go with the resources we have.

And I believe that Councillor Benham would know that this is something that does not just take leadership from the City government. All levels of government have to be part of this.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Final supplemental Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you, on this round. Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker can the Mayor explain how the 45 police officers can be dedicated to one task in one part of the City without affecting police presence in other parts of the City? And I'm thinking especially about community policing which is all about prevention? Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Mayor Katz: That is very easy to explain. Is that when you have expertise available to you Mr. Speaker you rely on that expertise. When the Police Chief and basically his staff tell you that this is something they can do within their means, I accept it. I certainly would invite Councillor Benham to speak to the Police Chief and get his own reassurances from the Police Chief.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes. Mr. Mayor with your announcement yesterday, you talked about the added resources for crime areas. You know, I understand the Spence neighbourhood is one of the areas but where else would they be operating? Like do you have any sort of geographical limits or boundaries to show where these new resources are going to be operating in? I know Spence neighbourhood because obviously we had the killing. But at the same time I'd like to know how wide an area is going to be, have this heavier policing?

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Smith. What will take place, as I believe the Police Chief did mention yesterday afternoon, we will obviously direct our energies and our resources where the problem is the greatest. Some of the areas identified obviously would be the West End where we were yesterday, Spence, West Broadway and potentially parts of the North End. Where crime is the greatest, where we can have the

biggest impact is where we will direct our energies and our resources.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Thank you Councillor. Any other Councillors have questions? None, we'll go to a second round of questions. Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Benham.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. Again on the same subject that's been, we've been discussing. In May of 2000 when the previous reorganization was done of the gang units one of the concerns expressed at that time was that the formation of the unit occurred without consultation with officers involved and resulted in the result that, a lot of feelings in the service was that the beginnings of it were flawed.

Specifically, that there was later on an operational review indicated that a lot of issues such as planning, acquisition, communication, training, consultation with the implementation coordinator, launch date, initial monitoring and implementation follow-up. These issues were not addressed from the outset with regards to the reorganization of and creation of that unit at that time. Have these issues been addressed and has the service officers involved been involved with the development of this new unit?

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

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Wyatt. I'm not aware since I wasn't here in May of 2000 but I certainly would be happy to take that under advisement and get back to Councillor Wyatt with the appropriate answer. I'm afraid I just don't have that accessible information right now.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Mr. Speaker based on the fact that the 45 officers, as indicated earlier today by the Mayor, that part of that is in addition to or already included in the existing gang unit that is working, can the Mayor get back to Council if he doesn't have the information right now, get back to Council with regards to how many of the 45 officers are actually additional to the work of the gang unit and how many are already there doing the work with regards to this announcement yesterday?

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

Mayor Katz: I would be happy to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. And the final supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. I'd like to know what action is being taken by the Mayor and members of EPC with regards to the situation of cruiser cars in the 27 patrol areas in the City constantly being pulled out at times of high priority calls to respond to calls in the inner city with regards to the calls coming in, the volumes coming in. What action is being taken to ensure those cars are by in large in their patrol car areas that they are assigned to?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I believe that by in large those cars are in their area. It's not anything new that if there is an emergency and cars are needed that they do come from one area to another. That's been common practice for a long time. Maybe as long as you've been here Mr. Speaker, maybe, maybe not, but maybe. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The horse's word is quick Mr. Mayor. Councillor Magnifico has asked but has not had previous questions.

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Speaker, previously…

Mr. Speaker: Oh I'm sorry Councillor Magnifico did have previous questions.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes he did.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry you'll have to follow the order. Councillor Gerbasi. It was so long ago I forgot.

Councillor Gerbasi: How could you forget such a great question Mr. Speaker? Anyway…

Mr. Speaker: You were in my eyes and it was easy to forget Councillor Magnifico I assure you.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The issue I'd like to raise has to do with the Recreation Policy that we passed in May of 2005 and I've been hearing from some of my constituents that are very concerned that they will not be allowed to improve their facilities, because to quote the policy it says "the net square footage of City-owned space for general recreation and leisure programming will be sustained at the current level and will not be increased." And it is all related to population growth.

And although Councillor Eadie denied this at the last Council meeting that that's the impact of the policy that was walked on basically to a Council meeting and passed, my concern is can the Mayor address this concern that community centres will not be allowed to expand particularly in older inner city neighbourhoods under our new policy.

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

Councillor Eadie: Who's telling them that?

Councillor Gerbasi: The administration Jae. That's who telling them.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think first of all is that I think we have to be aware of the fact that for the first time we have a policy. A policy that is endorsed by the GCWCC.

This policy does not negate the opportunity for expansion. It certainly means there would be review. By the same token, considering the reason we got to where we are is because we did not have a sustainable plan. I think it would be prudent for Council to make sure that any expansion is sustainable and if there is expansion we should look at what else is within the community where we can hopefully bring things together.

We're looking at the big picture and we want to make sure it's sustainable. Otherwise Mr. Speaker we'll be in the exact same boat we are today with a crumbling recreational infrastructure.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Can the Mayor address the inconsistency that in the policy in that community centres which are staffed by volunteers have these restraints on them whereas private/public partnerships and other issues like that, they are not subject to any restriction and they don't, it doesn't matter for example this proposal from St. Boniface which was just an idea. An elite facility can start in other types of facilities…

Mr. Speaker: You're way beyond preamble.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well I'm just saying this only applies to community centres. Can the Mayor explain why other facilities and other types of recreation don't have that kind of recreation when we're talk, don't have that kind of restriction on them?

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

Mayor Katz: Just for clarification, I'm assuming the example that was used was referring to the public markets?

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah.

Mayor Katz: I know you threw it, okay, I just want to make sure that's what… First of all I believe that Councillor Gerbasi believes in having policy. I know that because I know she supported it along with every single Councillor in this chamber, that's number 1.

Number 2 is that I do not believe that anybody is trying to prevent any community centre from making their area a better place to be with more facilities for the youth. All that's trying to be

accomplished is to make sure it's done logically, it's done with support of the GCWCC and that it's sustainable.

If Councillor Gerbasi actually knows of something that is, that's not correct, I would love for it to be brought to my attention and I'd be happy to put my energies and my time into resolving it. I'm not aware of it at this particular point in time but I'm sure that if it does exist Councillor Gerbasi will take me up on my invitation.

As far as private enterprise, I don't know of anything that's actually taking place. Just because someone talks about something Mr. Speaker it doesn't mean it's reality. It's talk. It's a story. Maybe it's a slow day. That's the way it is right now. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Do you have a final supplemental before we end the time?

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that and I guess I would ask the Mayor would you be prepared to reconsider aspects of the policy considering the rush nature that the policy was brought forward?

Would you consider if we discover this because I already know of projects that have been told that they cannot proceed at our community centres. Particularly Councillor Smith's ward, there's one that's been told that they cannot proceed because of our policy in the Isaac Brook School gymnasium expansion. And that's what they've been told by our administration.

Mr. Speaker: You have four seconds Ms. Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Sorry.

Mr. Speaker: There is no extension.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I…

Mr. Speaker: The time is done. There is no extension. Council is recessed for 1:30 p.m.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of October 26, 2005 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: This could work if there is no questions.

Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development. No report, no motions, no by-laws. Please no questions.

Councillor Swandel: The chair is not here.

Councillor Gerbasi: We can't ask him he's not here.

Mr. Speaker: That's the plan.

(Laughter)

Mr. Speaker: That's why. Unfortunately it's followed by Property and Development which we do have to wait for.

Fred is hoofing it down the stairs.

Councillor Magnifico: Quorum, quorum is here right?

Councillor Swandel: It's quorum without the chair.

Councillor Lazarenko: Franco you sit on Property and Development, take over his chair.

Councillor Magnifico: What do you need?

Councillor Lazarenko: Okay, give us the report.

Councillor Magnifico: Absolutely.

Mr. Speaker: Just, give it a shot.

Councillor Swandel: I move that the rules be suspended and Mr. Magnifico…

Mr. Speaker: It wouldn't require suspending any rules.

Councillor Lazarenko: Try it. Start. Go ahead.

Councillor Magnifico: I move that the following by-laws be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: No. One moment please. One moment please. Fred, please, Fred.

Councillor Lazarenko: Franco stand up and say Clauses 1 to 25 be adopted.

Councillor Magnifico: Everything is mixed up here.

Councillor Lazarenko: As Consent agenda.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah.

Councillor Swandel: As Consent agenda, items 1 to 25.

Councillor Magnifico: I'm looking. I'm looking. I've got everything mixed up here.

Councillor Lazarenko: Give the date.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. We move on to the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Order please. Report of October 4th, Councillor De Smedt.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED OCTOBER 4, 2005

Councillor De Smedt: I'm pleased Mr. Speaker to move the report of October 4th and I believe it's clauses 1 to 25 as Consent.

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

Motions none. By-laws first reading.

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

Councillor De Smedt: Questions are a little later Harvey.

I would be pleased to move Mr. Speaker, the By-laws No. 179/2005, 180/2005, 181/2005.

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

Councillor De Smedt. By-laws.

Councillor De Smedt. I would like to move Mr. Speaker the following By-laws for a first time. By-law No. 182/2005 through to 197/2005 all inclusive.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 182/2005, 183/2005, 184/2005, 185/2005, 186/2005, 187/2005, 188/2005, 189/2005, 190/2005, 191/2005, 192/2005, 193/2005, 194/2005, 195/2005, 196/2005 and 197/2005.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that By-laws 182/2005 to 197/2005 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 182/2005 to 197/2005 both inclusive.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 182/2005 to 197/2005 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Mr. Speaker: Questions? Councillor Smith, Councillor Swandel.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Smith: Councillor De Smedt did you hear Councillor Eadie say at the last Council meeting the following, and by the way Mr. Speaker, this is a quote, "and by the way Mr. Speaker there is nothing in the Community Facility Policy that we passed in May that says if you are to expand here you have to take away there. That's a myth and it's not in the policy". I'm asking you this.

Mr. Speaker: You have already asked it. Okay, first question did you hear him say that?

Councillor De Smedt: No.

Mr. Speaker: He did not hear it. Do you have a supplemental Councillor Smith?

Councillor Smith: Why is John Kiernan of the Planning, Property and Development department telling community clubs "in order for a facility to expand some rationalization of total recreational space is required and Isaac Brock cannot build a new gym without closing down part of their present facility so it's not to add any more space"?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt why is he saying that?

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker may I just say, I'll take the question from Councillor Smith under advisement to get him an answer, and parenthetically and let me just say, I find it very interesting that we're having this little tango here around the Council chamber this morning about that particular issue. I heard the discussion before from Councillor Gerbasi to the Mayor.

We will certainly get you an answer. I would have really have appreciated if you had sent me an email and I could have tried to find out for you the veracity of the issue that you are bringing forth, that it might be truthful okay.

But thanks very much. Really we have another way. Councillor Steeves spoke very eloquently this morning about to get some collegiality I would say from time to time. I'm always prepared to have an interesting debate on any issue but let's try and get a little more collegiality please.

Mr. Speaker: While we're here I think it's a good time if I might be allowed to mention that while we have no policy that I know of on the matter, bringing up the names directly of civic employees below the level of department head, it could put them on a hot spot, in a hot seat or on a hot bed and really I don't think that's the way we should want to carry ourselves out. They have no opportunity to speak back at this level and where possible if we could leave their names out and keep that to a private conversation it would be appreciated.

Councillor Magnifico. No, I'm sorry, Councillor Swandel, Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor…the other guy.

Councillor Swandel: That would be Councillor Magnifico

Mr. Speaker: It's been a long morning, I apologize.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker at last Council meeting I asked a question about the issue of architects and engineers and the recent Court judgment saying that plans for certain types of buildings now need to be stamped by architects.

This past week it's hit home in the St. Norbert ward where a community centre project for handicap improvements to washrooms was set back looking for stamped plans and drawings by an architect and it's come before us, it's going to be coming before us again for funding.

Can the chair of Planning, Property and Development give us an update on where this is at and what if anything we are going to see is part of the resolution in the very near future?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much for the question and Mr. Speaker I would like to advise all of Council that first of all this is a very difficult situation that the City has been put in. We are trying not to, have a balanced approach and not take the side of the engineers or take the side of the architects, and I think it's an appropriate one at certainly this stage of the game.

Let me just assure you that the City is working through the administration very actively in trying to seek reconciliation of this issue with the Province. It is an important matter. I can certainly say to you Councillor Swandel that it isn't simply, or Mr. Speaker that it simply isn't in the St. Norbert ward that we, that there is

tremendous impact on and getting permits out.

The department is working as dedicatedly as they can to try and reconcile those that are possibly within the judgment that has been made. There is no question though and I think we all can see this that there is going to be an impact right now. There is an impact. There is going to be a delay on the issuing of permits.

I mean recall that the most important thing that our administration faces and they have been working you know for 75, 80 years in a very dedicated way meeting the Building Code standards and that would be our approach is that contained within the Building Code should allow this flexibility to have judgments based on who should be signing off on particular permits or on particular applications.

So with that, let me just assure Council that there is some work going on immediately and trying to seek reconciliation and get the Province, under who's jurisdiction this is, to bring this matter to a rapid conclusion that will satisfy everybody.
Knowing that there has been a litigious situation here obviously some people may not be happy on a compromise but I think the best interest of all of Manitoba, because the legislation is just not to Winnipeg, is important here that the Province should work as quickly as they can.

I would certainly say that if you have some mystical contacts with members of the Legislative Assembly that I would encourage you to make representation there. We are doing our best to make sure that everything will come to conclusion soon.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Supplemental Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Supplemental Mr. Speaker. There has been some conversation in the public that the engineers and the...

Mr. Speaker: There is no preamble to supplemental questions as you know Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: Is the City of Winnipeg and in particular our Planning, Property and Development at the table in any ongoing negotiations as to what future legislation may look like or amendments to the current legislation?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: No, I have no idea. Let me just, I think it would be fair to say that the City's approach would be to have people focus on the Building Code. And that's what we've been upholding all these years through either engineers or architects but I wouldn't really want to situate what the negotiations are going to be. Because from the Provincial side they are saying they're not just dealing with City of Winnipeg they're dealing with the whole Province.

You know this is a sad story, frankly, that anybody that makes political comment, I think this is a sad story. That it's been brought you know, we've been brought to our knees by and you know, a learned judge has made their ruling and that's fine. But it is really too bad that it had to go to that particular point. That's all I would say politically to those out there both from the engineers and the architects. They are holding up legitimate business in this City and in this Province and regrettably I don't think they should have done so in this particular manner.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Final supplemental Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Final supplemental Mr. Speaker. Can the chair of Planning, Property and Development provide Council with a list of all occupancy permits that have been granted since the learned judge's ruling and verification that those plans have all been stamped by an architect?

Mr. Speaker: Those would be for buildings of over 400 square metres of course. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: I think Mr. Speaker that's a pretty technical question. I happen to have it here in my back pocket. Would you please send an email so that I can on behalf of all of Council, to me as chair, and I'll see what we can provide if I can get the context of what you are asking for, and I will share the information that the administration can provide, to you and to all members of Council.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplemental question of Councillor De Smedt? Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the chair of Planning, Property and Development. My question is following up on the Portage and Main corner issue. I know that I think the last step was a study, a further study into the award winning proposal for Portage and Main. Maybe you could just give us an update on that considering it's in the spotlight again with the Asper project going forward.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker I'm just reaching into my memory bank that as you know faded because I wasn't here at 1:30. There is a consultant been hired I think to, to look at the issues and make a proposal back in consultation with the stakeholders that are involved around Main Street and I'm trying to, there's six or eight of them. They've all been involved and I think we're trying to see again what kind of reconciliation would happen from the original plan that came in that got a lot of hype but then nobody could get agreement amongst all those partners of what should be there.

But I can assure you that, and members of Council that, Mr. Speaker that there is activity going on and I think in due course we will get a report. If you need some more specific timeframes again I would, if it would be satisfactory to you and members of Council, I will ask the administration to give me a bit of a brief synopsis and then share that with everybody.

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

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Speaker, this is something that I have been researching myself and I wanted to ask Councillor De Smedt if, in the same vain as Isaac Brock, I have Southdale Community Club with the same problem. In that they've been told by the administration that they will not be allowed to expand unless they amalgamate. That's what they've been told and that they would then get the square footage from the club they amalgamated with.

And unfortunately what we have here is Isaac Brock is an inner community club which is one type, Southdale is the type of club that the report that was tabled actually wants. It's one club in the huge area taking care of an enormous Royalwood, Island Lakes…

Mr. Speaker: Your question is?

Councillor Magnifico: And the question is when he researches Isaac Brock could he please research Southdale at the same time?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker obviously the answer is yes we will do that and hope to share it with everybody and try and get clarity maybe once and for all at what has or hasn't been said. And we will proceed accordingly. Thank you.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Speaker, I rise on the issue of impost fees. In the last week or so apparently there was a large meeting behind closed doors between the members of the business community, developers and those participating in that development in our

City and the Mayor from what I gather and there is a concern with regards to a major policy discussion and report that is coming forward. I believe a gentleman by the name of Hanson or Hamps has been hired out of Ontario to do a major policy with regards to impost fees.

And I am just wondering with regards to that Mr. Speaker, will the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development and Council in general be brought into the picture so that we can have some input into this policy development prior to there being an announcement with regards to this policy?

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

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker, for the record of the members of Council, the consultant that is working with the department and with our administration on this is Mr. John Hughes. There is a report in that is being prepared. I think once the report is submitted to the administration it will receive initial scrutiny. At which time I think, and I can't give you the exact timelines, I think it would be appropriate at the right time to seek advice from other members of Council on what's contained within the report. But I certainly, we have not yet received a final report from Mr. Hughes and certainly members of EPC have not been briefed on that, on the specifics of the final report.
But I can just assure you that as we progress with this very important item on behalf of I think all citizens in Winnipeg, this emotional term of impost fees seems to keep coming up. I think we prefer to call it development charges as is provided for in most jurisdictions in Canada and we want to try and analyze that in the most objective way possible to see how this would impact the City in the longer term and whether it is appropriate.

As you know as our City grows at some point in time we have that obligation and I think the Mayor would expect me to state that it was his position that as we grow, development should be sustainable. And I think that that's a very important principle that we have to maintain so that we can have the right balance of infill development, multi-family development contained within the existing City of Winnipeg and building up on our boundaries, so that such as we're having with the Waverly West development plan, Silver Acres which is just south and east of you, a huge opportunity and these are on our edges. But we have still a lot of edges left to fill in this City but that will create a demand for infrastructure. And it's trying to analyze with some degree of precision what those infrastructure requirements are, is it just contained within the development or what does it trigger.

And that would be the, I guess, the trick so to speak of how you do your analysis and make sure that it's equitable and fair to everybody. And by the same token we realize that while we are trying to do this we do have growth going on in the Capital Region which can be construed as a balance. Some Capital Region growth obviously provides choice for people and we don't want to kind of situate that. But I think I understand the drift of your question. There will be an opportunity for further discussion by all members of Council on this very important topic.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, thank you Mr. Speaker and thank the chair for his response to that question with regards to well impost fee, area charges or whatever, area charges or whatever they're being called.

The actual policy discussion coming forward, policy document will, I just want to be clear on this, is will we have an opportunity to have input prior to a report being formulated and brought forward to Council for consideration? Before that occurs will we have input and a chance to have a discussion and have input into that prior to it having, so that we are not going to say one day having the announcement and the report on the next day coming forward but that there is a genuine dialogue.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Well Mr. Speaker I thought we could just quickly have an unusual meeting and …

Mr. Speaker: Time is up for questions Councillor De Smedt. Give me yes or no. Give me yes or no.

Councillor De Smedt: There will be an opportunity before it comes to Council.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much.

Moving on to Standing Policy Committee of Protection and Community Services, the report of October 13th. Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED OCTOBER 13, 2005

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker regarding the report of October 13th, 2005 I'll move agenda items 1 to 3 please.

Councillor Gerbasi: Number 3 please.

Mr. Speaker: And I'm asking that number 1 be stood down. Anything else?

Item 2 as Consent. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1 Councillor Steeves. Councillor Lazarenko would you take the chair please?

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Item No. 1 - Community Incentive Grant - Seven Oaks General Hospital Foundation File PR-2.6(34)

Councillor Steeves: All right Mr., I'll wait for the Deputy Speaker to get set up there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Yes thank you very much Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will just point out one thing on my report. The, difficult issue, these are always very, very difficult because from time to time we have to deal with what are sometimes considered more particular ward issues. This is no doubt one of those brought forward by a Community Committee and of course a Councillor whom, like all of us, is held in good standing and is a friend.

The request was a request which had been made before to Council with regard to the CIG account. It was for an increased amount of funding. The gist of the request with respect to this money, and it's not a, it's not a small amount of money Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect to this, this fund which runs in the amount of $70,000 to $80,000 dollars per year. It's quite a large request relative to that, the amount of I believe was $105-ish, in that level.

The principal challenge that exists here and I'm not going to speak very, very longly because I have no interest in really smashing the idea down. I think it comes with, from a good place with good intent, but I'll just encapsulate my concerns by virtue of the one paragraph that reads with respect to the project being proposed at the Seven Oaks General Hospital. And it reads as follows: "The Seven Oaks General Hospital is committed to providing quality emergency care in an environment that is comfortable, safe, organized and efficient. Renovations to the ER will expand its total area by 50% to 7,800 square feet. In addition, renovations will result in larger modern ambulance bays, centralized triage, confidential consultation, larger fully equipped treatment rooms, secure medical cabinets, safer, more comfortable waiting rooms and computerization of patient records and charts." That's what the money is going to be used for.

I guess I have come before Council and I have asked for the relaxing of criteria. I did so actually quite recently with respect to the old St. Vital BIZ with respect to a truck they wished to purchase. The old St. Vital BIZ was, they set up, you've been to old St. Vital, the junction of St. Anne's and St. Mary's, all the flowers and the planters that exist on that boulevard by virtue of this group, our group, they

needed a truck to help to assist in watering those plants to make the area more beautiful. And they have done all sorts of sidewalk work. There is planters that are hanging, signs, etcetera. I asked for this Committee to expand and to relax the criteria because I thought it was important. I thought there was a sufficient nexus between what we do and what was being done by this group.

It is only my personal opinion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this particular issue that this one goes just a little bit beyond my personal comfort zone with respect to the CIG grant. Again I have no interest in standing up and bashing the project. That is not my intent. It is certainly a very worthwhile project that enjoys huge community support and again I will say I don't personally blame the Councillor or Councillors involved in supporting this. It just goes beyond my personal comfort zone. That's all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I find this request well within my personal comfort zone. The hospital hasn't planted any flowers on my boulevard but they did save my next door neighbour's life. May sound a little harsh but I think it fits in with what's been said so far.

Over the years the criteria have been waived for this type of grant hundreds of times. Almost, almost all of you on this floor have had the criteria waived in the past for projects that you knew, such as the truck, meant a lot to your community.

In my community, and Councillor Lazarenko's community and Councillor Pagtakhan's community, the number one project of last year, of this year and of next year, is a new Emergency department for the Seven Oaks Hospital. It is a community project.

Councillor Lazarenko and I along with others sat on the board of this hospital when it was bald prairie. Then Councillor Zuken, then Councillor Yanofsky, Councillor Fuga, a number of City of Winnipeg Councillors were instrumental in having this hospital built.

Attached to it and part of the hospital now is the Seven Oaks Wellness Institute which does fit in with recreation. This Council has passed motions in the past so that we could support and actually build and have a City plaque and recognition name on an outdoor running track, a meditation garden and another facility at this hospital. All of a sudden the door is slammed shut.

The amount means nothing. The amount of it whether it's $10,000 or whether it's $100,000, these are existing funds already approved by the City for matching dollar for dollar spending within the community. This is not asking for anything extra, this is not asking for money that was scheduled to go to any other ward or any other area of this City. And it certainly is not precedent.

There is one criterion that is not met. The only criterion is that it is not a recreation project. Correct. I don't think the truck was recreation unless people are going to outrun it or something. I don't know. And that's a little snide, I know.

I am asking for something and I believe I'm speaking for all three members of our Community Committee as we voted unanimously on this, I'm asking for your support for what we feel at the moment is the most worthwhile project in our area of the City. And as we have in the past and will in the future, recognize your judgment in what is important for your area. This is very important for us.

I ask your indulgence in this vote. It's only one of ten criteria that are not met, that is not met, and that is that it is not for a recreation purpose but a better ward here will allow a lot more people to enjoy their recreation for many more years if I can try and string that together in some nearly plausible fashion. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. No further speakers? Councillor Steeves closing.

Councillor Steeves: I'll be brief again Mr. Speaker. Again, I'm only speaking for myself on this and I will encourage Councillors to simply make up their own mind.

I am at a bit of a box personally on this. There was some time ago I was approached by Foyer Valade which is a seniors care home in my, in St. Vital right by St. Amant Centre. They asked for a CIG grant. Because of the same reasons that exist with respect to this CIG grant, I, we couldn't approve it at Community Committee. I guess as the area Councillor in St. Vital because I couldn't approve that I personally cannot approve this one. I'll just ask that the Councillors vote their own conscience.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers? Councillor O'Shaughnessy asked for recorded vote. All in favour of the clause please rise.

Councillor Gerbasi: In favour, just to clarify things...

Councillor Magnifico: In favour of what?

Mr. Speaker: Pardon?

Councillor Gerbasi: In favour means you're concurring with the recommendation not to give it to them?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's a recorded vote. Well yes.

Councillor Eadie: You're voting in favour of the recommendation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Those of you are voting in favour of the clause the recommendation please stand. Those who are not in concurrence with Councillor O'Shaughnessy's request, please stand. Those who are voting for the clause and that is not concurring with the request of Councillor O'Shaughnessy. Would you please get the vote.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Steeves, Thomas.

Nays

Councillors Benham, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Smith, Swandel, Wyatt, O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 9.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The clause is lost.

City Clerk: Lost but it doesn't necessarily mean approval.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Now you need two-thirds, two-thirds of the vote. Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Motion
Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

THAT Council approve a Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $105,000.00 (from the Mynarski, Old Kildonan and Point Douglas Ward allocations) to the Seven Oaks General Hospital Foundation to assist with the cost of the Seven Oaks General Hospital Foundation project, subject to terms and conditions.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Chairman as the clause is defeated as has been the past practice of this Council it is to allow someone to put a motion forward on the contrary. I understand this motion would require two-thirds vote to, or ten votes to support it.

But I am moving that the request of the LSWK Community Committee to make the grant as listed to the Seven Oaks General Hospital be approved.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll second the motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: And the motion seconded by Councillor Wyatt. Recorded vote, all in favour please rise.

(Point of Order)

Councillor De Smedt: Point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Point of order. What's your point of order?

Councillor De Smedt: I think we need a small adjournment to talk with the clerk. We can't introduce a reversal based on a policy that we have of a two-thirds vote, Mr. Speaker. So I need some advice from the clerk and I would ask that you seek that before we proceed. Otherwise, this becomes a farce in having policy in the first place, so.

So I would move short adjournment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Just a minute Councillor De Smedt. Mr. Clerk, would you please explain what you have told me.

City Clerk: The motion on the floor has been defeated. In the past, you've set precedent whereby you've allowed for a contrary motion to be moved by a member of Council. If there is a contrary motion in this case, as has been moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy it still needs to follow the policy and get two-thirds of the vote.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, a recorded vote has been called for. All in favour of a motion by Councillor O'Shaughnessy please rise. We need two-thirds.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Benham, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Smith, Swandel, Wyatt. O'Shaughnessy, Lazarenko.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Steeves, Thomas.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 7. The motion is defeated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion defeated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: P & C motions if any, there is a motion. Automatic referral.

Councillor Gerbasi: Excuse me, item number 3 was pulled off.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pardon?

Councillor Gerbasi: Item 3 has still (in audible).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh pardon me I'm sorry. Number 3.

Item No. 3 – The Winnipeg Humane Society Financial/Operating Proposal Concerning Cat Over-Population File EL-4

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. Just operatively as I'm sure everyone has picked up at this stage of the game, the original clause as brought to Committee was as it appears right now. And I will point out the operative difference which exists in recommendation number 3 which reads that "the Animal Services are a special operating agency working in partnership with the Winnipeg Humane Society on an ongoing public education campaign to promote responsible cat ownership." That's what went to the Standing Policy

on Protection and Community Services and that's as it appears now.

But as Committee, as Council may or may not be aware, at the Standing Committee, the Standing Committee voted 3-1, I will let you guess who was the one, the, voted to add in an amount after number 3 which was an amount of $30,000 dollars to support that initiative. When that went to the Executive Policy Committee, the $30,000 dollars was taken away, it was taken out of the recommendation and so now it stands before Council as it was originally presented to Standing Policy Committee. So that's been the machinations on this one, that's how it's evolved.

We have discussed this at a fair bit of detail for quite some time now and as people were aware, the Humane Society had originally approached Council with, in essence, an ask in the environs of an increase from $125,000 dollars which was their base funding that we were paying as a City, to an amount of $300,000 dollars with some other requests but not the least of which was at one point they were asking we consider the idea of licensing cats in the City of Winnipeg. In that all of those things have become part of the ongoing debate with respect to the issue of cats in the City.

After I guess fairly long discussions, different motions coming in and out of Standing Committee, the end result is what is presented before the Council today, which in essence moves funding from the set amount of $125,000 dollars to the, as can be seen an amount of $200,000 dollars with another $50,000 dollars accessible through the, through an alternate program that's available with respect to cat spaying and neutering.

The Humane Society, although not appearing in delegation today, did appear at Sanding Committee Mr. Deputy Speaker. I don't wish to speak on their behalf. I wouldn't purport to. I think I can say with some confidence to Council that they were qualified in their support of the clause as it appears. There were some shortcomings in their estimation but I think generally speaking Stuart Blake, the President of the Humane Society, and Vicki Burns, the I guess Director, I apologize if I've got that wrong, of the Humane Society, I think were generally supportive of this clause as it appeared.

So we have, I guess, that degree of comfort. There was some concern by the Committee which I'm certain may be, may be I guess restated today through various members of Council, that we should be supporting the idea of a public education campaign through some type of dedicated funding.

Of course as many issues wind their way through Council up from Standing Committee through Executive Policy Committee, this is, I think, another one of those initiatives where yes, lots of credibility, probably need, no doubt about that. But we're working in the framework of a, or in the shadow probably is a better term, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the shadow of an edict that has come down from our Fiscal Issues Committee saying that we essentially have to find $17 million or so dollars between now and the end of December.

We're short of money to a certain degree. And we're trying to do our best to augment and support existing programmings to the best of our ability in what could only be described as a pretty challenging financial situation. Even today we've talked about the funding of Assiniboine Park. We know that Partners in the Park has been on the agenda. We've talked about increasing the allotment for the purchase of new Police positions and that's really only scratching the surface when we talk about the need for additional funding in our administration.

This report and the funding as it exists in the report before Council today is what we think at this stage of the game we can afford. We think it is a respectable, a respectable increase to what was being offered essentially double before in terms of the previous contract. We don't think that's a slap in the face and again I want to assure Council that we had a chance to hear in delegation the Humane Society.

Certainly while they talked about the idea of potentially increased funding for certain areas they were, generally speaking I think, quite supportive of this clause as it appears. It was the Committee that added in the additional funding which was of course their right to do so.

This report, I don't think it needs to be said but probably should be said just to head off any concerns or any questions at the outset, does not call for the licensing of cats in the City of Winnipeg because that has been a part of the ongoing debate with respect to, with respect to that issue. That will not be part of the program.

In lieu of that we do have the special operating agency that is committing by this report to work in partnership with the Humane Society on an ongoing public education campaign to promote responsible cat ownership.

Bear in mind always that one of the challenges with respect to this scenario is that we're dealing with an SOA. So with additional funding that comes forward it's a bit of a challenge to find that new money within the operating SOA. There, it's not that big of a difference but there is something of a difference in that there exists, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a bit of a gap between the City of Winnipeg and the standing operating agency and it is not as easy for operating agencies to find new funding always within the context of additional ask. So I only throw that piece in for people's information.

Aside from that Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be supporting the recommendation of the clause as it's presented in the report. I am hopeful that Council will be supportive of it. I think I can say at this stage of the game that generally speaking the Humane Society is supportive of what's before you. With that I will certainly stand down and listen intently to what other Councillors have to say and try to respond as I sum up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to start by thanking the Humane Society for all that they do for the animals and the citizens of Winnipeg. They do provide an incredible array of services largely paid for by their own fundraising and volunteer efforts.

For years the issue of cat overpopulation has been a huge problem. The Humane Society is in the awful position of having to put to death thousands of cats per year as there simply is no place for them. Giving the Humane Society an increase in their grant is definitely a positive step and I will be supporting the clause.

There is absolutely no question that the Humane Society which spends over a million dollars in private funds each year deserves at least the amount of $200,000 dollars from the City. I'm also pleased to see the City's participation in the spay-neuter program. It's definitely long overdue but I'm sure it's gratefully appreciated at this point.

I point out that without the work of the Humane Society the City would be paying for all the costs of animal care on the property tax bill so it is extremely important that we do not take this organization for granted. But I would like to put some comments on the record because I have found the way this issue has been handled very disturbing and I will tell you why.

For years the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services has been trying to get Council to do something more to support the Humane Society. And more than that, to start dealing with the issue of cat overpopulation and euthanasia. It has taken a long time to get a response but what has been really frustrating is that the last two reports that have come to our Committee clearly did not contain the information that the Standing Committee members asked for.

The Standing Committee asked administration among other things to look at cat licensing as a possible way to raise revenue which could be used to address the cat overpopulation problem. For some reason, the administration has not been giving the Committee a

straightforward answer. It baffles me that such a respected administrator as the head of Animal Services would submit the likes of the two reports that our Committee saw and I say that with seven years experience on Council.

I'm going to outline some of the bizarre inaccuracies contained in those reports. When the first report was asked for a year ago, it was assumed that licensing would be included among the obvious options as a licensing program was part of the Humane Society's initial request which sparked the whole discussion. The first report which arrived in May of '05, a year after it was requested, only looked at licensing as an end in itself and on that basis didn't recommend it.

Well it's obvious that just licensing animals doesn't achieve behaviour change but what it does do is bring in revenue. Revenue that could be used for public education or a spay and neuter program.

I quote from the report itself in May, "other than a source of revenue it is not clear what purpose would be served by a cat licensing program." Only revenue, that's all. Well frankly, we desperately need revenue. Isn't it logical to have cat owners, the users of Animal Services, actually contribute a small dedicated levy that goes back into the agency? Isn't that what we do with dog owners and isn't that fiscally responsible? How does it make sense that dog owners will continue to pay the bill for cat owners now? This decision today will simply will add more money into our operating budget.

And I don't understand why the administration didn't recommend or consider, truly consider, a logical revenue source coming from users that would be dedicated to addressing the problem. Instead they would have us just take some money from the imaginary money tree that seems to exist at times like these especially when Councillors don't want to make the tough decisions.
On October 13th of 2005, the Standing Committee received a follow-up report when the Committee again said could you please actually investigate licensing thoroughly as an option? This time rather than giving the Committee an accurate picture of the revenue that could be gained we were presented with specific options that all showed that licensing provided little financial benefit.

At the Committee, I asked the Director of Animal Services why is Edmonton, in Edmonton did they bring in $300,000 dollars a year in the first year of their program and continue to bring that in to this day? I asked him why the numbers in our report show no revenues in the first year and only $30,000 in the second year, one-tenth of what Edmonton got. How is this possible?

Well according to the administration, the figures in the report are based only on owners who participate in the spay and neuter program buying a license. That was the answer I got. Well obviously you are not going to make any money doing that and why on earth would the report show the program being set up like that when our dog licensing program, for example, doesn't work that way?

I'm utterly baffled by these reports which clearly seem to have been written to discredit the notion of cat licensing. Why couldn't there have been a fair and open debate with proper administrative information? There is no chance for Council to support a cat licensing program when the reports are written in a biased and lopsided manner.

I can't say for sure whether the administration was somehow encouraged by EPC to make the report make licensing look bad, I will never know. All I know is from previous discussions we certainly know that the political will on Council was to see licensing not happen.

I know that some Councillors would like to dodge the kind of controversial issues and angry phone calls that we all know come with the cat issue. But it seems to me that if Councillors don't agree with licensing cats then stand up and be counted and say you don't agree with it and have a discussion about it. A fair and honest political debate with the proper information from the administration, isn't

that what we're elected for? And frankly that's not what happened here.

It also concerns me that a member of our staff might have been put in the position of feeling pressure to make a more politically acceptable recommendation. I certainly hope that's not what happened. I don't know if that's what happened but human nature is such that people will go along with that in certain situations. The cost of all of this is a loss of integrity. How can non-EPC members and the public trust the administrative analysis of business plans, which we depend on for so many issues we deal with here, when there is an appearance at least of political manipulation in the report writing process.

The end result is twofold. A loss of trust in the political administrative processes under the current administration and I'm very sad to say this, because I rarely say a word of anything but positive about our administration, rarely have you heard me talk like this. I don't do it lightly.

And second of all, a lost opportunity to look honestly at a fiscally responsible option that would have the users of the service subsidizing it. Because this new revenue stream has been dismissed without being looked at properly, we're left to find more money in an already tight operating budget. God only knows whose hide this money will come out of. And I hope it won't be housing programs or support for groups that deal with gang violence and all the other long list of issues we're dealing with.

Finally, I'd like to mention the $30,000 dollars that the Standing Committee added for public education. There really aren't any funds or anything real behind the public education component. And the sad fact is, I don't know if you all know this, but the majority of Winnipeggers don't even know that it is against the law to not spay and neuter your cat. And without any resources to do a public information campaign, it's only $30,000, dollars, it's not very much money, I suspect they will continue to not know that. And we will continue to see a huge problem of cat overpopulation and subsequent euthanasia in cats.

So in closing I would like to say I'm glad that the Humane Society is receiving the support. I think we could have found a creative way and a sensible way to pay for it, and it's unfortunate that we didn't. It's better than going backwards. We're taking a first step in dealing with the cat situation, although there is a lot more we could do.

(Councillor O'Shaughnessy in the chair)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan moves extension.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: But I'm very concerned about the transparency and I'm feeling less and less comfort when I get a political, when I get a, pardon me, a slip of the tongue there, when I get an administrative report which is supposed to analyze a business plan for me because that's what we asked the administration to do and I get a report and I don't trust what I'm reading because I have to figure out the way it's all been presented to present a certain political view. That should not be happening. And I put to you that that's what certainly seems to be what is happening today. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. First of all I want to tell Councillor Gerbasi I don't agree with licensing of cats but I support this clause whole heartedly. I think this clause is very good because it's really a step forward in working with the Humane Society, more as a partner to accomplish the goals. So I support this, this is a good clause. They are happy and I think we should be happy with this clause.

But I would like to draw your attention to the section 3 there where it reads "that the Animal Services special operating work in partnership with the Winnipeg Humane Society on an ongoing public education campaign to promote responsible cat ownership". Now, those

are nice words, eh? But what do they mean? Nothing! They may not do anything. Unless you allocate resources to a program, you can't count on that program going ahead.

Now, you know, $30,000 dollars was not a great deal of money. And I thought that EPC would go along with it because it helps deal with the problem. So, I'm supportive of the clause and it is too bad that EPC chose to have a bunch of useless words in place of a definite public relations education campaign.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I will keep my remarks brief as well. First of all I support the comments made by Councillor Gerbasi. In particular I share her concern about our reports, our reporting system and its impartiality is very important. We know that we had some questions raised by a prominent member of the community about the Panhandling Report, Dr. Schafer, a very prominent professor at the University of Manitoba, believed that that report had seriously misquoted him and the administration was forced to retract and apologize to Dr. Schafer.

When it comes to the report on cat licensing and the first time around when Mr. Dack, I hope you don't mind me referring to Mr. Dack, I think he is at the level that you've permitted, Mr. Speaker, I agreed with the comment you made, but Mr. Dack in making his report to us the first time around said to us the report was altered. He said that before Committee Mr. Speaker. When we tried to find out exactly what was altered and who had ordered the alterations, unfortunately things became much less clear. But it was clear to us that the report was altered. It did not contain, in fact, what he would have liked to have seen in it. And I find that very disturbing. I concur with Councillor Gerbasi that it's disturbing.
Currently we have a by-law that requires, as Councillor Gerbasi pointed out, requires spaying and neutering. I didn't know that as a Committee member. That was news to me and I suspect that Councillor Gerbasi is absolutely right that would be news to Winnipeggers and particularly to cat owners and particularly to irresponsible cat owners who have nothing, not a single message from the City that they should spay and neuter their cats and that it is their legal responsibility to do so.

I think a cat licensing system would be not such a bad idea and I'd like to have an open and honest debate about it. I appreciate that Councillor De Smedt says he is opposed to it from the beginning. I'm prepared to look at it. Other Councillors might have other views of that but at the very least it should be brought forward and we should have an honest debate about it and Councillors should be forced to stand up and be counted one way or the other. If you are going to have a by-law and you are never going to enforce it, then you are simply inviting disrespect for the law and it's not acceptable to me.

The point about dog owners I think is a good one. Responsible dog owners pay for licenses. Responsible dog owners pay more if their dogs are not spayed or neutered. They pay the regular fee if they are spayed or neutered. Responsible dog owners are subsidizing irresponsible cat owners. How fair is that Mr. Speaker? And particularly when we established Animal Services as a special operating agency so that it would be able to get revenue and use revenue to operate its own services.

Now, as Councillor Gerbasi has pointed out we have completely cut off up to $300,000 dollars in revenue perhaps in order to continue having responsible dog owners subsidize irresponsible cat owners. Because of those irresponsible cat owners and because of the lack of political will shown here by all Councillors, 2,000 cats will be put to death next year by the Winnipeg Humane Society. Just like 2,000 are being put to death this year and just like 2,000 were put to death last year. The blood of those cats is on the hands of everyone who is refusing to do anything about it. And I for one do not want to be responsible for 2,000 dead cats. Nor do I want to continue to force

the Winnipeg Humane Society to exterminate them. It is simply not fair.

The Humane Society exists Mr. Speaker to love cats, to love dogs and to provide for them and to see that they are provided for within civil society and we have failed. We have failed the Humane Society in our responsibility and our part of the bargain for City Council. And we have failed the City generally. And our City is now over-run by wild cats, by feral cats as they are known, f-e-r-a-l, that actually survive in our winters and exist in a wild state and we have no idea how many of them are. But I would suggest that if we had wild dogs running in our streets Mr. Speaker, we would be concerned. And the fact that we have wild cats I think should also be a cause for concern and a cause for action.

Finally I agree completely with Councillor Smith it is meaningless, absolutely meaningless to say that the Animal Services operating agency will support a campaign by the Winnipeg Humane Society to educate our public about our laws. They're going to take on City Council's responsibility of educating the public and furthermore we won't give them any money to do that. Here, here's another job that we should be doing, we're going to turn it over to you and you don't get any additional money to do it. Good luck.

Well Mr. Speaker I think that that shows a considerable lack of political guts on the part of City Council. I think it shows a lack of foresight and I don't think Councillor Steeves should be defending the fact that we allocated, that we in Committee allocated $30,000 dollars to make that clause meaningful and Councillor Steeves not only voted against it at the time but then colluded with the rest of EPC to take it right out so that we have essentially a meaningless clause. In my view the chair of our Committee should be going forward and fighting for what our Committee wants to see particularly when it's so reasonable. So Mr. Speaker I will of course, just like the other two speakers, be supporting these clauses, but very reluctantly. I feel that the, that City Council has failed as a whole. The administration has failed in outlining the proper options. We have failed to grapple with the real problem here which is enforcing a by-law and we are going to be, we are going to be responsible as a City Council for the killing, for the extermination of 2,000 cats next year Mr. Speaker. I'm sure not proud of that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement. There is no other speakers.

Councillor Clement: Good. Thank you Mr. Speaker. I didn't plan to speak to this but it's pretty hard to listen to some of the comments and not react to them.

First of all, Mr. Speaker just because you know there is a by-election and somebody new arrives on the scene doesn't mean that you get to revisit every by-law of the City of Winnipeg so that that person can say that they were in on the debate on the by-law. We have had a cat by-law debate in this chamber and not very long ago. And just because somebody new shows up and the light bulb went off in their bathroom in the morning doesn't mean that we haven't been there before. So when somebody, if somebody wants to talk about my intestinal fortitude you know, there's lots of opportunity for that if they'd like Mr. Speaker.

As far as the $300,000 dollars in revenue that I've been hearing about from a couple of sources here today, I invite them to also tell me what the liability is. They just fail to add that part. There is no such thing as creating a revenue stream without it costing some money. So let's be fair about how much is really out there.

And we had that in front of us Mr. Speaker once before and we were told point blank that the cat by-law was not only unenforceable, that's what we were told in this chamber or in the report, course maybe that report was skewered too, you know. I mean goodness gracious somebody must have fiddled with that for it to say something like that.

You know I have a lot a problem with that kind of nonsense Mr. Speaker. It's right on the edge, some of those comments in my view and I just don't like that very

much. You know people, you know that want to make these types of comments but they don't really have anything tangible they've just gonna say it so that it sounds good you know.

Well I have a bit of a problem with that. I read the report and I did read it. I found it amazing actually that this whole issue showed up here by the way. Not long after a capital program was being pursued down here and you know it's interesting. We have a Capital Budget Mr. Speaker that's planned five and six years ahead. Just about everybody knows that, that's ever after any of that money including Miss Burns, Ms. Burns sorry, I don't know whether she's married or not so I'll call her Ms. Burns, and she knows full well how we work down here.

So all of a sudden bang, this idea of a new home shows up, and we're supposed to react in six months and we're supposed to provide a whole pile of money and it was a big ask, and the answer was no. Not right now because we need time to deal with these kinds of things and that was basically how that got dealt with.

Magically, they get told no about the amount of money that they were requesting from us and then somehow, just magically within just a short period of time this issue shows up and it's interesting that the amount of money that the ask was in here would service pretty much the amount of money that they asked for in the first place for the Capital program. But I wouldn't want to suggest that something like that was going on. Because then I would be getting into the same, same ditch that some of my friends were just on a minute ago about the discussions about reports. So I don't want to go down there either.

As far as the public education issue deal, when I read what came out of the Committee it didn't say that there would be a shared plan, that's what it reads I mean these are the same words that came out of the Committee, exactly the same. It says that they'll work in partnership with the Humane Society on an ongoing public education campaign to promote responsible cat ownership and that the City would put up $30,000 dollars.

It didn't say anywhere in the motion that came out of the Committee how much the Humane Society was going to put up and we're going to work in partnership with them. Were they putting up $30,000 too? Did you put it in there that we're going to put up $30,000 subject to them putting up $30,000? No, no, no, nobody did that. Nobody did that.

So EPC didn't like the way it was worded because it didn't cover it off so we took it out. So that not only did we take the $30,000 out, it might be $50,000. It might be $50,000 or $60,000 Mr. Chairman, we don't know because what we suggested was that go back and talk to them. Let's talk about what the program would be, come back and talk to us about it and when you've got some numbers then we'll talk about how we're going to find it, find a way.

And by the way all of that will happen before the Current Budget comes down Mr. Speaker. But nobody asked. It's just you know, let's draw and shoot, you know. There is lots of, there's lots of time to ask questions. Everybody is around all the time but oh no, let's just go in there and we'll just unload our guns on the floor of Council, it's on TV. I get frustrated with that when nobody comes and asks the question Mr. Speaker, why did EPC make that change?

They made the change because it wasn't a shared thing at all. The language says that it's going to be shared now and if somebody wants to change that go ahead but I suggest this to you that's its better off to leave it the way that EPC put it because this way they can come back and if the program is $100,000 and they want to put $50,000 into it and we put $50,000 into it they're going to get more than $30,000.

But right now we're going to be paying the only $30,000 and you're going to see a joint program come back that spends $30,000 dollars and we're going to fund the whole thing. And that was what was

wrong with the way it was worded. And that was why it was changed. There was nothing untoward about it whatsoever. There was nothing unsupportive about it. In fact it was exactly the opposite if you were sitting in EPC listening to the discussion Mr. Speaker.

Anyway I've had my say. I'm going to support this clause. I'm going to go there. And by the way I voted against licensing cats and I'll do it again.

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

Councillor Steeves: All right.

Mr. Speaker: And the amendment.

Councillor Steeves: I'll try to think of a way to put this diplomatically Mr. Speaker but I think at this stage of the game it should be fairly evident that when it comes to the issue of cats in our community there is a pretty wide scope of sympathies that exist on either side of the spectrum. Ranging from people who really don't believe that there is much of a feral cat problem in this City at all, to those who believe that, if I'm quoting correctly, "the blood of 2,000 cats will be on all of our hands".

Which is why frankly Mr. Speaker, I have found this one of the most enjoyable files to handle in recent memory because it's, I think it's brought forward a lot of very graphically different opinions and we tried to bring them together and I hope that, I hope that people on either end of the cat spectrum as it were Mr. Speaker, kind of appreciate that when they look at this clause and they look at this clause as that compromise.

And that's what this is. It's one of those I guess, odd and unique sort of clauses and recommendations, where in my estimation certain people on Council are actually outside of the wishes of the Humane Society. Frankly when the Humane Society spoke on the report and the recommendation at Standing Committee they were quite positive.

Clearly there's members of Council who are not at all positive, but will vote I believe, but not very positive on the report at all. Which is fine and that's sometimes the way it works but I think maybe there is something to be said for looking at the client you are attempting to work with in the community and attempting to service them which I think accomplishes that goal.

I do wish to bring this Council's attention to the report itself, on page 1230, on the computer at least. There is a section that deals with cat licensing. When Councillor Gerbasi spoke she may have left some people with the impression that it wasn't dealt with at all in this report. It was. I think what Councillor Gerbasi was saying if I could paraphrase was that she wanted additional information, more detail, financial discussion and I take that.

I just want to assure Council that there was a page of information on that very issue provided in the report which ended with "should a cat licensing program be established it is recommended that the cost of cat licenses be as follows", and then they're enumerated throughout for the next few lines. Not the recommended option of the report but it does go into that type of detail. Enough detail for some, maybe not enough detail for others apparently.

There is a philosophical argument that I think exists here although this isn't strictly dealing with cat licenses. We talked at length about the issue of cat licenses. I guess personally I have some concern with the idea of putting forth a bald regime of requesting that we license with no discernable means of enforcement. People have drawn the analogy with respect to dogs and that's fine but the difference of course is that dogs are outside in our community. I think by anyone's standard of observation they cause significantly more danger than cats do. We have people who are entrusted with the task of apprehending dogs that are dangerous and all of those sorts of things.

In essence what we have with our community Mr. Speaker is a contract

essentially, although it's not a formal contract, that cats are indoor animals. We are not in the practice of licensing indoor animals generally speaking. If that wants to change I suppose we could have that discussion again at some point. But strictly speaking this report is not dealing with that nor is it recommending that. I don't think I have to go any further in that.

I think this report is going to be received unanimously. I sense some real acrimony coming forward with respect to even people who are supporting it. I would remind and conclude Mr. Speaker with the comments that, this report is generally speaking, received quite well by the Humane Society. Some things they would like to see in addition to no doubt. But please know that as a Council if we do pass this report today the Humane Society has stated they can work with this.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. There has been a change in the way we do our agendas after 2002 when the former Mayor, perhaps in collusion with his press secretary or others, assumed EPC amendments in the re-wording of clauses. It is still, I have checked, the policy of Council, when EPC recommends a change to a Committee recommendation, that it be voted on separately as an amendment. And in future agendas they will be listed separately and put as a separate motion as they properly should have been all along.

So in this case I am putting forward the, moved by Councillor Steeves, the amendment of EPC to amend clause 3 deleting the $30,000 dollars as a separate vote to amend the main clause.

All in favour? This is a vote on the EPC amendment to remove the $30,000 dollars from the clause.

Councillor Gerbasi: Could I just get a point of clarification. So if you, it's only about that? It's not about the rest of it?

Mr. Speaker: It's only about that. The other would be a separate clause on the original motion or the motion as amended depending on the outcome of this vote.

Councillor Benham: A recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: So a recorded vote has been called for on the amendment proposed by the Executive Policy Committee to remove the $30,000 dollars from the Committee recommendation.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Benham, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 4.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is passed.

Now the vote on the clause as amended which is the form you see it in your agenda before you.

All in favour? Contrary? Clause is Carried, as amended.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: PCS motions. We have the motion of Councillor Lazarenko which is automatic referral.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Lazarenko,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS during the 1995 re-organization, the Winnipeg Police Service acknowledged a shortage of 91 front-line officers;

AND WHEREAS currently the WPS remains short 85 front-line officers;

AND WHEREAS personnel shortages are continually affecting the specialized plain-clothes units;

AND WHEREAS the vacancy management program is affecting the WPS staff sector;

AND WHEREAS gang activity and an overall increase in crime rates have increased both police and staff workloads immensely;

AND WHEREAS the overall shortage of police and staff resources is compromising public safety in Winnipeg;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that City Council move aggressively against gang activity and continued high crime rates by authorizing the hiring of 16 additional police officers, thereby increasing the authorized police compliment to 1,245;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City Council direct that the 84 officers currently funded by the federal and provincial governments be listed above the newly authorized police compliment;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City Council direct the cancellation of the vacancy management program for the staff sector and increase the staff compliment by 50 additional members, thereby increasing the authorized staff compliment to 398.

Automatic Referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services in accordance with Rule 16.1 of the Procedure By-law

Mr. Speaker: By-laws none. Questions of the chair. Councillor Benham.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Benham: Mr. Speaker to the chair of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, does the chair believe that Councillors on the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services should be allowed to review, at an in camera meeting, the recent arbitration settlements of both the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service and the Winnipeg Police Service, with their respective unions.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: My inclination is not, Mr. Speaker. The reason, sorry? My inclination is not Mr. Speaker. The reasons for that are as follows. We essentially have a policy protocol standard, whichever term you wish to use, I'm not exactly certain which is the correct one that negotiations work as, as follows. The, and again there is no need to speak specifically on these two particular negotiations, they apply to all negotiations.

We send our administration in, often times with legal counsel, to meetings, without prejudice meetings, with representatives of various collective agreements and their legal counsel often to work out agreements. I have probably every inclination to believe that's what happened in these cases although I wasn't part of those negotiations.

When they go into these negotiations Mr. Speaker, it is I guess acknowledged by everyone that that's the process that's going to be followed. The small group of people sit down and if the deal can be arrived at, which in some cases does happen, everyone acknowledges that when you leave the table it doesn't go anywhere from there. And again I'm not speaking about these two particular incidents. I'm talking about everywhere. All of them.

Now it begs the question, can we change the rules after that part of the game has been played? I would submit we probably can't. I would submit that if some of our representatives sit down with anybody, on any collective agreement and they work out some type of deal, and the people who we're negotiating with, against,

whatever term you want to use. If they have an understanding that it's not going to leave that table I doubt that we can change the rules halfway. That would be my inclination.

My answer to the question is, if ongoing, if ongoing Council wishes to change that, it will become incumbent upon us to contact each one of our directors, our high level administrators who are in charge of such things, and say to them from now on when you sit down with representatives of any collective agreement group, their legal counsel with your legal counsel, please know, and please tell them, that if you come to an agreement you may have to come back to us because that might make a difference in terms of the negotiations.

I don't know if Council would like to change to that rule or to that protocol. That may or may not be our wish. I'm not sure. But I don't think we can do it now after the game has been played.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. And if I just might on that, contract negotiations are not the purview of any of the Standing Policy Committees. They are the purview of Executive Committee. All contract negotiations. No matter what. A department may be… Councillor Benham supplemental.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In, if Councillor Steeves' answer stands who will protect the interests of taxpayers in these negotiated settlements when the taxpayers' dollars are at stake in secret arbitration settlements and they should be shared among all Councillors. Why should they not be shared among all Councillors?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Well, stop me if I run afoul of anything Mr. Speaker. I'll try to answer as best I can. If the citizens need to be protected from decisions that our administration might make, with legal counsel with groups opposite behind closed doors. If they need protection from that and if it's possible to change that then what we have to do I suppose is sit down and say from now on this is the way we are going to do it. If indeed we have that power, and I don't know for certain that we do. But that is in my estimation the only real or fair way we could do it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Further? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the chair of Protection and Community Services and I'll remind him as he hits me, he's on television. Could you tell us about the consultation process with Protection and Community Services which resulted in Operation Clean Sweep?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Well I, like I said the Mayor had had some very preliminary discussions with me and I'm not going to go into the discussions that I had with anybody privately, that's not my, that's not my, that's not something I do. That's not just for the Mayor, that's for anybody in this Council. I don't believe there was any formal discussions with the Standing Committee if that is indeed the question. And I think probably the fairest and most direct way I can answer this question Mr. Speaker is to say that this, for all intents and purposes appears to be the prerogative and the plan put forward by the Mayor. Which I guess as the Mayor he has the right to do.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Supplemental Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Can the chair of Protection and Community Services tell us if he has had any talks at Protection and Community Services with the other Committee members regarding underlying social factors that are causing higher levels of crime in some parts of the City?

Mr. Speaker: Doctor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: On the a, I guess the first thing that pops to mind is the *Poverty Committee Report* that's been, we did discuss at some length at Standing Committee last meeting. And I

mean, contrary to popular belief our Standing Committee isn't always arguing with one another we actually had a very, a very good discussion on that. We get along actually quite well and we don't always agree on everything.

The, I'm glad Councillor Swandel asked this question because Chief Ewatski was kind of brought into the discussion indirectly, and he did state that yeah, the big issue here is drugs. And he did actually say regardless of how you look at a lot of these problems it does kind of boil down to in most instances the issue of drugs. And he put forward I think a very good question. If drugs are causing this problem and if the goal is to get people in our society to stop using drugs, what is the best way to do that?

And if you reflect on that question I think Mr. Speaker for even a very short time you're going to come up with all sorts of different answers many of which don't have a lot to do with policing and that's kind of the discussion that we have at Standing Committee with respect to some poverty, the Poverty Committee ideas put forward and those types of things.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Final supplemental Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Final supplemental Mr. Speaker. Through you, can the chair tell us what mechanisms might be employed to build community capacity to resolve underlying social issues resulting in higher levels of crime in certain parts of the City?

Mr. Speaker: Again doctor.

Councillor Steeves: Asking a lot my good friend from St. Norbert. The, but I'll be frank, I'll be frank. The, we are best set up in this community through our Police force to solve crimes. That is what we do. That is our primary function. We solve crimes. We do other things as well. But we primarily solve crimes.

When my friend asks about what can or cannot be done or what should be done or what direction am I going with respect to the larger social issues. My respectful opinion Mr. Speaker, we start to get outside of the core competencies of a Police force. Not that they can't help. Not that they can't play a role. They certainly can. But I think at that level you start to get into the jurisdiction of other specialties potentially even other levels of government.

I think at very least Mr. Speaker the goals of sort of amending these important issues through amendment of social policy which I happen to agree with wholeheartedly. I think the brunt of that work and the brunt of that funding and the brunt of that policy jurisdiction probably exists in another level of government with us playing a strong supportive role. That would be my opinion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Speaker, with regards to Operation Clean Sweep, the *Winnipeg Free Press* today is reporting and I'm quoting the *Free Press* because they have some numbers in their article of budget costs and I want to get a clarification from the chair to see if those numbers are correct. They are reporting $1.6 million dollars is going to be the cost of Operation Clean Sweep and of that $1.6 million, $800,000 dollars is new money. And I want to know is that information correct Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: The Mayor has made comments with respect to funding on this issue and I've said already that this is, I guess, the program of the Mayor and he's brought it forward from his office as is his right. There have been numbers that have been stated. Not my numbers. The Mayor has also been asked how he is going to fund these and I was at the press conference yesterday. He stated that he was going to find the money. Fair enough.

If that is what's going to happen, that is what's going to happen. I don't take any umbrage with those numbers. I don't take any dispute with those numbers and at

this stage of the game I can't take any responsibility for those numbers.

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

Councillor Wyatt: That being the case then when will Council know that this money's found if that is the case and from where?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I don't know the direct answer to that question but I can assume that it will come up with respect to either the budget process or there will be some announcement as to where the money is coming from. I think I've said too much according to Councillor Clement.

Mr. Speaker: Final Supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I guess, they always say follow the money but anyway I'll change the subject of my final question. The issue with regards to the resources that are being dedicated to Operation Clean Sweep, what divisions within the Winnipeg Police Service are being reduced staff resources in order to provide for Operation Clean Sweep?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: What I'm going to do is I will undertake to get as much detail as I can and will get that detail disseminated to members of Council with respect to Operation Clean Sweep.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Boy you'd think some of us don't want to have the gangs cleaned up on the street, anyways. The chairman for Protection and Community Services has stated that we aren't allowed to speak about any of the negotiations for the Police contract, or for any contract for that matter as you pointed out, because once the, our bargaining unit gets together with their bargaining unit it stays there and they have their discussion. Why can we not talk to our bargaining unit as a Council before they go to their table so we can give our input to bring to the table to change some of the things in the contract that might be good for the citizens?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: We could if, we could if that's what we wanted to do. But we would have to, my suggestion would be is that we would have to decide that we want to make that change operatively.

I think we should think long and hard before we do that. Do we, for example, if someone in our administration is discussing something with some group representing some collective agreement with some lawyers out there do we want them to have to come back to the 16 of us and sort of run stuff by us before they agree to anything.

And then, and then Mr. Speaker please be advised that the parties sitting opposite will always have the knowledge in the back of their head that, okay this information is going to be back and forth, is it going to be leaked, what's going to happen?

We may want to do that. We may not. All I'm saying is we have to make that decision in advance, in the full light of day, so everybody, our administration, the people we are negotiating with, all understand, exactly the rules of the game.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Supplemental Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: I'd like to ask the question again because Mr. Steeves obviously didn't hear me, Mr. Speaker. Why can we not have it done prior to the negotiations starting? Have our input put in. We don't come back and forth. We have one shot at it, prior to the negotiations starting. And then they go with at least some of the information that we'd like to possibly offer.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I thought I did answer. I thought I said we could. If we wanted to change the way we've been doing business for a very, very, very, very, very long time. We'd have to let our administration know that before you go into negotiations or whatever, come and see us first so we can talk about it. And then I don't know what we would say if as they are going through negotiations things change, different deals come onto the table. Do we want them to come back? Maybe we don't. I'm not exactly sure. We are Council and we can make these rules if we wish. We just have to decide if we want to make them.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Time for questions is up. We now move on. The time for questions is expired.

We now move on the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works and the report of October 11th. Councillor Eadie.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED OCTOBER 11, 2005

Councillor Eadie: Yes Mr. Speaker I'll move that the report of the Public Works Committee for October 11th be received and that clauses 1 through 4 be adopted by Consent.

Councillor Gerbasi: 3 and 4 please.

Mr. Speaker: 3 and 4. Clauses 1 and 2 as Consent.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause 3 madam Clerk.

Item No. 3 – Award of Contract for Residential Manual Garbage Collection Services in South Winnipeg File GL-9

Councillor Eadie: Actually Mr. Speaker if I can with the permission of Council, I would like to move 3 and 4 together as a package because they are both related, it's the same contract, except one is manual and one is autobin collection. So I'm going to speak to both of them anyways.

Mr. Speaker: What is Council's will? Is it satisfactory to Council? Yes. Proceed.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Separate votes however will be required on separate clauses.

Item No. 4 – Award of Contract for Residential Automated Garbage Collection Services File GL-9

Councillor Eadie: That's fine. Mr. Speaker and I'm not going to take long. The reports are here and I'm sure all members of Council have read them. In July and I don't have to remind anyone we had a policy debate in this chamber on the, on whether or not to contract out the south quadrant of the City for refuse collection. That decision was made and the decision to contract out collection and the phase out of the in-house collection was made and will begin to take effect in March of 2006.

The contracts that are here following that decision Mr. Speaker the tenders went out and bids came back in. The successful bidder meeting all of the specifications is the, oops I'm in the wrong clause, it's BFI Mr. Speaker, BFI Canada on both of the contracts. The total savings work out to about $2.7 million dollars a year.

The business plan that we considered in April I believe it was, projected that it would be about $2.8 million dollars. So we are slightly under on the actual, it would have been nice if it was more, but we are slightly under on the, under the actual but I don't think that's, shouldn't be a major consideration.

Under this contract Mr. Speaker the cost per location under the contract is about $39.41 per household. If we continue to do it in-house, it's $73.98 per household. So I think that this particular pair of contracts is a no-brainer insofar as the savings are concerned and it should be approved.

And I'll just simply indicate Mr. Speaker that we certainly discussed this at Public Works on the 11th. These two recommendations go forward with a 3-1 vote in favour and so I'm recommending on behalf of the Committee that Council approve both these contracts so that we can make the changeover in accordance with our policy beginning in March of next year.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First I'd like to acknowledge the presence of the President of CUPE, Local 500, Mike Davidson, who's here listening to us speak today. So I just wanted to acknowledge and thank him for attending.

I have some concerns to raise about these contracts that some of which are similar to the concerns I also raised about the new northwest contract that was just dealt with at the last Council meeting. It is notable that with the awarding of the contract BFI will have three quarters of all of the single-family garbage collection. Clearly when you look at the players in our garbage industry in Winnipeg they're not Mom and Pop operations, they're big players. And I would suggest to Winnipeggers who have money, invest in BFI.

I also noticed that as with the recent contract for the northwest part of the City the contract for single-family collection has come in significantly higher, 11% higher than estimated. And I really don't understand why the reports did not predict this increase. It's the same as the northwest one. Why they did not predict that all the estimates would come in higher than estimated. It's not as if the tender went out for this one a long time ago, before we knew gas prices were up. It's not as if we don't know that garbage output per household is up. We knew that with the contract we dealt with last month. So, and we know that the administration keeps track of all these issues.

So I'm just really baffled about as soon as they know we are out of the business and now we are out of the business, all the bids are in higher. And I just don't have a proper explanation about that and that concerns me.

There's also been claims of savings of $2.7 million in the mayoral press release and here repeated again by Councillor Eadie, and that comparison I believe is inaccurate, because when you look at the report it's comparing an option, this option that we are taking with one that we never considered doing which was status quo without even improvements of our own workers. That is the $2.7 difference. No one ever suggested that including CUPE.

They all said that we would, everybody agreed that the minimum we would have the workers improvements of a million dollars. So $1.7 is really the number they should be throwing around. It sounds really good to say $3 but nobody ever intended on implementing status quo with no change to anything. And I think that's really misleading.

I'd also question how much the savings would be if the wages as some cities require that their contract pay wages similar to city wages. If that requirement was in place I wonder what the gap would be. Certainly we are making some savings on the backs of some workers.

Another point I'd like to raise today is the Alternative Service Delivery process itself. And I was on that Committee several years ago when we first looked at this issue. And the Alternative Service Delivery process that we give the administration to work with can only work within the parameters given to them by Council.

But unfortunately the process of ASD does not ask our administration to look at the social costs that come from our decisions about contracting out. And I've had this confirmed from, I've talked to the administration about this before I'm saying this, so this is confirmed by the people in Public Works. That they aren't told to look at the impact, the social costs from job loss, from low wage jobs, from under-employment, for the lack of stable of employment, for lack of a living wage. All of those issues are not part of what we just look at the bottom line of dollars in a

more obvious way. And the spin-off impacts of social and economic are not considered. So here we are making these decisions in a flawed process. And that's the argument I put to you today.

Government is, must operate in a business-like manner and I'm one of the first to say that. I'm one of the first to believe and to talk about finding alternative forms of revenue that are fair and all that. But we aren't just a business. We are government, should be looking at these broader issues and making our decisions in that context. And I'm disappointed that I don't see us doing that today.

So I would urge the ASD Committee as they continue forward to make other decisions to please broaden their criteria and I think Council has to actually be the ones, and maybe the chair of the ASD Committee can look at that in terms of making our processes more accurately reflect the whole picture of the decision that we are making.

So I really don't believe, sadly that we are really looking and there is other arguments I can make here if I had the staff to hire to go through the business plan. Myself, and if I had more than a week to do it, I could come up with a number of other arguments to try to take apart the business plan but I don't have the staff support. I don't have an EPC Secretariat to do that for me so I can't really make much more of an argument than that today.

But I think, I think even without that it's clear to me that the numbers of $2.7 in the Mayor's press release does not accurately reflect the true cost of contracting out garbage and if we really, and if this City is really was just a business I'm not sure we'd make Fortune 500 with this type of approach because I don't think that we are going to realize the savings that are being put forward in this.

And I have, and I wish I had more confidence in this process and I wish I could support it but I feel, I feel that there isn't time or the proper resources to analyze it further than that. But I can tell you there is some pretty, pretty clear flaws in our process and in these numbers. It depends on how you look at them. So thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will be brief. I ran downstairs and brought something that was presented to us here on the floor of Council on July 27th, 2005. It was presented by CUPE as a matter of fact, the Manitoba portion of CUPE, Kevin Rebeck, the President of Canadian Union of Public Employees from Manitoba.

I can assure Councillor Gerbasi that we gave careful consideration to this matter when it came to the Public Works Committee. As a matter of fact it was a vote of 3-1, I believe it was only Councillor Lazarenko that voted not to support this item because of some particular issue he has with autobins, I believe.

So, we had taken our administration to task on this and we wanted to know the ins and outs of it and it was a little difficult to really fully comprehend because we were talking about now today 2005 dollars and projections for I believe seven years into the future. Whereas the original arguments that we'd had around the general conversation about contracting out of garbage and its impact was relative to numbers that were garnered in 2002.

So we took our time, we asked our administration to qualify the numbers and so that we were very clearly comparing apples to apples and oranges to oranges and not just making statements for the sake of making a particular political point or representing a particular ideology.

When Mr. Rebeck made this presentation to Council on July 27th in the conclusion section I found the following words: "governments provide public services not because of some economic mistake or some historical fluke but because those services are necessary to ensure the high quality of life in our communities." We're

not stop, ceasing the operation of a public service here we're merely contracting it out. This is not the privatization of garbage. This is the contracting out of a public service. But it's still is a public service.

"Services were brought into the public domain in order to meet basic human needs, to protect public health and safety, to foster a healthy economy and to advance other significant social policy objectives. The private sector would not or could not provide public services because the private sector couldn't or wouldn't deliver quality services to all who need them and at a price they could afford."

Well here we have the private sector willing to provide the service at a price that is less than what we are paying right now. So in this document there is our very argument that says to us we should be doing what we are setting forth to do in this contract.

In the last paragraph in the conclusion section it goes on to say "Canadians want government to provide essential public services, especially health care and education for everyone. And they want their governments to spend their tax money wisely and fairly." I believe we are Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was going to sit back and just listen to some of the comments being made here today but I can't.

They, the question is before us here now Mr. Speaker is the contracting issue is behind us, it was dealt with in July. And I was one that voted against it and I said my, the reasons why. When this, awarding of this contract come before the Public Works Committee, the four of us, I was the only one to vote in opposition and stated the reason why. And I'm going to repeat mostly what I had said at that time.

The issue that is before us even now, and I have stood my position for many years, 22 years I've been on this Committee, of Public Works, 22 consecutive years. And that's going back a number of contracts that we had to deal with.

When we had those services provided by the City of Winnipeg it was more of a challenge to say how we can compete and how the private sector versus ourselves as a public sector. Price control, control in the way the services are being conducted. The one issue Mr. Speaker when we talked about savings, I never in all those years that I've been on this Committee have ever, ever been able to get an honest answer from the private sector, let us see your books.

With us, when we were going in, went into the autobin system, that I introduced back in 1990, it was implemented in 1992, and I said it here many times, what hell I went through in 1992 with the elections, when some of the candidates who ran against me used every method they could to say that you'll have this big boxcar on the back of your yard. Lazarenko's bin will be there. There will be dogs and cats and who knows what will be even he odd time a small baby. All of those things were being used to win over what was being done.

That was the best way for the citizens of Winnipeg to get the services provided through the autobins. The autobins, clean, safe, environmental friendly, no stray cats or dogs, garbage was not thrown all over the place, it went straight into the bin.

But then what happened during that time when we were making a profit, well savings I should say of roughly $500,000 dollars a year in the northwest quadrant of the City of Winnipeg. It was a big saving because one person operation. No compensation costs. Before we had, the old conventional way we had three and four years we had $3 million dollars in compensation costs. Right after the implementation of autobins none. City-owned and City-operated. We proceeded to put in the capital funding to purchase the equipment, the bins, the rest of it. It was working well, perfect. We were the pride and joy of the City of Winnipeg in

the northwest quadrant of the City of Winnipeg because to have the autobins, clean, efficient, environmental friendly.

But what happened, then slowly the opposition that came in from the private sector had said well we want to go into that business too. We said well go ahead. But said we can't because we've got a contract three to four to five year contract. They decided not to.

Then what was happening, the autobin systems started failing. Lack of enforcement. Garbage being brought in from outside the City of Winnipeg. We were advertising ourselves through the news media when we had an overflow of all kinds of bulk waste, chesterfields and who knows what were dumped along side. As soon as the media played up this role we were sending out messages to St. Norbert, I guess to West St. Paul, wherever, that we are open for business. We will pick up the garbage because now we've stuck because we've got all the garbage bins in the back lane. We were getting adverse publicity and to that fact.

There was very little enforcement. And I used to talk, I used to mention this at each Public Works Committee why isn't it we do not have the enforcement? How many charges have been laid in violation of a by-law that was implemented, a special by-law dealing with the autobins? Zippo.

Now what's happening I hear once this is being, has been privatized, contract is being awarded, now there is going to be additional funding provided by the City of Winnipeg to monitor the garbage that will thrown along by the autobins. There is going to be about four vehicles that will be driving around, City forces, go around and report to the private sector to say look will you please go an pick up whatever is there. At our cost. I asked why? Why didn't we have this before?

The move was made some time ago Mr. Speaker. We're just fighting here I think in an empty barrel. When former Mayor Glen Murray introduced the user fees for garbage he suckered in I'd say every person in Winnipeg and with the union was suckered in because they said well this is what we have to do. Because we are losing too much money with the Brady Landfill site. Sure we were because we started going hog wild with the user fees of such as the tipping fees went up to $40 dollars a metric tonne.

The private sector warned us and they had said you are forcing our hand to seek our way of, our business elsewhere. BFI did. They set up a landfill site in Rosser Manitoba. We challenged it. We lost it. So we lost, from $10 million dollars we lost, we lost $7 million dollars. Thanks to those who were going hog-wild with the user fees. And I have to say once again former Mayor Glen Murray and former chairman of the Public Works Committee, Councillor Duguid. That had said it each time, there's gold in garbage. Increase the tipping fees. Well we sure got suckered. We were told by the administration don't because we'll, we're going to tip ourselves out of business.

So here's what happened. The bins were being left alone. Garbage all over the place, people are complaining, what the hell is going on with this damn bin you've put in the back of my yard you dumbbell, I've got nothing but garbage, now I'm getting stray cats or dogs are coming here. We tried but it was not being enforced Mr. Speaker. Now the question, how is it going to be enforced when the private sector will be doing it? That what they say, because I haven't got much time.

When we talked about the cost, sure we know what our cost is. They give us their costs but can we correct it? Can we challenge it and go into the books? The benefits Mr. Speaker that we pay our City employees I'll tell you what I'm mighty damn proud. We've got our City employees who are getting a decent salary and a decent benefit when they retire and their golden years they're not standing in line some where's to try and get another side job because all they get is just Old Age Pension and just a supplementary and Canada Pension. We pay them because this is something I have always believed in.

We Councillors, we have a cushion. We've got our pension. But look how much we had to fight for the damn thing. We had some stupid nut balls in here that said we should not be allowed to have any benefits. Not because we are elected by the people. No benefits. We should be doing some of this even voluntarily. We had some of those idiots that were here in the early '80's Mr. Speaker and I'm sorry to say that…

Mr. Speaker: You are straying a bit.

Councillor Lazarenko: that they were the ones that said no way but when they went for re-election they lost. One or two landed up on welfare roll. Yeah I'm sure that was so nice, nice thing to say, a former Councillor is sitting on the welfare roll. That should not be the case. Any corporation you pay your people…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham moves extension.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Lazarenko: the people that work for you. We've been paying very well to our City employees. The private sector they don't have those benefits Mr. Speaker and I've questioned some of them. BFI, Laidlaw and I questioned even the contractors why is it that you don't give them at least a decent wage and benefits that they will have something to look forward to when their time comes to leave? They say well no because we just can't afford it.

So now when they put their bids in sure ours is higher because ours is all included. The overhead costs, what the cost is, cost for the equipment and material. They say about fuel costs. What happens later on Mr. Speaker when the fuel cost is going to drop? We're in a higher bracket right now. What happens when it drops? Say to, say to 80 or 70 cents a litre. That means we'll still be paying the same price because they included that cost with their bid and we're accepting it.

Now I'm not to argue Mr. Speaker of the, what we did in July. July it's past. But I'm just giving you my version where I come from I know this no doubt is going to go, will go be passed today. I was, like I said once again, I was the only one on Public Works because I stated the reason why as I'm stating here now. And I can't. The years that I've been sitting on that side to use a common sense approach I just cannot go ahead and say now that I'm not going to now all. Oh no we're, we will contract out but there's got to be a reason.

And some of you that are younger people in here will find out say in 20 years or 25 years, you'll start thinking a little bit different and well gee whiz, hey, say just a minute. I was a young radical in here, back in 1974 and later on while I learned how to be a radical I was a real radical in the early '80's. You know yourself.

Councillor Eadie: You were talking about prostitutes on Selkirk then.

Councillor Lazarenko: Some of that too. I'm not going to repeat what Councillor Eadie said. Not to this meeting.

Mr. Speaker: We heard it.

Councillor Lazarenko: But just to give you an example I was heard and I made myself heard. And some of the members of Council did not like it but it was just my way of expressing and the only way that you could express at times you have to do something like this. So in all wisdom Councillors do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lazarenko. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Here we go again. I want to say that there's three, three issues: the quality, the monopoly and the cost. I'll speak first to the quality. As I've told you before when the service was contracted out in my area I got nothing but complaints. I will warn you that the quality of the service is going to go down in these areas because it has, it has done it before it will do it again.

Monopoly. When we were heading down this road we were told oh there's three, four businesses that will all apply for this.

Each and every time that we put in for a bid the lowest bidder has been the same person. We are soon going to find ourselves in a monopoly situation because if this person is getting all the contracts then the other three people are not going to exist for a very long time.

Finally the cost. I will speak to clause 3 briefly and then I will spend most of my time on clause 4. Clause 3 is 11.1% above the estimated pre-tender cost. 11.1% above. That's a very serious impact on, on our revenue stream and I'll let you know that if these things continue to come in above the estimates the 3 which was 2.4 which was after the latest, the last one that we dealt with, down to about 1.4. If this comes in 11.1% above, pretty soon there is not going to be any difference between having the service delivered by City personnel or having it delivered by personnel that are not City forces, it's going to cost us the same amount of money and I think we are going to have to ask ourselves why was this done?

And 4 which seems to come in under the pre-tender and I'll say pretender and pronounce it in that way, estimate, I will call your attention to 5040 and I'll read this sentence. "Since this is a unit price contract the final actual cost will also depend on the growth and the number of tonnes generated and the number of locations in the service area."

Councillors this is for the autobin sections. As you know there has been a problem in the autobin section when people who have no right to use the City autobins are using them. They're coming in from other areas. They're dumping loads from other places. We've had phone calls with regard to that that have occurred that have told us they saw this certain contractor dump building materials, they saw this certain person that they knew lived outside the City limits dumping stuff in their autobins down their back lanes. We know of those problems.

Right here it says the cost will depend on the growth in the number of tonnes generated and the number of locations in the service area. That means if there is more to be picked up there is more that we are going to be paying the contractor. And I think we have to seriously look at whether there is actually going to be any savings at all in the autobin pick-up area.

That's why there is more policing of that because we are trying to ensure and get at those people but we don't have staff to stand at every autobin and inspect what's going in there and ensure that only the people who live in the area have the right to put stuff in the autobin. And I'm going to suggest that it's not going to come in at, under budget as is guesstimated here.

I would say that the pre-tender estimate and even the tender estimate that has come in is a pretence and that we are actually going to end up and find at the end of the year when the costs are put in that there's been more money then we've estimated on. So please look at that clause there because it's very clear to me that it's only a guess of what it will be, be there.

So I can't, can't support this. I can't support paying more money for refuse collection. I can't support us contracting out and not using our City personnel for this and I can't support estimates that are really going to change at the end when we find the costs down the road.

So I would like you to seriously look at this clause. I brought it up at Executive Policy Committee level and I was told by the administration, oh no that is with regard to clause 3 it isn't with regard to clause 4. So I looked very carefully with regard to it and it is with regard to clause 4. It is with regard to the autobins. And the person who told me that it wasn't was wrong because it's right here in the clause. And I can see it. Please turn to page 5040 and you will see it too. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker I can't support this proposed contract. You know I believe that if the people who pick up the garbage in our City should be paid a liveable wage. That's the issue.

I don't want to be a slummy employer. I don't think the City of Winnipeg should be a slummy employer. I think we should pay wages to people so they can live. Not substandard wages. And that's what we do when we have the private sector in this situation. So I cannot support this contract on that basis. I want a liveable wage paid.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to also speak to this item. I've spoken to it before like others. One of the concerns that I automatically see when I look at the report before us today is the fact that yes we are awarding the contract to, by the looks of it on face value, the lowest bidder. Having said that though now it's my understanding that this company will have a number of contracts throughout the City with regards to garbage collection. And the issue of a monopoly comes up.

But the other issue that has been raised by some colleagues on Council here is the fact that they are also in the garbage collection business or not the garbage collection but the garbage disposal business with the fact that they have their own disposal site in the Rural Municipality of Rosser. And the concern rises with regards to the estimate of the gross savings from the analysis provided in the report is that we are deducting for the forecasting, forecast spending in 2005 with regards to manual autobin, with regards to this contract, we are deducting less landfill tipping fees.

And the question I would have right now Mr. Speaker and I think is a real concern specifically considering the fact that the nearest bidder is not that much out compared to this contract is that exactly how much less now we are going to be making in our tipping fees? Considering the fact that the garbage could be hauled to their own BFI landfill and collected and put there and that would be a direct savings to that company versus having to dispose of the garbage at Brady Landfill and us collecting our tipping fees.

And I think that's a real question considering the fact that based on this report before us today the actual savings with regards to one versus one company and another is just, there is about $136,000, $132,000 dollars difference in the contract with regards to that. My concern Mr. Speaker is how quickly would that be eaten up in tipping fees and exactly what are the real tipping fee numbers we are going to be getting? Are we going to be seeing as part of our future fiscal reports that we have actually on the Fiscal Issues agenda here, are we going to be seeing now under the department of Public Works future financial shortfalls with regards to the tipping fees at the Brady Landfill because of these decisions made here in Council?

And I think that has not been addressed in this report. And I think that's a serious issue because it's based on the entire assumption made in this report that there is a $2.7 million dollar savings. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker, it's over here now but I just wanted to start off by saying to my honourable friend and colleague from Mynarski that had he waited I probably could have used that autobin speech in my closing debate because I know it by heart, I've heard it so many times now. But I do appreciate him putting the comments back on the record again for the time, I haven't even been able to count the times anymore Mr. Speaker. But it's always an enjoyable story that someday his grandchildren will probably be bobbing on his knee asking "grandpa please tell us about the autobin story you were in" because he wouldn't want to tell them about the prostitutes on Selkirk Avenue that was his earlier issue years before autobins because he went out and personally fixed that problem Mr. Speaker.

But getting back to the, to the two clauses Mr. Speaker the reports are here and the information has been provided. As I said when I opened debate on the clauses the savings on the contracts was $2.7 million

dollars a year over what we are currently paying. I'm not able to say why the reports couldn't have predicted in April when they were written what might happen in October when we are actually dealing with a specific contract and maybe those reports could have been changed but then I wouldn't want to be hearing about reports being doctored after the fact to suit somebody's agenda.

So the reports that were written as far as, insofar as the ASD business plan were concerned which have been now approved by this Council are what they are and they were based on the best estimates that administrative staff could provide with the information that was available at the time.

The comparison between the contract costs and the current City costs are based on actual work. Not based on somebody's dream of what might be. They are based on actual work. The same kind of work that is performed today by, by our staff under the collective agreement and under our legislation is the work that will be performed by the contractor under these contracts and that's what you compare the numbers on Mr. Speaker.

We could make all kinds of pie in the sky projections I suppose if we went on what ifs for everything. But we don't do that. You base your, you base your cost of work on the actual work that is being done and the actual work that will done in March is the same type of work that is currently being done by our forces today. So that's the, and those are the facts. That's how you, that's how you do your cost comparisons.
I guess we are today as we were a couple or three months ago, it's, for some it's an ideological sort of debate, contracting out versus, versus in-house, Mr. Speaker. I think we all went through those debates. We've had them now I think three Council meetings in a row, both with the policy discussion we had in July, with the contract in the northeast last month, and now with the south contracts. I'm not going to get into that any, any further.

I made some comments on the general policy discussion back in July. I indicated last month that insofar as the contracting out collection is concerned that in my part of the City in the northwest quadrant of the City the change took place and I don't think anybody saw the difference. The service was provided. It was provided as efficiently and as effectively as possible. And it's one area of service I do get very, very few complaints about personally from my own constituents.

So in summing up Mr. Speaker, I'll just simply commend both of these clauses for Council's support so that we can make the changes that were mandated by the policy change last July.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. All in favour of clause 3.

Councillor Gerbasi: A recorded vote please.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote has been asked. All in favour of clause 3 please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 6.

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried.

Vote on clause 4 recorded. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 6.

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried.

Motions, none. By-laws, none. Questions of Public Works. Councillor Wyatt.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. As reported now that our Graffiti Policy is going to be coming forward in December for consideration of Council with regards to the issue having a comprehensive city-wide graffiti plan to remove graffiti. I just want a clarification, this is what I read again in the paper, is this correct?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I, I don't know what was in the paper but and I think Councillor Wyatt asked me a question at the last meeting and I apologize, I forgot to provide a response but I do believe that the finishing touches are being put on a report. It hasn't gone through the system yet but I'm anticipating that they're targeting for December thereabouts, to have something come forward. So I apologize, I had meant to provide that answer before now.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, thank you Mr. Speaker and thank you Councillor Eadie. The, it was, it's been some time since the Councillors had a chance for input on this. It was I think in June or July or '04. Would it be possible to have input again into this prior to the report being finalized and brought forward? You know, seeing that we may be breaking new ground here, I'm not sure but would that be possible?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I'm not sure of the process here but normally a report would come and after being signed off by the CAO would come to the Standing Committee. If the, if it works in that process that the Standing Committee was of a mind it could certainly stand it down and perhaps arrange for a seminar or something. At least there would be a seminar on the document and if there was some will on the part of, collectively on the part of Councillors to make some changes, I'm sure that could happen in terms of providing more input. But I'm not sure whether it could happen before the report actually is signed off by the CAO and comes forward.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Final supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, just on that point, is it possible, either through a Council seminar or a briefing at the Standing Committee, where all Councillors could be invited, to get a briefing on the work done so far and exactly the direction or what's being considered early on before a report is issued? Could that be done in the next month?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question under advisement and do some checking with the, with the administration before I give a definitive answer on that. We could be certainly flexible but I don't want to start providing answers that are incorrect.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie, also on the graffiti issue. I read in the paper as did the 8,000 members of Winnipeg Business Improvement Zones that there is a motion which will have the responsibility to clean up graffiti go to business owners or some change in that whole process in any case, and I realize it's just a motion that's not complete. But would it be possible to consult with in some way in this process, the businesses that would be affected by this? Because they just keep reading stuff in the paper that alarms them without having any information and I'm just wondering if there is going to be some process to include the people affected by the changes that are being considered at the Policy Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I'm not responsible for what's written in the paper so I don't, I'm not going to respond directly because whatever they write, they write. I'm not aware of any motion coming forward. I haven't seen a motion here and I haven't seen one at Committee that I can recall.

Certainly whenever the report comes forward there is opportunities and I think we can make opportunities to get input if it hasn't already been provided by the so-called stakeholders in it. So I don't have any problem with doing that Mr. Speaker but I'm not going to respond to what's written in the paper.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor.

Councillor Eadie: Those kind of questions are out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Moving on to the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues, the report of October 11th, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED OCTOBER 11, 2005

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I'm pleased to bring forward the report of Fiscal Issues for October the 11th and move clauses 1 and 2 as Consent.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 2 is asked to be stood down.

On clause 1.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause 2 madam clerk.

Item No. 2 – Deficit Avoidance – Transfer of Funds from Snow Clearing Reserve Fund File F-1

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement did you wish to introduce the clause?

Councillor Clement: Maybe I can find out who asked for it to be set aside and they can speak to it and then I'll clarify anything that they don't understand.

Mr. Speaker: That's fine. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to this item, or stood it down for the very reason that you know that we could just simply approve this and let it go through but I think it warrants a discussion with regards to the fact that we're taking from what I understand that this is approved and if the decision is made, we're taking the last funds from the Snow Clearing Reserve Fund and applying it to our bottom line here so that we can balance the books and based on the fact that we had a lot a snow.

And from what I understand the budget in 2005 for snow clearing was $14.1 million, the cost to date or $18.9 million and the projected cost to the end of the year are $23.5 million. So $23.5 million represents a $9.5 million dollar overrun with regards to the snow removal budget for 2005.

And it strikes at the heart Mr. Speaker of you know the fact that we seem to always do this at this time of year, take money out of our reserves to balance our books because we didn't accurately budget in the first place what we should be budgeting for these items. And I think that strikes to the very heart of this issue and the heart of this debate and hopefully the heart of this discussion we'll have.

That if we, every year that I've been on Council so far it seems that we don't have a proper budget passed. And I don't know how that's possible. We're always struggling at this time of year, giving edicts to the departments not to spend money on this and that or to freeze hiring's and to basically manage in a form of a crisis so that we can come in on budget.

And I have a concern with regards to that because to me that is not accurate budgeting. That is not you know we are not coming forward. If anything we should be budgeting in a safe and conservative manner and at the end of the year talking about surpluses and exactly where we should be putting the monies or setting them aside in the reserves.

For awhile we were doing that with regards to just our snow budget until we decided to start to reduce the size of the snow budget because the reserve was growing and then all of a sudden wham we got hit with some years with some snow, believe it or not, in Winnipeg.

And now we're hearing from our administration that we should be budgeting around $19 million roughly a year with regards to the snow clearing budget. And we budgeted last year for this year $14 million. That's $19 million based on past spending that has occurred over the last number of years and taking an average of that for snow clearing.

Mr. Speaker, it's clear that you can look at last year's budget variances and there is not a lot of difference actually. A lot of it is the snow. It's the Police overtime. It's the photo radar. It seems to be the same issues coming up over and over and over again from year to year. So the question is where is the accountability within our budgeting process?

And why are we being asked now to raid our Snow Clearing Reserve, where there will be no more monies left and who knows what position that's going to put us in, when we still all of a sudden EPC pulls a rabbit out of a hat at the end of the year and balances the books? And we are, we have no more deficit by pulling out the reserves by raiding the reserves, by doing these sorts of things.

Maybe we don't need to take the $3.3 million dollars at this point I guess is what I'm saying to this Council. Maybe we don't need to give EPC the authority to take $3.3 million dollars out of the Snow Clearing Reserve at this point. Because that rabbit, we don't know how big that rabbit is they're going pull out of the hat, you know, come the end of the year. And maybe there is other ways that we could find these funds.

We set up the Snow Clearing Reserve Fund Mr. Speaker, which is what we are here discussing about, to give authority to EPC to take those monies out. We're here, we set that up to be there in case we needed it. Now we've raided it a number of years in a row. We're now reducing it to zero. If I saw that we as a Council were realistically budgeting for our snow clearing, as we should be, I could possibly support this, taking the money out.

Because I know that if we have a slightly lower than average snow clearing, snowfall year, if we're budgeting correctly there will be net revenues, or net proceeds going into the Snow Reserve. At this point I know we're not and we're depleted the reserve completely and there's a good chance, well it's hard to say you know, you know unless we can't know what the winter is going to be like coming up, but based on past snow clearing performances of what the City on average has spent, there is a good chance we are under, if we budget what we budgeted this year we're going to be under again.

So I have a concern with that and I have a concern with the budgeting process that's gone on here with the, in the last three years and the fact that we're now once again looking at a, our total forecasted General Revenue Fund deficit of $17 million. And the question comes up is when we as a Council are going to start to have a realistic discussion with regards to budgeting?

And I appreciate it and I want to thank and use this opportunity Mr. Speaker to thank the Mayor for telephoning myself on Friday, and I understand he might of, he's also called other Councillors, to talk briefly with regards to our budget priorities, and it was a short conversation but nevertheless appreciated. I think we have to do more of that. I think we have to do more working together as a Council, as a group with regards to this setting our priorities and our strategies for the future.

I want to thank for that opportunity but at the same time, I want it to be said that the realistic discussion we need to have here is that we know we're going to have a real problem coming up here and that this is directly part of that. The $17 million dollar shortfall is part of the fact that we've now had basically eight or nine years of budget freezes and we've accomplished it through a variety of means. We know what we are talking about. We're talked, we accomplished it through either freezes or cuts, through deferring services, selling off Manitoba Hydro and taking the revenues from that. But we reduced our debt and deferred that debt saving cost and financing costs to our budget. Raiding reserves once and awhile and now we're seeing that basically this issue is kind of catching up with us now.

And I think the discussion has to happen about whether or not we actually have a tax increase. And I think that's an honest discussion that has to happen because what we're facing here today. And I don't hear that coming out of EPC or that discussion coming out of EPC at this point.

But just to put it into perspective we have a $400 million dollar payroll and we're giving tax, were giving increases in payrolls of about 3 to 3-1/2%, that's $12 million dollars plus a year, alone in payroll increases. A 2% property tax increase, let's say if it's in line with the rate of inflation, would bring in approximately $8 million dollars a year. The question is why at this time we are not discussing that has to be put forward because I think there is an obligation.

I realize that's politically difficult but I can tell you right now that any business person receiving increasing costs to their business always tries to find ways to save money or adjust to hold their margins. And we're not holding our margins. We are shrinking. We're, we're, the noose is tightening and the question has to be, if we are finding ways to save money great but they also, you know, not even mentioning the other increase in costs Mr. Speaker, the costs of doing business, the cost of asphalt going up, the cost of gasoline, when you start factoring that in the number just grows exponentially.

And we are hearing now that we are going to have a $35 to $45 million dollar shortfall for next year, the question must be begged Mr. Speaker, what is the priority of Council? I think part of the problem is that we're on this kick of also reducing the business taxes and now the question is how do we continue to, how can we raise realty taxes for residential and commercial and we are also reducing business taxes. I think this is an honest discussion that has to happen. It's not happening and…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel moves extension.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm of the opinion Mr. Speaker where we, it's our obligation to get off of this, this, this freeze mentality when all of our other costs are going up and to start realistically budgeting.

Nobody wants to see us to go back of course to tax increases Mr. Speaker of 7, 8, 10, double-digit percentages which occurred back in the late '80's and early '90's, nobody wants to see that. But everybody knows that in the last six years

we've eaten 18% inflation and that Mr. Speaker on top of our other rising costs we have an obligation and a duty to our citizens to have this discussion to know exactly what we are doing before we start raiding more reserves.

Because that's what we're doing here, we are raiding reserves to balance the budget and that can go on for a little while, it's been going on too long. And that's why I can't support this. I challenge EPC to have this discussion, this realistic discussion and to bring forward a budget coming up here that will actually and sell a budget that will actually work and be sustainable. Not something that's unsustainable and that's the direction we've been heading. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether I'm going to support this clause or not. I'm going to put some queries on the floor for the chair of Fiscal Issues.

And you know as a newly elected Councillor I have never dealt with the budget process before hands-on and I've asked for information on the different reserves that the City has in its disposal. And it seems to me that when it comes to deficit avoidance that reading the policies of the different reserves, we have stabilization reserves that we can use and perhaps I'm misinterpreting some of the policy here and I'd like to hear from the chair the, an explanation of why we wouldn't use the stabilization reserves which have some $60 million dollars into them and at the same time maintain our Snow Clearing Reserve.

And I'd also like to know from the chair why it was that last year where we actually had a policy that we couldn't raid this reserve in the fashion that we are raiding it today, that we had to change the policy, eliminate the previous reserve and establish a new reserve that allowed us to go and take all this money basically leaving zero dollars and zero cents in the Snow Clearing Reserve.

So Mr. Speaker, I hope to get some further explanation from, from the chair of Fiscal Issues as to what other resources are at our disposal and why this particular resource was chosen for deficit avoidance. And I would also like to hear, as it would appear that as Councillor Wyatt has mentioned that we've had some poor fiscal management practices in the previous years that we haven't done careful budgeting and that we haven't targeted for real cost.

As a matter of fact it's been suggested that even though in years, in the last 10 years I believe it was seven of the 10 years, we were putting money into the reserves for snow clearing that we were in fact under-budgeting for average snowfalls. And if that's the case then how do we get to a correct level of budgeting and how do we begin to create this reserve so we are fully protected in the future?

As we all know this, this, this City and this Council have benefited greatly from no tax increases and actually tax decreases in some of the last six to eight years, I don't know what the exact number of years, but for quite a number of years. But if in fact we were, we were sort of robbing Peter to pay Paul at the end of the day it wasn't the wisest fiscal practice not to be addressing inflation and not to maintaining certain standards for the quality of life of our citizens then how can we address that this year without raising taxes which nobody wants to do?

So I will leave those as my comments and hopefully the chair of Fiscal Issues will be able to bring me some, a little further clarity on those particular items.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: That's interesting.

Mr. Speaker: Your clock is ticking.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I must represent a kind of a unique area because I can tell you that if I went door to door telling people that I was going to raise taxes I wouldn't have a

chance in my area. You know. And I guess it's different elsewhere, I don't know.

First of all to get to the actual nuts of the issue here on, and I'll try to deal with Councillor Wyatt's comments first. First of all when we are dealing with a shortfall we have to deal with it by the November Council meeting. You don't deal with it in December because they need a little timing. There are things that actually have to happen administratively. And if you wait until December it's a little tough or they'd be doing them on Christmas Eve. And so these corrections, whatever they might be, whatever recommendations are going to come forward, usually come forward in the October/November timeframe.

This one appeared to be a no-brainer to the Finance Committee or Fiscal Committee. The balance of whatever is going to come will come and if there is in fact a shortfall, when we get there, the fact is Councillor Swandel that the Mill Rate Stabilization Reserve, the Fiscal Stabilization Reserve were in fact created for that purpose. Okay. You're not raiding them, that's why they were created in the first place as was recommended by our bond readers. So they're there.

By the way, 10 years ago there wasn't very much money in them. In fact we hadn't even created them yet. And today even though we've been absorbing all these numbers and while we've been cutting taxes or having zero tax increases, we've managed to somehow put $35 million dollars in the Fiscal Stabilization Reserve and $26 million dollars in the Mill Rate Stabilization Reserve.

I don't know how we managed to do that and cut taxes or cut taxes and then on top of that reduce debt by 46% at the same time. Some kind of magical wizardry. It wasn't. It was pretty good, pretty good budgeting as a matter of fact. That's what was going on. It was very careful budgeting for the most part.

In terms of snow. First of all some of what Councillor Wyatt suggested was accurate. In 1997, we spent $23 million dollars on snow removal. We had a lot of snow that year. So it was discussed and decided we'd have a Snow Reserve and we would put surpluses from each year into that reserve. And then he went on to talk about what happened last year that we had to pull some money out of it and this year we're suggesting that we take the balance of the $3.3, but he skipped over 1998 to 2003, when we budgeted it exactly the same and with the same data as we did in 2005 and 2004 and 1997 for that matter.

The data is 10 year averages that the administration uses. We don't tell them what number to put in by the way. Sure we can adjust it but it's not played with very much I can tell you. A couple hundred thousand here or there maybe. But the number has always been in and around the $14 million dollar range. I don't know where the $19 million dollar number came from I've never heard it before it. Never once heard that number before for snow removal but I'm sure that somebody that knows what's going on must have given it to Councillor Wyatt. I'm sure he just didn't pick that out of the sky.

But the fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, that 1998 through 2003, somehow magically with this careless budgeting somehow something over $10 million dollars wound up in the Snow Reserve. I wonder where it came from if we were budgeting so terrible.

I mean you can do whatever you want with numbers Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, is that we typically over the last number of years, and I'm going 10 or 15 years back, the average data shows that our costs are in the $14 million dollar range. In fact they used to be about $13. They might be getting a little more now too. They might be, maybe that number is going to move on us a little bit. We're always building new streets and things like that.

But the fact of the matter is that those 10 year averages are what the administration uses and they plug the number. And I can tell you that the number that they plugged last year wasn't altered one

dollar. Nor was it altered the year before. We plugged whatever number they had and those that was their best recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: The Mayor moves extension.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Clement: They bottom line is is that we have about a $17 million dollar issue. That's no secret. Every time that, that we, excuse me, have a meeting we get an update on where we are for the year. And you know people can take whatever shots they want at the process and what the numbers are. Some of them are frustrating things to deal with.

I guess that when the Police department looked into photo radar and gave us all of the data Mr. Speaker, that came from every other city that had ever had it, but they were lying to us. They must have been lying to us because the data that they gave us just hasn't, hasn't proven to be accurate in Winnipeg. I don't know why. I haven't got an idea why. But every other city that had photo radar had data. They took that data, they gave us the numbers and they said this is our best recommendation based on the best information that we can come up with.
And we've chiselled away at the number, and chiselled away at the number trying to figure out what the right number is. And it's a little scary by the way because the cost of operating photo radar is around $8 million and guess what our revenues are pretty close to that. And last year we budgeted a higher number. This year we budgeted a lower number. It's still too high. We're not sure. We keep getting different information as to well you know we're going to add more cameras, so let's leave it here, you know.

So you take the best advice you get from administration when you are developing these budgets. They're based on long-term data. They're not just pulled out of the sky. And you know, it's interesting it's always, you know, I guess you know if somebody else can do better you know, but for the last 10 years we've had one tax increase of 1.5%. We've had six zeros and we've had three minus twos. And during that time we've cut taxes, or it has to be, we've cut our tax supported debt by 46%.

Hydro wasn't part of that by the way, in fact selling Hydro cost us money. We were taking $23 to $24 million dollars a year, plus they were doing our Christmas lights and a number of other things, that we lost when we sold Winnipeg Hydro to Manitoba Hydro. And that money is not there anymore. And so we took a hit. We didn't get a surplus or some big amount of money dropped on us when we sold Hydro. That did not happen. What we did do was we got out of a long-term, huge liability that our bond raters were nervous about and our banks were nervous about. That's what really happened.

So you know you can take these things the way you want. The bottom line is is that we can either take this $3.3 million dollars this month or we can take it next month Mr. Speaker. The bottom line is we are going to wind up taking it because we've got a $17 million dollar problem and that's why we created the fund.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Question on the clause.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions none. By-laws Councillor Clement.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Clement: I just have to bring my computer back up Mike because it shut off on me and I'll be just a second here. Here we go. Yeah I know.

I'll move By-law No. 7710/2000 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: No you won't.

Councillor Clement: No.

Mr. Speaker: 177/2005 perhaps.

Councillor Clement: Oh sorry. I'm looking at the second one.

Okay I'll move 177/2005 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 177/2005.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 177/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 177/2005.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law, that By-law be, that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 177/2005 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 Clement: I'll happily take questions.

Mr. Speaker: Questions of the chair. Councillor Swandel and Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to use Question Period as an opportunity to have Councillor Clement clarify, or perhaps I can help clarify with a bit of a preamble here in the original question.

My question wasn't to suggest that Councillor Clement should be knocking door to door, there's a word, conducting a survey on whether or not he was nuts to raise taxes. My, my inferred question was to find out if there are other mechanisms behind, besides using the reserves or raising taxes or besides using that particular reserve in order to address what appears to be some pending fiscal doom that's in front of us. We keep hearing about it almost every...

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Are there other methods Councillor?

Councillor Clement: No. We have a Snow Reserve that we are allowed to use for snow debt and it turns out that the, the issue that they budget for snow this year, or the amount that we're spending is more than $3.3 million than what we budgeted therefore we can in fact move that money.

When we get to the end of the year the two accounts are the Fiscal Stabilization Reserve and the Mill Rate Stabilization Reserve that we can deal with if we have an issue. Or if you'd like we could carry it into next year's budget but we don't do that anymore.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker to pick-up on the discussion previously and my preamble is this. Would the fact that we are now under, we are hearing that we are going to have a $35 to $45 million dollar shortfall to, with regards to our Current Budget for 2006 and this is, well this is what was passed on to me, that's what they're saying, this is what it is, whatever the shortfall is. And now we know we have a $17 million dollar shortfall for this year, which is up from this time last year.

My question would be, knowing that all these costs are going up, knowing that our payroll is going up anywhere from $12 million plus, knowing that our costs for gasoline are going up and asphalting, is Fiscal Issues and is EPC and the Mayor going forward Mr. Chairman, going forward on the basis of formulating a budget based on a tax freeze for 2006 or are you contemplating looking at an inflation based tax increase?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Yeah, thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all I've never heard the numbers $35 million to $45 million. It doesn't mean that somebody's not saying that or that somebody hasn't said it to Councillor Wyatt. I haven't heard that

number. I don't know where it comes from.

Secondly, while it's true there is a $17 million dollar shortfall, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is is that we do have, or we have had more snow removal than what was normal. We had two huge storms this summer. One that created a lot a problem in your back yard frankly and they are still cleaning it up. And I'm talking about the huge amount of money that in forestry that nobody can budget for something like that.

Although there were increases in fuel added to the budget last year we've had I think a few blips and I don't think too many normal people have budgeted that up-front in their household budgets and those types of things. Fuel went real high and it went real high for a number of reasons that I'm not going to pretend to understand but I know that some of it at least had to do with the hurricanes in the States and so on. Bottom line is is that the budgets that were created were based on the best information that we had and we thought they were pretty solid.

The answer to the last part is, I honestly don't know what's going to happen with that Russ. And the reason I don't know is because as I remembered Monday, next Wednesday the various Committees are restructured and frankly, I don't know who the chairman of Fiscal Issues is going to be or any other chairman is going to be at that moment in time, and frankly I haven't had any discussions in relation to same with anybody. I haven't had a meeting with any staff people, nobody. I haven't talked to the Mayor about that.

So I assume that once those things are cleared up next week that those types of discussions will take place. And then subsequent to that I will probably be able to answer you next month if you ask the same question.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, Mr. Speaker, so basically from what I understand you're indicating, and I want to just get a clarification on this, that there has been no instruction, absolutely no instruction given by yourself or members of EPC to administration to work on and come forward with a budget based on a 0% tax increase? There has been no instruct, none of that work has occurred to date?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I'm not going to tell you that no work has occurred to date because the administration starts dealing with the budget as far back as July and August most of the time, I believe. Where the Chief Administrative Officer and Chief Financial Officer and some of the directors get together and that's when they start formulating next year's documents.

But there has been no direction from Fiscal Issues on that matter. It hasn't been discussed at Fiscal Issues. And unless there was a meeting called that I'm not aware of at EPC and I can't remember missing one, there hasn't been any direction from EPC on budget either.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Final supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, my last question pertains to a tax increase city-wide and whether what the direction was on that.

My next question Mr. Speaker is, has there been any direction given to administration to come forward with the budget based on the promise made to continue and to extend the business tax cut city-wide?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: My, well first, the first part of that answer is no there hasn't been any discussions about anything. But I think if you recall last year, the Mayor's program on that was to reduce the business taxes in the core area of the City or the downtown by a percentage last year and to bring everybody else in step with that reduction two years out which is 2007. So it wouldn't be discussed for 2006, there's no requirement for it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. What you want a second round? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm sorry I didn't realize that we were rolling the carpets up at ten after 4:00 but anyway Mr. Speaker, in the budget variance before us today we have $3.2 million dollars under the Police department expenses are anticipated to be over budget due to higher overtime costs as a result of increased operational challenge and calls for service and other costs. This is a continuation from last year where we under-budgeted for the overtime for Police.

My question would be with the announcement of, and I welcome the announcement of Operation Clean, Street Clean or Clean Sweep, thank you, Clean Sweep, you got to get the broom, get everybody involved, and with that announcement are we, are you planning to incur the costs for that through the numbers that we see before us today? Has that been part of the numbers before us today with the work that is, that has gone on there?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: The Police overtime number is approximately $3.2 to $3.5 million dollars of the $17 million dollar number. And my recollection was that based on what they actually spent last year we actually gave them an increase of about a million and a half dollars over '04 for overtime.

But I think that if you talk to Chief Ewatski he'd answer you pretty honestly that it wouldn't matter what number we plug there it's never going to be accurate because they never know what's going to come up. When they are in the middle of, I don't care whether it's them or whether it's a Paramedic or pick one, I mean if they're at the end of their shift and then all of a sudden they are involved in some sort of an issue they have to stay and finish it up. So that creates overtime.

And I don't know how you ever deal with that appropriately but we do plug a number. We plug one based on what we thought would be the best, once again the best information we had and we increased it be a million and a half dollars, is my recollection.

As far as the other $800,000 dollars, I think the number is that I heard, first of all that money would, is nothing to do with '05 as I understand it. I don't believe that there is any cost issues with 2005 given that the program is going to be implemented late in the year or at least it was announced that it was going to start. I'm not sure exactly when the implementation is. I wasn't at the press conference.

I'd also like to point out of course the Mayor is out there and maybe somebody wants to stand up and go and talk to some microphone somewhere and tell everybody that it's a terrible idea to maybe try to do something about this issue.

But the fact of the matter is is that until that report actually comes through EPC and into this Council chamber the amount of money that's required has to get past here. So there's been a press conference. If somebody doesn't like what they've heard they can vote against it when it gets here I guess. But it will be in next year's budget.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: So just to make clarification then, you're suggesting that $800,000 dollars is the cost and that this will be reflected in next year's budget increasing the Police budget by $800,000 for additional resources on top of their existing budget?

Councillor Clement: Councillor Wyatt based on my knowledge of the press conference and the amounts of money that I am hearing about, I believe that's accurate.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Final supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Final supplemental is that a recent motion was passed at EPC

about service based budgeting. I'm just wondering if you can give us a bit of background on that Councillor Clement and what the, where that is going?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Hopefully to a real good ending. Service based budgeting is nothing new. It's a, I guess what we would like to do and we're I think that that what it is all about frankly Councillor Wyatt is what all your questioning is about. You'd like to see our budget documents as they roll out over the course of the year be reflective of what we actually budgeted. So would I and so would the Mayor and so would other members of EPC I guess, and hopefully everybody in this room would like to see that. And that's what that type of budgeting supposedly will provide us with. And in the past frankly it has.

We've had some difficulty in the last couple of years but prior to that we wound up with surpluses. Although in a couple of cases when we were in the middle of the summer like we just came out of, we had shortfalls, we went into deficit avoidance initiatives and we got out of them.
In other cases we wound up with surpluses because of other corporate things that changed that worked in our favour. You know these things happen from time to time and sometimes you get lucky, sometimes you've got to work a little harder to solve them. But the, what this is about is trying to reflect numbers that are as close to the best as we can play our cards. That's all it is.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Clement. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. When I had asked the, through you to the chair before about other mechanisms to address funding issues, I'd hoped that he would get the talking away from property tax and reserves and start talking about new funding sources such as the Federal and Provincial government and things like gas tax. When we started talking before the New Deal, gas tax deal was to be done with the Province as well as the Feds.

I'd like to know from the chair of Fiscal Issues if there is any ongoing conversations with the Province about increased revenues from the Province to the City to help with our infrastructure issues?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well first of all I'm always happy to talk about new funding. If you've got any ideas my door is open. The gas tax Councillor Swandel was dealing with Capital not Current. Although our Capital is cash so I suppose you could blend it somewhat somewhere if you wanted to but I think that their intent is that we spend that money on infrastructure and that's certainly my hope that we spend all of that money on infrastructure. So there isn't any issues there.

In terms of the Province of Manitoba, I'm not privy to the direct discussions, the one on one issues that go on over there. Usually those are held between the Mayor and his EA and the Premier and his EA. Sometimes they are done through Inter-Governmental Affairs but although I would be happy to give Minister Selinger some sage advice and explain to him that we could use a little bit more money at the same time he's never invited me over for a chat.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Thank you Councillor Swandel.

Secretariat Committee.

**REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 17, 2005**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt moves the report of October 17th.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

And Councillor Pagtakhan moves adjournment.

Roll Call.

ROLL CALL

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

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 4:18 P.M.