COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday November 23, 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 Lazarenko.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have pages with us today, Elaine Manipol of Kildonan East Collegiate, who resides in Transcona ward and we have Michael Dwilow, I hope I pronounced that correctly, of Fort Richmond Collegiate, who is a resident of St. Norbert ward. On behalf of all members of Council welcome this morning.

And just before we proceed further I just want to say to all of you my thanks for electing me to this position. I hope that I'm not going to regret it after today but I appreciate your confidence in this job. It's been a while since I've sat in this chair and I hope that, I hope that I won't let you down and we'll still be able to have vigorous debate and orderly debate.

And I appreciate the work of my predecessor Councillor O'Shaughnessy who was, who did a good job in guiding our deliberations over the past five or six years, I think it is, so but thank you for that.

We have guests with us today. A presentation to be made by Ian Neville, President of the Canadian Public Works Association, Manitoba Chapter, to a presentation to His Worship Mayor Katz with regard to a CPWA award. Mr. Neville.

Mr. Ian Neville: Mr. Mayor and members of City Council, special guests, staff, ladies and gentlemen. And it's my pleasure as President of the Canadian Public Works Association to be here this morning to recognize the City of Winnipeg's achievements during National Public Works Week. And speaking of public works I made a note that flying in here last night I see that winter is already upon you, so I get a first taste. Coming from the banana belt of Niagara we haven't quite seen it yet but I'm sure it's coming shortly.

By way of some history on National Public Works, just a brief spin of it. It had its beginnings really in the Oval Office of the late President John F. Kennedy. And it was his vision to create a greater appreciation for the importance of public works and the contribution that public works practitioners made to the quality of life of our communities and the citizens who live in those communities. As you know National Public Works Week is now celebrated across North America under the auspices of both the American Public Works Association and the Canadian Public Works Association.

The award itself is intended to recognize outstanding National Public Works Week programs and initiatives that encourage community engagement and education that lead to a more informed public and citizenry that better appreciate not only the value of where their taxes are being spent particularly in the public works area but also to recognize the skill sets and the quality of the staff and the practitioners that provide those services.

Being judged the best in Canada is not an easy achievement. This is not only requires dedicated staff and volunteers working long and hard on organizing the events, it also requires political leadership who champion public works initiatives not only during Public Works Week but obviously throughout the year. And I think it's pretty evident that Winnipeg does that and more.

Winnipeg's 2005 National Public Works Week outreach initiatives, the education programs, the scope of community

involvement, the broad participation by union and non-union staff, the charitable initiatives to assess, to assist those less fortunate in the community, were simply exceptional and have been judged by the Canadian Public Works Association as the best in Canada for population centres greater than 150,000.

On behalf of the Canadian Public Works Association I congratulate you Mayor Katz, your City Council, all you City staff, the volunteers upon their achievements. And I would like to make a presentation to you in recognition of this award.

(Applause)

Mayor Katz: Mr. Neville it certainly is a pleasure on behalf of the City of Winnipeg to accept this award. I would like to thank all the dedicated professionals we have working in our Public Works Department. It's because of your hard work and passion, and your commitment to our City that we have been recognized by the Canadian Public Works Association.

There is nothing quite like receiving recognition from your work, from your peers and I want to thank Ian Neville, President of the CPWA, Randy Borsa, Tony Esposito, Stan Siu, Terry Welling-Skorodenski, Brian Graham and Bill Larkin for making our City proud. Thank you all very, very much. You earned it.

(Applause)

MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: We have a motion of condolence with regard to our late colleague Magnus Eliason. Could we have a motion read, I'll read it, that's okay.

Motion
Moved by Councillor Lazarenko,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor Magnus Eliason which occurred on November 11, 2005.

Mr. Eliason served the citizens of Winnipeg as Alderman for Ward 2 and Councillor for the Bannatyne and Redboine Wards for various terms between 1968 and 1989.

This Council extends to his companion Betty Laing and his brother Frank, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask all members and the gallery to rise for a moment of silence please.

Motion
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

THAT Councillor Thomas be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to illness.

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

We have delegations appearing before Council on a number of items on the agenda.

Councilor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I don't know if you moved the minutes of the last meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Oh I'm sorry.

MINUTES

Councillor Wyatt moves the Minutes of the meetings held on October 26, 2005 and November 2, 2005 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Now, there I am. Do you have a point of order?

Councilor Wyatt: No, Mr. Speaker I rise to, with a motion to suspend the rules. It's come to my attention that there is a total of six individuals including two members of the Legislative Assembly who wish to speak today. I would, I hope the Council

will consider this now so that many of them have taken time out of their work schedules to be here to know whether or not they should stay. And I would move that motion.

Mr. Speaker: On which item?

Councillor Wyatt: Item number 3 of the EPC report of November the 16th and they are presenting in opposition. I've given a list of the presenters, the delegations to the Clerk, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If this is agreed to a maximum of five minutes, no questions, for the additional ones, if the Council agrees.

Councillor Wyatt then has moved that the rule be suspended to hear those additional six who are listed with the Clerk on that basis.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I too have three additional speakers on item 4 of the Executive Policy Committee. They recognize the issue may have changed a bit but they would still like to say a few words to Council, they're here and would like to know if they can speak. I have three people's names which I could give, I've submitted.

Mr. Speaker: I have the names. Same basis.

Councillor Gerbasi: Same basis would be fine.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of that motion? Opposed? Carried.

We will begin with those who are registered. The first delegations, Gail Asper and Glen Dyrda, on behalf of Manitoba Theatre Centre, opposition to clause 1 of the Fiscal Issues report of September 13th.

Mr. Glen Dyrda: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Your Worship, members of Council, thank you for allowing us to meet with you this morning. My name is Glen Dyrda and I'm the President of MTC's volunteer Board of Trustees. I'm here with the Past President and MTC supporter extraordinaire, Gail Asper to talk about the Entertainment Funding Tax.

As I explained at EPC last week, we are facing a cost of about $60,000 dollars with respect to our 2005-2006 Season. Funds that have not been collected from MTC subscribers who have purchased tickets to our season.

One of the difficulties that we have with this tax is that we sell subscriptions before we complete the casting of our plays. We do not collect the tax because we don't know whether it will even be applicable. As a result we can sometimes get caught in an interpretation of the rules that suggest that we are off-side with poorly defined local content requirements.

The interpretation of the rules that is being applied to MTC ignores the fact that we have costume designers, lighting technicians, sound technicians, set designers, carpenters and a host of other artisans, who are every bit as important to the success of our performances as the actors that you see on stage.

With respect, this narrow interpretation of the By-law seems patently unfair to theatre as an art form compared to other performing arts with different operating structures. We are a not-for-profit organization. We sometimes do business with for-profit organizations but nothing that we do is designed to make a profit.

We are fiscally responsible and we don't spend money that we don't have. In fact we've been forced to enter into co-production agreements with other theatre companies in order to keep our budgets in balance and we've done that willingly.

Yet the By-law penalizes MTC because we may deemed to be not directly holding a production simply because we involve a co-production partner. The By-law states, and I quote, "that listings for exemption from the tax are intended to assist locally based charitable and not-for-profit cultural organizations in producing entertainment

with admission prices at a level which will encourage a broad audience."

While we have different levels of pricing, we do have subscribers to our main stage that see six plays each year for the rock bottom price of $45 or about $7.50 per performance.

As I indicated, we don't agree with the interpretation of the limited local content rules to MTC's specific circumstances. Nevertheless, even if the more restrictive interpretation is applied the By-law further provides that Council in its discretion can exempt performances where in its opinion and again I quote "the limited local content will complement and enhance the ability of that organization to produce entertainment and attract a broad audience."

We have about 20,000 subscribers each and every season. As a volunteer in this community I cannot comprehend any interpretation of this By-law by Council that could suggest that our performances do not complement and enhance the ability of MTC to produce entertainment and to attract a broad audience.

The City's Red Tape Commission stated that after all Winnipeg's Entertainment Funding Tax is really not about arts funding. While the title implies otherwise section 20 is worded to give Council full discretion on what it does with the funds collected. Over half the taxes raised are remitted to sports facilities.

With this in mind it is time to abandon the pretense that the Entertainment Funding By-law is strictly an arts funding issue. Instead we must focus on the important over the urgent. We need to repair a By-law that is an embarrassment to the City and to its reputation as a great place to live, work and play. The experiment failed. It is time to end it.

Your Worship and members of Council you have acknowledged the flaws in this By-law and you plan to do something about it. Why wait for spring? Please support the proposed motion put forth by Councillor Swandel, seconded by Councillor Magnifico that was tabled at your June meeting. This motion was in support of exempting MTC's 2005-06 season in its entirety. We believe that it is the right thing to do.

Ms. Gail Asper: Well I think, Your Worship, and City Councillors and MTC subscribers and future subscribers and concerned citizens, Glen Dyrda has really said everything that needs to be said, so I want to say a couple of other things.

First of all fabulous Christmas tree outside. I saw it last night. It is magical. Kudos to whoever designed it. It just makes that street look great.

Second, what? Sorry?

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: God designed it.

Ms. Gail Asper: God designed it because the creator of all beauty and somebody at the City implemented it and thank heavens for that.

Thank you all for wearing your star pins. I know you probably just get them out because you knew I was going to be here, like my brothers do. Oh my gosh, Gail is coming, put your star pin on.

Third of all, I really just want to say, we volunteers and I've been a volunteer with MTC for 16 years. We volunteers get feted and rewarded and awarded all the time for what we do, which is exactly what you guys are doing, basically trying to improve the landscape of this City.

And although Councillor Clement and I may trade voicemails from time to time, that may seem acrimonious; the bottom line is I know you are all here trying to do exactly what we are trying to do. Improve the landscape of the City. And I don't think you should ever think that I forget that. That we are all rowing in the same direction and that is our greatest strength in this City. So thank you.

And finally a thank you to the work that you have done in enlightening and helping other arts groups who come to this Council needing help. You've shown great visionary leadership for our friends at Pantages and Burton Cummings and of

course Partners in the Park. And we're not here asking for a bailout. We're simply asking for an arbitrary and difficult law to be eliminated eventually but certainly to not apply to MTC.

As the campaign chair for the endowment campaign I can tell you that an amount even as, perhaps little to you is $60,000 dollars which is what we are arguing about right now I think, is a huge amount for a group like MTC. That's a heck of a lot of raffle tickets at Polo Park that somebody is going to have to sell and it simply isn't the pious and best use for our volunteers and our managers to be worrying about this law.

And I love the fact that your very own committee on Red Tape has very clearly stated that this law doesn't make sense. A City of our caliber, it's not appropriate. It's, it's, it's almost amateur night that you having a law like this, so people. You know we shouldn't have a law where people shake their head and say gosh this doesn't make sense. How can a business like MTC, a not-for-profit business but a business manage it's commodities, manage it's sales and everything with these kinds of laws?

Where I stand finally is that I don't look at the City as 20 different pots of cash for MTC. I look at you as one, one wonderful investor in this organization. We have Winnipeg Arts Council that gives MTC $200,000 dollars for core funding and they've got a 60, $40,000 dollar increase a few years ago, which is terrific when you, when that funding was increased. But then if this tax comes in it takes, not only does it take the $40,000 away it actually takes $20,000 more or even more money.

So we look at it it's like the City giving with one hand and then seeming to be investing in this organization but then taking with another. And I, I don't think that's the best way to appreciate an organization that puts on about 300 nights of theatre in the community each year, does the Fringe Festival.

You probably have no idea of the positive impact your help with groups like Partners in the Park and the Burton Cummings and the Pantages have done. When you guys do something like eliminate the Amusement Tax for MTC or do those kinds of things, you have energized and enlightened and inspired all the volunteers and supporters of those other organizations with one act. That's what you guys can do. That's the power you have.

MTC hasn't had that kind of pat on the back from the City in awhile. We haven't been able to get endowment funding because you guys are strapped and I understand that. We haven't had the increases from Winnipeg Arts Council that we really need. I thought we would get $200 or $300 grand not 40, but 40 is better than a poke in the eye with a sharp stick, so thank you.

But what we don't need is the Amusement Tax to come in. You have the right and the power to make, do the right thing and as Glen said we know you can do it. And we really appreciate your support and understanding for our request. Thank you very much for everything you do now and for everything you have to do for the rest of the day and we're counting on you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks very much Ms. Asper. Is there any questions of this group? Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: If the Amusement Tax or the Entertainment Tax didn't exist overnight would that revenue be replaced in your operating model, i.e. if you didn't have to charge people that 10% or whatever it is, could you just charge them that and that money would flow directly to your organization?

Mr. Glen Dyrda: Well in fact I think Councillor Steeves the money is a tax that if we collect it we have to remit it. So what we are talking about here is a situation where we have not collected the tax because the rules are such that we don't know when we should be collecting the tax.

So we don't collect it, if we've sold our season out we are now being told that we should be remitting $60,000 dollars in tax so it will come out of funds that we have

otherwise raised from other sources that were not budgeted.

So it's not money that we have raised, it's money that the City is telling us we should have raised when we sold tickets months and months and months before our season began and before we had even a cast in place.

Ms. Gail Asper: And I think they wouldn't, they wouldn't just add 10% to the ticket price and then say oh good we have a windfall. I think MTC's goal is to keep the ticket prices as low as possible. That's why there is 20,000 subscribers. So the ending Zaz Bajon would say we don't want to charge more then we need to for their tickets. We want to keep the people coming in.

So they wouldn't, if there was no Amusement Tax the prices wouldn't go up and they wouldn't be a way to make more money. They would probably just let us fundraisers try to go out and subsidize the tickets even more through sponsorships and the endowment campaign. But right now that money hasn't been billed because I think there was an assumption that they wouldn't be required so there is no line in the budget of that money that's been raised. So there is no money in the coffers right now for that Amusement Tax.

It was very, I think that management probably thought it was pretty clear they wouldn't have to pay the Amusement Tax so this year has been spent explaining why they didn't think they would have to pay the Amusement Tax. And I think Glen did a good job. It's complicated and pretty boring stuff frankly. But if you go through the act, sorry yes I'm sure someone loves the Amusement Tax Act but if you went through those conditions you would have thought that you were exempt in all the cases so that's why it wasn't collected. Is that sort of clear?

Mr. Speaker: Anything else? Thank you very much for your presentation. Thank you.

The next group of delegations are appearing on the, in support of clause 3 of the Executive Committee report of November 16th, the Olywest project. In the 10 minute position a Mr. Karl Kynoch, I believe Chairman, and Peter Mah, on behalf of the Manitoba Pork Council. In the five minute slot Mr. Ron Friesen, President of Eastman Feeds. Mr., you're Mr. Kynoch?

Mr. Karl Kynoch: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor, the Councillors, ladies and gentlemen. Good morning, my name is Karl Kynoch and I'm the Chairman of the Manitoba Pork Council. Manitoba Pork Council represents the interest of all hog producers in Manitoba and I would like to start our presentation here today by reinforcing that hog producers of Manitoba, large and small, endorse the Olywest project.

For more than 15 years the hog producers of Manitoba have been looking for more competition in the packer industry to take our animals for processing and to add value and jobs right here at home. A little more than two years ago our producers passed a resolution specifically directing our council to seek another processor for the eastern side of Manitoba.

After many long months of groundwork, the Olywest project was announced just as soon as agreements in principle were in place. This proposed facility will not only provide much needed packing capacity for hog farmers, it will provide 1,100 jobs for Winnipeggers. And it will contribute significant tax dollars to the City of Winnipeg as well as the Province and Federal government.

It will also reduce the vulnerability of the Manitoba pork industry and Provincial economy to US trade actions and thus secure many Winnipeg based jobs already tied to the success of the pork industry; veterinarian jobs, jobs with feed companies and feed mills, trucking jobs, etc., as well as all of the jobs in government, retail banking, finance and education that are supported by these workers.

At this time I would like to ask Peter Mah the Manitoba Pork Council's Director of Community Relations and Sustainable

Development, who has over 30 years of experience in land use and community planning. Peter.

Peter Mah: Thank you Karl. Your Worship and members of City Council I want to just take a few minutes of your time, to put today's vote on the City's incentive package on Olywest into context.

Today's vote is indeed a very important milestone in a very comprehensive development process that may or may not lead to the establishment of the new Olywest project in Winnipeg. It is only the beginning of what will be a lengthy six or seven month formal review and development approvals process. Six or seven months. This will include rigorous environmental analysis and clearly without any doubt extensive public review and consultation.

And this is on top of the already two years of joint business planning by Olymel, Hytek and Big Sky Farms and over six months of good faith negotiations and due diligence with Provincial and Civic leaders and their administration in a parallel process both in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan and here in Winnipeg, Manitoba. For business that must make its decisions to meet time and financial constraints and marketplace pressures, timing is a critical factor.

Mr. Mayor and Council, Olywest has followed due diligence in it's deliberations with the Provincial and City governments. And we and Olywest fully appreciate and understand the desire for neighbouring communities to know how the proposed plant will or will not impact them in their quality of life. We appreciate that. Of which odour and traffic are clearly the two key issues. And I can say again, resoundingly, we do hear you.

I'll remind Council and the community that Olywest was publicly announced just nine days ago. Nine days ago and we find ourselves today engrossed in a windstorm of emotion and speculation. Respectfully we all need to collect our thoughts and allow due process to take its methodical and logical course. No doubt there will be lots of opportunities for all questions to be answered.

It's important to note as well that the proposed site for Olywest has been carefully chosen by the proponents in consultation with the City and Provincial officials. It is factored in and balanced area land use compatibility, transportation, labour market and infrastructure servicing requirements. From a land use approvals perspective the industrial site conforms to the long range plans of *Plan Winnipeg.*

And I should just quickly quote here, a couple of sections in your administration report, it's on page 1099 and in it and I quote "based on information provided the slaughterhouse and meat processing facility meets the priority set out in *Plan Winnipeg* in its long term economic development strategy". And it goes on "it will draw from the local employment pool, support further employment and value added enterprises and enhance Winnipeg's export profile."

It also notes, members of Council, other *Plan Winnipeg* policies that support this proposal and there are six of them and I won't read them, you can see them yourselves. And then it talks about compatibility with surrounding land use, the opening line of which "the proposed land use is compatible with the adjacent and surrounding land uses".

I only wish to point out to Council as well that the proposed plant meets all the M-3 Heavy Industrial Zoning requirements and is in fact a permitted use, fully contemplated in the City's Zoning By-law No. 6400/94 as amended.

With respect to odour the actual plant site is buffered from neighbouring residential communities that are at least one and a half, and in most cases of a major community, perhaps closer to two kilometres away. The nearest residence 1.5 kilometres to the proposed location of the site itself. This is located centrally with an area bordered by standing bush and by other established industrial uses. Olywest has indicated that it will use state of the art, 21st Century technology and

best management practices to ensure that odour does not become a factor.

With respect to transportation the proposed site is accessible by an established arterial city route system that will avoid residential areas and which closely links up with the Winnipeg perimeter and provincial highway system. And the CN intermodal rail terminal immediately adjacent to the south can provide future options for moving processed food products directly to market.

With respect to infrastructure servicing, public transit and trunk water and sewer mains can be extended south from Dugald Road to service the site with treated water and secondary sewage treatment. Both of which are essential for the plant. The Olywest plant will be responsible for primary sewage treatment onsite.

I'd like a glass of water if I could Mr. Speaker? I'll just carry on.

I want to remind Council that the land use issues and planning that designate the St. Boniface Industrial Park and adjacent land as industrial and M-3 Heavy Industrial Zoning has already undergone extensive public review and consultation through the planning by-law preparation review and approval process. That happened many, many years ago, thank you very much, and carries on.

This is to say therefore that community land use and project siting issues have for all intents and purposes essentially been addressed. Clearly what remains are the environmental issues specific to the proposed processing plant and they will be fully examined and addressed by the independent Clean Environment Commission in the rigorous environmental review and licensing process. This will include again extensive formal public notice, public information and public consultation. The process will require extensive design engineering and environmental assessment to be done firstly before meaningful public consultation can take place.

And I just reference a document, I don't have it right here with me, but it's in my folder, and the document is called *Manitoba Conservations 2005 Generic Advice Document for the Preparation of an Environment Act Proposal for a Meat Processing/Slaughter Plant.* This process will include studies and measurements of probable impact and mitigated measures to address the following factors. And I'll list them for you. One minute? Sorry.

Surface and sub-surface soils congeality, ground water conditions including quality in movement, topographic and facility elevation, surface drainage, all the way through to retail demographics, background ambient air quality and emissions or discharges into the environment.

Moreover Olywest's proposal that's still to be required to be filed according to section 10 to 12 of the Environment Act must also detail other information relative to road and rail access, power utility lines, meat processing facilities, storm water drainage, input and output of fuels and so on and so on, including again point source air emission control facilities, fugitive air emission minimalization techniques and point source air emission monitoring facilities.

In short we are confident that the community at large will be fully consulted and engaged in both the formal environmental review and licensing process as well as in the forthcoming community information and consultation programs.

In fact nine days out of the announcement Olywest today basically is coming forward with a public information program and I wonder if I could ask the indulgence of the Speaker basically to give this to Council, if the pages will take this, thank you very much. This information will be made available widely to the community in the coming days. It's factual information and there will in fact be further comments by Olywest to hold a public open house early in January 2006.

There is a number of assurances that we can give but you need the site. Council

needs to give the site today to Olywest to be able to initiate the environmental review process. Without the site which an integral part of the incentive package there will be no assessment, there will be no further questions that can be answered through this process. And on that point what I'd like to do is just turn that over to Mr. Kynoch just to close if I could?

Mr. Speaker: You time has run out but there may be questions later. But first we'll hear from Mr. Ron Friesen in the five minute slot.

Mr. Peter Mah: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Ron Friesen: Mr. Speaker, Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors, ladies and gentlemen. I hope everyone enjoyed their bacon and eggs today. It's a great day for our company. I'm the Vice President and General Manager of Eastman Feeds and we're a family-owned manufacturer of animal feed nutrition in, located in the City of St. Boniface on Marion Street, 715 Marion Street, and we have eight locations across western Canada. My father Peter Friesen started Eastman Animal Nutrition in 1969. We've been in this business for 36 years and we started in the city of Steinbach. We moved our head office location to our current place on Marion Street and we've enjoyed 34 years of doing business in that location.

We witness many changes in the landscape of St. Boniface where we currently are during these 34 years and the meat processing industry has consolidated over that time. The once vibrant meat processing sector in St. Boniface has really been reduced from five major packers down to one. And with the announcement of Olywest coming into this area we truly believe that this validates the agriculture industry and the hog business for the next 40 years. And we truly believe it's an important part of our future.

What does Olywest processing plant mean to Eastman Animal Nutrition? Well it demonstrates to us the continued confidence of a major food industry stakeholder in the Manitoba's family farms ability to produce quality pork for the consumer. It demonstrates to us the confidence of Olywest has in the City of Winnipeg and the strong labour force.

Olywest's confidence is vital to our family-owned businesses and our 82 Manitoba employees and 126 employees across western Canada. Olywest's confidence has solidified our strategy for a $2 million dollar expansion in our own manufacturing facility in St. Boniface in 2006, which will add about 15 to 20 positions to our existing workforce and help us grow our business from our current $80 million dollars in sales to approximately $100 million dollars per year.

Being active in food production locally and globally, we are aware of the technology utilized today to ensure environmentally sound food processing facilities. We are confident in the City of Winnipeg and Olywest's ability to ensure that this plant is state of the art and will be an example to the world in the production and processing of safe food for the consumer.

Eastman Feeds Nutrition and our 126 employees are excited and support Olywest's plan for the processing plant in Winnipeg. It solidifies Winnipeg's place as a leader in sustainable agriculture and food production in Canada. Let's not confuse the odour that comes from a rendering plant on Dawson Road, which is a renderer of dead animals with food processing.

I have four sons who are, who would like to be part of agriculture in Manitoba in some form or the other and Olywest will give them a real chance to do so. In the words of Prime Minister John Diefenbaker "You can burn down the cities and they will rise from the ashes again. Take down the farmers and grass will grow in the streets." Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Friesen. There are some questions for this group of delegations. Councillor Lazarenko. Just remind a short question, short answers, we'll get everybody through it.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr., thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask a few questions and it's not that I as one opposed what is before us. As due diligence, as what was said by yourself and this is the direction I'm going. If there is a motion on Council that will be dealt with later on to have this laid over for further information and to allow public consultation to take place, which way would it hurt your application now if this happened that Council will adjourn till December?

Mr. Kynoch: One thing I'd like to address that is you'll have to remember we went through quite a process to attract this to Manitoba. There is another Province that is aggressively after this plant and we know that the doors are still open for this plant to go there.

So I guess that that would definitely I wouldn't want to see the project put at risk. We've been looking for 15 years as hog producers to bring this to Manitoba and we've finally succeeded. So I guess I would ask Council that, to help me strengthen the agricultural industry and we will help you bring 2, 000 jobs to the City of Winnipeg.

So I'm saying don't let that opportunity go. It's already at risk of going to Saskatoon.

Mr. Mah: Mr. Speaker if I could just answer that as well, a supplementary answer to that. The question today if there's a vote to delay the project that first of all would not be meaningful and help the project from our perspective on two accounts.

One very much what Mr. Kynoch has said because timing is critical, but secondly because the information which the community wishes will be coming forward in the environmental review process. It is largely environmental based. The studies must be done to be able to come up with the full engineering design and all of the environmental impacts assessments. That information will be forthcoming to the community in the public participation program by Olywest as well as the formal environmental review process.

To try and get that information now before the community, before studies have been done, and in fact with all due respect to Council, before the site is even verified to be able to go an Environment Act proposal is clearly premature.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Lazarenko?

Councillor Lazarenko: Yes Mr. Speaker. The questions that need to be answered, I know you made a very well, you delivered your presentation very well. Where I'm coming from, either one of you, public consultation, you had mentioned consult with the community, but I think they should be consulted, with the community before we would take the vote. Would you agree on that sir?

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order please. There are no demonstrations permitted from the gallery, even if you are enthused, contain it. Thank you.

Mr. Mah: I appreciate that Councillor Lazarenko. On face value yes, it's always good to consult with the community and that in fact is going to be happening because the information is forthcoming even as of today. Olywest has indicated that there will be a public open house in early January. The information of which still needs to be pulled together to answer the questions for the community.

Council's decision today, I might point out, is really two choices. One is it open for business, for the City of Winnipeg with business interests who have negotiated in good faith over the last six months, with your administration and with City Hall and they've invested time, money and effort in this and they are waiting for a decision. Or do they may move to the other, other option which is Saskatoon?

They need this site and they need the assurance that the incentives will be there for them to be able to proceed forward clearly with credibility to the environment process, prepare the proposal, hire the engineers, prepare the answers and get into a fully engaged consultation program.

That's the logical process.

Council's question today is will you offer this incentive package, including the site, to build the proposal around? The questions the community has are legitimate. They will be answered fully in due course.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Final supplementary, short question.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker my final question to you sir. The responsibility to the Clean Environment Commission will not be addressing such issues as the flow of traffic, the number of trucks that will be going, against the environment it's a question of environment.

Would you be will sir, one more time, would you be willing to take this proposal to the community that may be affected, to go to the community for public consultation?

Mr. Mah: Mr. Speaker I can't speak for Olywest but I have had discussions with them and it was confirmed even as of this morning that again there will be a formal public open house in early January.

And as of today as the information, if you look at the maps that you have in front of you, members of Council, there is a map that shows the proposed plant site and the route for traffic, truck routes on arterial streets, coming off of Highway No. 1 at Fermor, down Plessis Road and then cutting into Camiel Sys Road which is well before any residential development into the industrial park.

It also shows an alternative route which would take you from the Perimeter Highway west along Dugald Road to Mazenod Road and down south into the industrial park. It will avoid residential development. Those are two established arterial routes. Those are the clear and really the only viable ways in which to get into the site and clearly it's not fronting the residences in front of or fronting along Plessis Road, the few residences there, and any other major development. It crosses industrial and commercial enterprises.

So the routing is there. The highway issue should not be a large factor. It's again, I would remind Council that this area is designated industrial. It would not have been done so without the full knowledge that transportation routes would need to be, to lead into for ingress and egress out of that particular area. And I would suggest to Council that that has been largely addressed.

If you look at the map, the community residents will be able to see this map themselves today, and in a few days there will be available some copies here we've given to the Council, extra copies. But other copies will be widely distributed in the community in the coming days. And the maps will show that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith is there a question?

Councillor Smith: Yes, some of us are concerned about the environment and what this project will mean to it. And you say the Clean Environment Commission will, will have public hearings, da, da, da, but are you aware that the Clean Environment Commission recommendations are not binding so what guarantee do we have?

Mr. Mah: Thank you Councillor Smith. The only guarantee I can give you is the fact that the process works. The Clean Environment Commission is an independent commission. It does yes, quite correctly study all of the assets, pros and cons of the development relative to the environmental impacts and mitigative measures. It provides ample opportunity for public notice in the, for not only the proposal itself that goes on the public registry but also the very advice document that government provides to the proponent to be able to fully scope out the full extent of the environment impact assessment. That document, the advice document is on the public registry.

When the impact studies are done and they are submitted to Manitoba Conversation they in fact will again go on

the public registry and available to the public. The government will no doubt hold a Clean Environment Commission hearing. The hearings, yes the mandate will be to prepare all of this and prepare recommendations back to government but in all experiences government listens to the Clean Environment Commission. That's their mandate.

And I think you can take full confidence in the fact that the developments that we have in Manitoba, the major developments that go through this process extremely rigorous, very comprehensive, very time consuming, very, very many opportunities for public consultation and direct input into the process. In fact I would suggest to you Councillor Smith there is at times also available intervener funding available to opponents to be able to prepare for the Clean Environment Commission Hearing.

It is a well balanced process. It's very thorough and I can guarantee you that the recommendations, whatever comes forward will fully scope out that environmental issues and questions will be answered.

Mr. Speaker: Very quickly.

Councillor Smith: My other question is, nine days we've heard of this project. You know you talked about years of preparing and so forth you know. For what you're asking us to do I don't think nine days is very, very long to delve into the whole project.

Mr. Speaker: What is your answer?

Mr. Karl Kynoch: I understand your concerns, but I guess you have to realize that we've been working on this for over two years and the one thing that...

Councillor Smith: Nine days.

Mr. Karl Kynoch: Is with Peter is we took due diligence in the siting of this. We actually looked at 10 sites and narrowed them down. The number one thing that we looked at was people. Where is the closest housing to this thing? We took the people's consideration was number one. And we had the closest house to this plant is 1.54 kilometres. And with the way, over the past many years we've tried to get a packing plant here in the past. It's always been too public and it always gets jeopardized. So that's the reason for it staying very quiet to this point.

But I have the confidence in Olywest. Knowing some of the history of Olymel that they will answer all these questions in the community. They've offered an open house and they have an excellent reputation of doing business in communities and also addressing issues of concern for communities.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Time for questions has expired for this section. Thank you very much gentlemen for your presentation.

Councillor Wyatt: I have a question.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Councillor Wyatt: No, no. I've got a question of the separate delegations.

Mr. Speaker: No they're taken in a group, that's the rules now.

The next two delegations are appearing in opposition to the same subject, item 3 of EPC, November 16th, Mr. Glen Koroluk who has the 10 minute slot and Ms. Diana Ludwick, who has the five minute slot. Mr. Koroluk.

Mr. Glen Koroluk: Thank you Mr. Speaker and Council and Mayor. My name is Glen Koroluk and I've been an environmental researcher and advocate for 15 years and I've been a volunteer for the Hog Watch Coalition for about six.

I just want to answer one of the questions that was asked about the competition. Saskatoon does not want another kill plant because they just rolled out a deal with Maple Leaf about a month ago, so Maple Leaf is moving its production facilities to Saskatoon with a great subsidy package from the NDP government there in Saskatchewan. So there is no more competition. This is the only place where Olymel is looking.

Generally speaking communities don't want this type of development for the various reasons which I'll speak on. I read the incentive package and it tells us that seven *Plan Winnipeg* policies support this proposal. However the incentive package doesn't admit that 12 *Plan Winnipeg* policies do not support this proposal. So there are actually more policies in *Plan Winnipeg* that go against this proposal. And I'll speak about those *Plan Winnipeg* policies.

One of them is the commitment to sustainability. I'd like to tell you that two years ago the Clean Environment Commission had hearings on the Maple Leaf expansion in Brandon. One of the recommendations from that Commission was to have the Province conduct a sustainability impact assessment of the hog industry in this Province. That assessment was to be done by the end of this year. To this date Manitoba has not lived up to that recommendation and they are not conducting this sustainability impact assessment. And the Commission at that time felt that the industry, it wasn't proof that the industry is sustainable.

And just a little bit on the Clean Environment Commission, just for clarification. It is not an independent body. It does not report directly to Legislature like the Provincial Auditor or the Ombudsman's office. It's, the tenure of the CEC is held at the pleasure of the government of the day. So the recommendations that come from the CEC are in tune to the government of the day.

The government of the day in Manitoba right now supports industrial hog production. And they've demonstrated it with the amount of subsidies they've put in the past. So do not place faith on the CEC. I could come up with numerous other times where recommendations have been made and the Province hasn't followed up on those recommendations. All it does is provide advice.

The second *Plan Winnipeg* policy that I've picked out here is there should be a commitment to greenhouse gas reductions. This plant will increase greenhouse gas production in Winnipeg and in Manitoba. I just wanted to say that agriculture is the largest emitter of greenhouse gases in Manitoba. And our Province does not have a law that says we have to reduce greenhouse gasses in this Province.

Another policy this is supposed to provide sound management and as part of that promoting productive and a healthy workforce. Well this type of development, this slaughterhouse does not promote a healthy workforce. As well as killing pigs, this type of job kills people in the long term. It is the worst place to work in North America right now.

The US statistics right now say that almost one in three workers either get injured or they get an illness. The line speeds have increased threefold. They used to be about 400 animals an hour. These state of the art plants the line speeds are now 1,200 to 1,300 animals per hour.

The wages, families used to live off wages working in the slaughterhouse industry back in the '80's, $15, $16, $17 bucks an hour. Maple Leaf the starting wage was $8.50 an hour. It's up to $10. We're going to get low paying jobs of around $10 dollars an hour. This is not a sustainable workforce. It's a transient workforce. And we have all this information from what's happening in Brandon at the Maple Leaf state of the art facility.

Another policy in *Plan Winnipeg* were to protect traffic flows from significant increases. Well the incentive package has not really addressed that issue. We don't have a traffic study. We've got Plessis Road which is a single roadway. We've got Dugald Highway which is a single roadway. We're going to get 350 trucks a week coming down those roads times two, the two trips, 700 a week. That's 100 large trucks a day in that area. And we don't even have in front of us what the financial implications of that will be. It's not in this incentive package.

Another policy is that we are to promote vibrant neighbourhoods. Well that hasn't

been demonstrated yet because you know no one has talked to the people yet who are going to be bordering this proposal that being the Transcona residents and residents of Windsor Park who are in the dark about what's happening in their neighbourhoods.

We are also to provide wastewater management and we are doing that but we don't know exactly what we're providing. It's sort of like a blank cheque right now because those financial implications have not been identified. There is mention in the incentive package that Olywest is requiring some assurance of future access to the City sewer and water over a long term. And it also says the City will work towards a mutually agreeable sewer and water access agreement in this regard. So and that's it.

So what is this agreement? Why isn't it here in the package? And what are the implications to all the other users who are paying into the sewer and water? Because I'll tell you I know these companies. They want a break in their water supply. We currently have decline in block rates so we are already giving them a break but they'll want a further reduction in the long term. And they don't want a sewer surcharges placed on our sewer rates. And if we don't do that we're going to have to ask all other users in this City, mostly residential users to pick up the tab on this and believe me this already happening.

Another policy that is in *Plan Winnipeg* is that we are to address water, air and noise pollution. Well there really is no mention of this in the incentive package. There's indication that there will be a pre-treatment plant built on site which basically is a big basin which will let the solids settle from the liquids and then from there on will go to the City's treatment plant. But we don't know what the City has to do in order to take this waste stream from this large plant.

It's been mentioned this past week by Dr. Bill Paton at Brandon University that it is not a good idea to mix this quantity of pig waste with human waste because it will create some problems downstream. In Brandon they do not mix their human waste with their pig waste. The City of Brandon had to build a separate industrial wastewater treatment facility for the Manitoba, Maple Leaf kill plant. So I mean as a minimum that's a responsibility for the City to determine if they could even handle this kind of waste. There is no mention of that and no mention of the cost for that.

And another policy that we have here in *Plan Winnipeg* is that we have to protect and manage our potable water supply and source. Well I don't know if anyone missed this out or if this is a flaw in *Plan Winnipeg* but I've looked at the map of the site location and the northern boundary of the proposed site is the Shoal Lake aqueduct. The Shoal Lake aqueduct is the boundary of this proposed site. The Shoal Lake aqueduct branches at the Deacon Reservoir. There is the branch one that goes north. Branch two that goes south. So the entire half of Winnipeg's drinking water supply is placed at a tremendous risk of having 4.5, 4.6 million hogs a year traveling in that area.

Now I say risk because the state of the art facility in Brandon, the Maple Leaf plant in its first two years of operation had a number of spills. It had blockage in their pipes in their treatment wastewater facility. So we've got this, we're creating this tremendous risk in having a facility of this size built right beside our drinking water supply. It's ludicrous. This is not the right site. And in fact that's probably a flaw in *Plan Winnipeg.* And just to mention on…

Mr. Speaker: Final sentence please.

Mr. Glen Koroluk: On the closing on this, the incentive package does say that this type of development is compatible with surrounding land use areas, land uses. I would not agree with that. To the south is heavy industrial but to the north is light industrial. And given the fact that we do have the aqueduct separating the north and south I urge Council to place special restrictions on development on our drinking water supply. It's very important. I thank you Council.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Mr. Koroluk. Diana Ludwick, on the five minute slot.

Councillor Benham: Mr. Speaker you'll take questions (in audible)

Mr. Speaker: After.

Ms. Diana Ludwick: Hi, my name is Diana Ludwick and I'm one of the nurses at the Occupational Health Centre. Our centre has been invited by several workplace health and safety committees as well as union reps to help address some workplace health and safety concerns within the meatpacking industry in Manitoba.

Workers in meatpacking facilities are at risk for a wide range of illnesses and injuries. They include things like stress, bacterial hazards, noise, but by far the most common is the work related musculoskeletal disorders. They are the leading cause of injury to workers in this particular industry.

Slaughterhouses have increased the pace so much in production to put out more product at less cost that workers work at an incredible pace. A much faster than the body was ever designed to do.

As well hand tools put workers at risk. Often poorly designed knives are held at awkward angles with great force for long periods of time. Revolving knife blades are used to quickly cut and trim meat and they vibrate and this altogether poses great danger when they become clogged with fat and gristle, which is commonplace.

But really you have to picture what the working conditions are like. They are cold, humid, noisy and cramped. Many parts of the modern slaughterhouse are kept cold to preserve the meat products. And the temperatures range from below 32 degrees to 4 degrees Celsius. Workers in the meat refrigeration units routinely wear several layers of clothing to keep warm. In spite of these precautions workers often complain of the cold and this cold stresses their already overworked joints.

And so there is a really high rate of injury in this industry. I tried to get the latest numbers but the notice for this was so short that I wasn't able to do it. But a couple of years ago when I did look for this, certainly meatpacking was probably rivaling the number one position as the most dangerous work in the Province.

Many injured workers leave for other opportunities and so many plants have a large turnover of workers. New inexperienced employees are at a much higher risk for injuries until they have mastered the job. And our experiences and my experience in particular because I have been to the slaughterhouses on a number of occasions, we can bring a human face to this information.

Work shouldn't hurt but for many of these workers it really does. And the meatpacking sector is one of the most vivid illustrations where the body wears out quickly with excessive pace and demands of work.

I have been in a plant and in one of the plants on the very most difficult part of the line which is the head skinning line, there were five workers and they ranged in age from 18 to 25 and they were the most able-bodied men and women that you could imagine and yet every single one of them, after 18 months, had repetitive strain injuries. Some of them will probably never be reversible in life. That's the extraordinary demands on these lines. And so workers on the rest of the line do not want to replace these injured workers even though the salary for this particular part of the line is much higher.

Potential workers from across Canada are also not willing to place themselves at likely risk for serious injuries in this type of work and so workers are now imported from other countries to perform the more demanding jobs in meatpacking plants. Even they do not stay long and return to their homeland, which is true of the workers from Mexico.

As City Councillors your decisions now will affect the health of workers. If we limit ourselves to the shortsightedness of

the business bottom line then the cost of injured workers in these plants will catch up with us in some way. Eventually most of the health, social and financial burdens of these injuries are more likely to be unjustly carried by workers, families, taxpayers and communities.

Can I say a closing remark on a personal basis? A number of years ago I worked for A Healthy Public Policy. I was there for a about seven years and I would have been the person that reviewed all the environmental impact studies from the health point of view, health for Manitobans. And really I think that in terms of health for workers and the environmental impact of health and the risk that it poses to Manitobans, you really need to think long and hard on this decision and make a wise one. And I really implore you to heed the opening prayer, weigh your decisions very heavily, discern wisely because much is at stake here. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Ms. Ludwick. There are some questions for this group. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise first of all, thank you very much for both of your presentations and they were very good with regards to this issue. I, I, I'm going to ask a couple of are you aware questions and either can respond.

But are you aware that today Council is being asked to give land and provide subsidies to this industry for the development of this hog plant? And at the end of the day this is the people's land, this is the people's money. And are you aware that, or do you believe based on that alone that the public has a right to be skeptical and to have some distrust if this Council is being asked to hand over public lands and money and then after, go and have public consultations. Do they have a right to be skeptical about the usefulness of such public consultations, after the fact?

Ms. Diana Ludwick: They not only have the right but they need to be aware of how other communities across Canada have been affected by these kinds of decisions. Without exception communities are not in the long run supportive of these kinds of decisions.

Mr. Glen Koroluk: Yes and I just want to make a point. When a developer comes in what usually happens is there is a financial package and there is a memorandum of understanding signed and what that does it limits what the Clean Environment Commission can do. It limits your, it places the financial obligations up front.

So for instance if the Clean Environment Commission which only gives advice says this is the wrong site, I mean that's a problem because we have already picked the site and we've already said how much money we're giving the company for subsidies, so anything that the Commission identifies as an environmental problem that needs to be addressed won't happen because all the dollars have been taken care of. So you've actually limited yourself.

So in reality what has to happen first is we have to do the public consultation. We have to do the assessment and then the City will say, we'll incorporate these recommendations into our incentive agreement. That's how it's supposed to be done. And that's an open and transparent process.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Koroluk this handout that was just presented to Councillors on the fly here by the industry is, they claim in this handout to be saying that there will be minimal odour generated by the Olywest plant and minimal odour experienced by area residents. What do the, and then they on to talk about buffering. I, what, from your experiences living with the industry how can they define minimal? And what definition do you apply to minimal odour? Can it be defined?

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: Sure.

Mr. Glen Koroluk: Mr. Wyatt, I'm not sure what they mean. If they've discovered a new technology to prevent hogs from defecating then there will be no odour. I mean it's as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, in the last few days I've received a lot of very emotional calls, calls of concern from constituents based on the experiences that has gone on across Manitoba. Is this typical of this industry to come into a community and not hold any public consultations before, before they actually may ask governments for land and money?

Ms. Diana Ludwick: I don't know if it's typical of the industry here in Manitoba. I think it is a, a, often the way the industry presents itself across Canada, across North America and on other continents as well.

Mr. Glen Koroluk: And just to an addendum to that. This particular industry operates by stealth. They were kicked out of Europe with this production system. They went to the US. They're getting kicked out of the US and they are coming up to Canada. Quebec had a moratorium on the expansion of the industry for three years, so they're coming out to Manitoba and Saskatchewan where we offer competitive wages. And as people get to know what this industry is all about it will travel again in the global market and it's moving to Mexico and Brazil right now.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham, question?

Councilor Benham: Thanks Mr. Speaker and I thank the delegations. Through you to Mr. Koroluk, I received an email yesterday and I'm going to quote from it and I'd be interested if you can tell me if you know if this is true or not. And I'm not quoting, I don't have the permission to quote the sender, but I believe that she is quite sincere in this. "Just one example of an environmental consequence of a slaughterhouse is that natural and exogenous hormones in hog blood will not be removed by wastewater treatment. These hormones can disrupt the endocrine systems and reproductive systems in aquatic biota." Do you have any research or material to support that one way or the other, briefly during this period?

Mr. Glen Koroluk: I am not a Ph.D. on that issue and I do have that material in my office if you would like to have it. I know Dr. Paton at Brandon University raised the issue about mixing hog waste with animal, with human waste, and the reason being the endocrine disrupters is an issue, our wastewater treatment plants do not remove that.

Another issue is the pharmaceuticals also in the waste stream of our wastewater treatment plant do not remove pharmaceuticals. The medication, the feed that's given to the hogs these days is medicated at low dosages and this use of antibiotics as growth promotants and to control disease because these animals live in confined quarters there is a lot of disease vectors in a barn stuffed with a lot of animals.

So all this ends up in our aquatic environments and we use these antibiotics for human purposes too. So we're getting into antibiotic resistant bacteria that is an emerging issue, a real emerging issue that needs attention too. So what we're doing is we're, we're, we're creating a situation where we might have some, some health disaster down the way.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary? No.

Councillor Benham: That's fine, thank you.

Ms. Diana Ludwick: I would suggest that if these kinds of issues come to discussion that you probably should invite Dr. Eva Pitt, retired from the University of Winnipeg, to speak on some of these issues because she is very knowledgeable and I think she would be able to give you answers that are very reflective of the Manitoba scene.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Magnifico you have a question?

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Are you aware that today we are not voting on whether we are going to build this processing plant or not, we're simply voting to accept the incentive package from a straight business point of view for the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Glen Koroluk: I am aware of that Councillor Magnifico but as I explained there are other financial implications that haven't been addressed in this incentive package, so I mean without having the information in, all the information in front of you as to what is the financial impact will be on the City, I mean you can't vote on this.

And I also indicated that this site may not be the best site so we can't be giving the land away for a dollar without actually knowing that you know the impacts to our drinking water is a serious issue. You know that the aqueduct runs right along the north part of that property. So that's a very serious issue. So that site might not be the right site.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Magnifico?

Councillor Magnifico: Are you aware that this package that is just being voted on and if all of those things that you are saying come into play and that the environmental study comes back negative and all of these things happen, we don't give them the land for a dollar and we don't give them the incentive package? Are you aware of that?

Mr. Glen Koroluk: I'm not aware of that and I haven't seen that in the package itself but based on experience in assessments for the last 15 years I haven't seen that to be the case. Once a memorandum of understanding is drawn up it's, it's you know, crossing the "t's" and dotting the "i's". So what the City gives today will set the stage for what is going to happen in the future.

There has never been a process to my knowledge in the last 15 years where the subsidy has been given yet the, it was determined somewhere down the line that this is not a good idea because of the environmental impacts, so unless... You seem to have a lot of faith in the process. I'm telling you do not have faith in the Provincial CEC process. It's burned the City in the past and it will burn people again.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary, very quickly.

Councillor Magnifico: Are you aware that the Provincial CEC process isn't the final stop? It has to stop here later so we do have our controls. Are you aware of that?

Mr. Speaker: Very short.

Ms. Diana Ludwick: That's why we are here to make sure that some roadblocks are here to pause and really reflect seriously on the consequences of what is being proposed.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much.

The next group of delegations are with, are here with regard to clause 4 of the EPC report of November 16th with regard to citizen committees. Ms. Sandy Popham with The Access Advisory Committee has the 10 minute slot, Ms. Laurie Helgason of the Citizen Equity Committee, Equity Committee, I'm sorry has the five minute slot. Ms. Popham.

Ms. Sandy Popham: Can you hear me all right? It's close enough? That's, that's better? Mr. Speaker, Mayor Katz, City Councillors, thank you for hearing our delegation today. I am aware, and our Committee is thankful and pleased, that the motion that was passed last Wednesday at the Executive Policy Committee is being stood down, as I understand, from the letter that Mayor Katz sent me personally. And I know many people were contacted who had objected and registered their objection to this motion.

I have to say that last Wednesday when I arrived at EPC never having spoken there before that I was very surprised that this

motion was there at all given that no one was notified that this was happening. We had no awareness that this was being proposed and have some serious concerns about the method in which this had come to the EPC.

I would also say that we were also surprised because just the week before this came to EPC to dissolve our Committee we were thanked publicly at the opening of the Millennium Library by Head of Library Services for all the work that our Committee has put into helping to make the library as accessible as it is. So it is very interesting that one week we're thanked by Head of Library Services and the next week we are told we were to be dissolved because we're just sort of a waste of taxpayers' money.

So I bring that to you today and I need to make sure that people are aware of those two things in particular. And as I said when I spoke to the motion at EPC I had no idea where this motion came from. What is the concern? I can say that as a result of that we decided, we realized well I think we need to do some education about our Committee, about who we are, what we do, what we stand for and what we've done and where we're going in the future. So I hope to use this time slot for that purpose.

I was also told that it was very unlikely that I would be speaking today, so I'm sorry I have all my, everything laid out here but I really hadn't put everything together because I was sure we were not speaking.

Anyways, I will say that our Committee was formed in, I believe it was '89, Bill Norrie I believe, Mayor Norrie was the one that formed us and we are to be a liaison with the disabled community. If you are not aware, I believe that there are over 200 disability related organizations and committees in the City of Winnipeg. So having one Committee that reports to Council and reports to EPC, which is what the Access Advisory Committee that I represent and am on, is a very good use of one Committee to represent all the other 200 committees or organizations that are across Winnipeg.

I will also mention that Winnipeg is the disability centre for organizations in all of Canada. This is where it's at. This is where things happen which is partly why we have moved. I'm not talking about our Committee specifically, but Winnipeg has definitely moved to be on the map as the city in Canada that is out and leading the movement for access for making our City an example of an accessible city. And I hope we get to carry on with that and that the City does carry on with that. We have been recognized nationally in, on that account.

There are so many things that our Committee has put in place over the last many years. I can just talk about say the last 5 or 6 years. In December 2001 the Committee was instrumental in the development and approval and implementation of the first Universal Design Policy for a city in Canada and in fact the next city that followed us was in the States and it was New York City. So just to say that we are the leaders and once that is in, once that was in place, the administration or the, also then put in place, putting in the universal design, hiring the position of the Universal Design Coordinator that helps with this work at the administration level.

So what we do is bring the voice from the community to administration. I will say that we have worked very closely with administration and they have been very supportive of the work we do. And that I hope that in the future we will continue with that.

We're the liaison between the community and this Council. We report directly to EPC, we don't have to go through a line department, therefore a lot of the work we do is streamlined. It avoids red tape, I will point out to the Red Tape Commissioner over there that we help the City avoid red tape by being able to go directly to EPC and not having to report to line departments.

Sort of losing track here. It's important to realize that our Committee is mainly made up of people with disabilities. We also have people who have worked extensively with organizations of people

with disabilities. We also have a voting rep on the Committee from the Provincial Government so we liaise with the Provincial Government as well with their Disabilities Issues office.

We're the contact for citizens who don't know which department to go to or who are caught in the gap where their issue is complex, it is too complex, it's not covered by one single department that can respond effectively. We serve as a resource. The AAC we serve as a resource to the City Council and the administration in the concerns that are brought forward and proposals made by advocacy groups and are addressed in the coordinated and collaborative approach lead by us.

We don't simply advise Council, even though that's the name of our Committee, Advisory. We work on sub-committees, we write reports, design policies. We conduct community consultations which we did in the last one was in '03 and had 40 disability related and seniors organizations who came together to give us what our mandate or what our, the future that we will be working on and have continued to work on based on their prioritization of issues.

One of the, just a few of the things that we have done. There would not be a Sign Language Interpreter Policy here in the City if it weren't for our Committee. The Universal Design Policy, as I've mentioned. There would be no capital accessibility program which has been in effect for the last three years of $250,000 per year which we are hoping will also be continued in the future. There would not be the audible signals research project that we're working on right now.

It's ongoing. It does not have to do with building codes. It's not what it's all about. Building codes are only part of it and looking at close-captioning of our Council Minutes that are on today, right now currently on channel 11 Shaw, and the fact that they are close-captioning is the result of our Committee.

Anyway, there are so much more that needs to be done in the future that we are nowhere near finished yet. I want to draw to the attention of the floor and of everyone here that I was very impressed to hear that Vancouver, just this week, this weekend I believe it was, elected their Mayor, Sam Sullivan, who is a man in a wheelchair. Well, we could do that here or you could break your leg or you know something could happen that you could get in here and the reason that you can do that is because of the work of our Committee in getting this Council chamber made accessible with the elevator and all the work that was done to make this chamber accessible and that was the work that our Committee did.

So I'm just reminding everyone that that's the kind of thing that we do. It's not just little grassroots stuff but it's that too but it's working on policy. So I hope that that helped to educate people on who we are and what we do and that we're not a waste of money. Thank you very much.

And I will be looking forward to having Mayor Katz attend a few of our meetings, as you mentioned in your letter, and working quite closely and doing everything we can to educate this chamber of the work we do. So thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Ms. Popham. Ms. Laurie Helgason has the five minute slot on the same issue.

Ms. Laurie Helgason: Good morning Mayor Katz and Councillors. I'm here to represent the members of the Citizen Equity Committee. Recently a motion was walked onto the agenda of the EPC Committee that would have ended the work we do in the community on behalf of the City of, of City Hall. This was not a well researched motion.

Fortunately Mayor Katz listened to the many members of the communities we serve on behalf of City Hall. Thank you Mayor Katz. Had Mayor Katz not had the courage to admit that he'd made an error in judgment and listened to bad advice, there would not, there would have been a much different atmosphere in Council this morning. Instead we have an

atmosphere of cooperation that will only benefit the communities we work with.

I'd like to take this opportunity to talk about what we really do on the Citizens Equity Committee. We keep open the lines of communication between the civic administration and the culturally rich and diverse communities that live and work in our City. We guide refugee and immigrant families through our City services and opportunities. We ensure that this civic administration is an equal opportunity employer and that the labour force within our municipal employ is representative of the communities it serves. We make sure that our boards and commissions truly represent the communities they serve.

We celebrate cultural holidays and community events with the many diverse communities in the City in order to learn more about the cultures and traditions as well as respect for the roots that bind these communities together. Winnipeg is the City that has the honour and privilege to be the second home to a global community.

At the time the Citizen Equity Committee came into being, the mood in the diverse communities was that the City didn't care about them. It took quite a long time to build bridges into the communities. We had to show them that we cared and wanted to help them grow. Trust lost is hard to regain.

Now we've built some bridges into the communities. Those communities know we will work hard for them. They know we are working with them to improve their quality of life. We are listening to their needs within their communities.

There are 22 recommendations to improve equity and diversity within the civic structure. Yes, we have completed some of them. Our very first public forum was held last April to give to the community our 2003/2004 report card for that year.

Some of you thought we were sleeping out there but here's some of the things we managed to do. Young people working hard, studying hard and influencing their communities in powerful ways. To recognize youths from ethno-cultural and disability communities who are making a difference we held honouring our youth role model awards in November.

Participants at this ethno-cultural job fair said it renewed my faith in the system that the government is making an effort to provide equal opportunities for other people from different ethnic groups. That was the Philippine/Canadian job fair in May.

We worked with eleven youth in the Aboriginal community giving them a chance to see how staying in school and celebrating their culture could lead to exciting City employment. Did I say exciting? Well our youth seem to think that it was what they wanted when they got out of school. That's an achievement. That was the Aboriginal Youth Career Awareness Camp in August.

We have represented the City of Winnipeg at many job fairs in the ethno-cultural community. Our Outreach Coordinator gets an average of 260 emails each day from the community. People that need information hit our website approximately 65 times a day. Our Coordinator meets with the communities every day to address some of their issues.

Our volunteers meet once a month as a Committee and once a month on a sub-Committee. All of these volunteers have busy lives and yet our Committee attended more than 27 cultural events in 23 different languages and communities to honour and celebrate the diversity in our City. Our chairperson, Lucy Cummings, attended an amazing 44 pavilions at Folklorama in 14 days.

We are actively and continually going out into the communities with the message our City wants you to belong here. We appreciate your differences, celebrate your traditions and our doors are open to you.

The City of Winnipeg has always been a rich collage of culture, religion, language and experience. Our City has been home

to a varied population: Aboriginal, the disabled, visible minorities, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender and women. Invisible barriers are insidious and systemic. They are ingrained in our institutions in the minds of individuals. We recognize they are difficult to remove and continue to prevent the progress of many people in our society.

Mr. Speaker: I have to get you to sum up please.

Ms. Laurie Helgason: I'm there now. It's the CEC's mandate to try and break down those systemic barriers that prevent some citizens from full participation in all the opportunities the City has offered.

Mayor Katz, we on the Committee commend you for your decision to work with us. We look forward to the opportunity to show you what we do. We are open to hearing from you, hearing your input and suggestions for improvement. We believe that we all have the ability to change and grow in new directions and as we work hard to address our current mandate and the recommendations, we realize that who we are and the work we are doing is evolving from what the first Committees did and accomplished.

We are getting better at what we do and becoming more effective in the communities we work alongside of. In learning how the experiences and realities of other cultures affect those groups we're becoming more sensitive to the needs of the communities. Mayor Katz, Council, we are celebrating now with all our communities at the renewed feelings of hope that the lines of communication are open. Thank you, Mayor Katz for listening to the people in the community and on the CEC Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Are there any questions of this group? Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and I would like to thank both delegations who have taken the time to be here today. One of the things that was said in some of the coverage coming out of this, some of the media coverage, well these Committees have kind of done their job, good for them but they accomplished what they set out to do, therefore that's, there's no need for them.

What would you say, and I would open it to both members of the delegation respectively for their Committees. What would you say Ms. Helgason when you talk about barriers that are still insidious and systemic in society, what would you say are still some of the goals, some of the things that need to be done by the Citizen Equity Committee? And I would extend the same question to Ms. Popham of The Access Advisory Committee. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Laurie Helgason: We have only addressed a small portion of the mandate and recommendations that have come to our group. It's taken a few years to build bridges into the communities. There was a lot of mistrust. We're just now starting, now we've gained a lot of that trust back and are working with those communities to make them aware of how the City is going to be inclusive to them.

We still have a lot of communities we haven't met with, we haven't talked with, we haven't been able to reach. We have a newcomer's package that needs to come out to the community from the City. Working with multiculturalism in the Provincial government and Federal government, there is information from Welcome Place and a few other places but there is a missing piece from the City. People really don't realize that this is an environment where they can come and they can speak and be welcome. We need to get that information out.

Little things like how do I take a bus in Winnipeg needs to get out to the communities. In some communities, when the new immigrants come, where they were, when you got on a bus and you went and then when you got, when it was time to get off you paid for the distance you went. So when they come here and they get on the bus and they where's your bus pass well they don't even know what that means. And we

need to get that information out so people aren't marginalized in the process.

Councillor Benham: Thank you. The question was to Ms. Popham as well if she would like to answer.

Ms. Sandy Popham: I didn't really take enough time to say what we had left to do. We are a developing Committee and we are always working on the needs, the developments that are evolving out in the community. One of the areas that we are working on and have worked on this last year and will, and are continuing to work on both involving City and the Province is looking at the whole issue of Visitable housing, which we're working with the Province in looking at the Waverley West development. And I realize that that's only one of them. That's all the developments, that housing development that need that kind of input and that, so that's just one of them.

One of the things that we believe needs to be in place before our Committee could disband, if that's going to ever happen, is to have a Universal Design office here in the City that actually takes, but even then we still would need to be there because there's going need to be ongoing input from citizens out in the community with disabilities into influencing and having impact on policy as it is being developed.

But if there was a Universal Design office here, it would have some teeth to it. It would have a budget. It would be staffed appropriately and possibly have a report to the CAO's office, not through a line department, so that things could actually get done efficiently. Because that I know the current Universal Design Coordinator is always taking input from all the different offices or from dealing with policy that influences all the different offices. It's not just one department that is being looked at. It overlaps over many of the departments so. Does that sort of answer your question?

Councillor Benham: Thank you very much.

Ms. Sandy Popham: Thank you.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Thank you very much for your presentations.

Pursuant to the Council Order made earlier this morning, we will now proceed to hear the additional delegations first on the Olywest item. There are six in number. Each allowed up to the maximum of five minutes. There will be no questions of these delegations. They are Robert Chapot, if I mispronounce your names I do apologize, Robert Chapot, Lawrence Toet, Linda Bateman, Jim Stevenson, Daryl Reid, MLA and Bidhu Jha, MLA. Mr. Chapot.

Councillors we have a quorum problem. We need a couple of members back in.

Mr. Robert Chapot: Good morning.

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute. Okay, we're fine. Proceed Mr. Chapot.

Mr. Robert Chapot: Good morning Mr. Mayor, Councilmen. I appreciate the fact that you're letting me speak this morning. I understand this is not a normal situation. My name is Bob Chapot. I live at 38 Gardner Cove in Mission Gardens and I've been a resident at this address for the last 3 years and I've lived in the Transcona area for the last 28, having just moved to my new address.

I understand that Council is discussing the merits of the economic support package for Olywest project. As a long-time taxpayer, taxpaying resident of Transcona and Mission Gardens, I'm appealing to the elected officials of the City of Winnipeg to vote no at the present time on this item giving approval to Olywest.

I've done the available research in the last few days, getting information off the internet, talking to my City Councilman, my MLA representative for Radisson. I've left calls with, at your office Mr. Mayor and at the Minister, I believe it's Wowchuk's office. I'm trying to get call backs, I realize you're busy and not able

to take all the calls but I'd like some of the following issues, the following issues are some of the things that I feel need to be addressed before this project can go ahead.

One of the main ones, and it was touched on this morning, is our main water supply for the City runs directly north of the north side border of this proposed site. The proposed site requires a new sewage line and it will have to run below our main drinking water aqueduct which flows from Shoal Lake. I would like some kind of assurances that our main drinking water supply will not be contaminated by a sewer malfunction or groundwater contamination from 4,000 hogs being held in holding pens.

My second point is the effluent or solid waste. This product, this type of facility will produce vastly different effluence from the normal residential development and light industrial use currently in the area. My questions are is how is this sewage going to be treated? Where is it going to be treated? And where will the by-product be disposed of? And it's most likely into our river system. I would like some assurances that the existing sewer system will be able to handle this and that we will not be on the hook for updating the system that benefits this new project.

My third point is the nutrients or nitrogen levels. In your report it states that the sewage and waste products will have high level of nutrients and high nitrogen levels injected into the sewer system from this type of development. We are now facing extremely high levels of nitrogen in Lake Winnipeg.

It was just announced this morning that they're going to spend $40 million dollars on making Lake Winnipeg a little more, or rather $40 million dollars looking at the environmental impact of this. They're talking about making Lake Winnipeg one of the six Great Lakes and if we kill it by adding nitrogen to it, the fishing industry and the tourism industry are not going to be extremely happy about that. Both those industries bring huge dollars into this Province and having this lake contaminated by a system like this just doesn't sit well with the community.

One of the points too, is the noxious odours. This is from your reports. These are your own words. I find it hard to believe that 4, 000 hogs in holding barns and the rendering plant that will process these animals will not stink of piggy poop and the rendering process.

Olywest suggests that having residential houses 1.5 kilometres away is acceptable. And I plead with you to have them, this site not go ahead and to choose another site. The people that are involved in this are roughly 60,000 to 80,000 and I'm guessing at that number and these are the people that are in communities of south Transcona, Transcona, Mission Gardens, Windsor Park, Southdale and South Park. Huge amount of, huge amount of problems and I think these have to be addressed.

In closing I understand that the development of this magnitude will benefit the City as a whole. However the concerns of the residents and businesses who will be most impacted should be addressed at the onset of the project and not at the conclusion of it. Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Mr. Chapot. Lawrence Toet.

Mr. Lawrence Toet: Good morning Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor and Honourable members of the Council. I thank you for this opportunity to address Council regarding the Olywest hog processing plant that has been proposed for the St. Boniface Industrial Park. I make my comments as a longtime citizen of this City who is proud to call Winnipeg my home.

I wanted to start by reading a piece from your own report on 1097 regarding site selection. You read in there the consortium had original had a short-list of five sites within the City of Winnipeg that interested them. Four City-owned and one privately held. Two of the sites were associated with a public market site adjacent to the Manitoba Pork Producers

off Marion with the other three sites in close proximity to the St. Boniface Industrial Park.

In subsequent meetings with the consortium, the City administration had strongly recommended that the St. Boniface Industrial Park site is the more appropriate location for such a facility. The recently prepared public markets land use plan envisioned and it's in quotes in your own report "cleaner industry through enhanced performance standards in medium and light industrial zoning thereby moving away from uses such as meatpacking plants." So within your own report you acknowledged the fact that meatpacking plants are not a clean facility.

As a member of the community with roots tracing back to the Lord Selkirk settlers, with ancestors such as John W. Gunn who did much to build up this community, and a contributing businessman, I understand and appreciate the desire and indeed the need for progress. It is out of this desire for progress that I have many questions that should not only be answered for myself but most importantly must be answered by members of this Council before they are able to make any decisions on this matter.

As I stated I favour a City in progress. This then brings a question as to whether this is a step of progress or regress. Is not a part of progress enhancing the fabric of our quality of life? If this is the case then I question how we can bring in a facility that neighbouring economic growth then will at the same time potentially wreak havoc with this very quality of life for many of our City's residents. Do we only measure quality of life with dollars and cents? And if that is what this Council does then sadly they have missed the mark by a very wide margin.

From what has been provided as information to the public of this City I am shocked to see that the Honourable Mayor of our City who has shown a great amount of business acumen in his private enterprises has seemingly left that behind when he worked through this deal on behalf of our City. How can we make a deal with another promising them millions of dollars in giveaways and incentives, $2.4 million in infrastructure, $1 million in property, $9 to $14 million dollars paid up front by the City in local infrastructure district improvements and a loan at an undisclosed and presumably very favourable rate and then request its Board's approval before it is worked through the process of due diligence.

This is simply not an appropriate way to run any business, never mind a City. Obviously the proper way is to do the due diligence and then you can make your deal and your final decisions. What is the due diligence missing in this particular case? Here are about a few of the questions that must be answered.

What is the impact on the surrounding community and especially the respective odour? We hear these wonderful phrases like state of the art, virtually odour free, etcetera. My question is have any members of Council or the Mayor visited the 20 or more sites across Canada Olymel operates? Have you canvassed the area residents of a, have you canvassed the area residents within three kilometres of any of these plants to assure yourself completely that there are absolutely no issues with odour?

How many of these plants have been built in the centre of a city surrounded by residential development? And have you paid special attention to these sites? Have you considered the stress on the water supply this facility will have with its huge consumption of water per day and what implications this may carry for the water supply of the entire City?

Where is the sewage from this kind of consumption going to go? How well will it be treated before it leaves the plant? Where will the City treat this amount of waste? And how much will it cost to build and sustain such a facility?

Will there be any odours from the sewage as it moves to a treatment facility? Drive down Dawson Road for an opportunity to experience this wonderful perfume.

Are there guarantees in place that there will be no contamination to the existing

aquifer or City water supply since you're going to run sewage lines nearby the existing aqueduct which supplies water to the City?

This is just a small sampling of a myriad of issues that are being ignored or seemingly pushed under carpets. We must have guarantees and not just vague assurances. I know some of you will argue that the Clean Environment Commission will look at these things. They possibly may address some of them but it is at the wrong end of a deal.

This is due diligence that must be completely done before this Council is in any position to ratify any kind of deal and must be done by a body that has strong regulatory strength. If the Mayor has no concerns that these issues will be properly addressed in public consultation and the work of CEC, he should also have no fears of waiting for this process to be completed before he or this Council agrees to give away our tax dollars to an as a yet unlicensed company.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Lawrence, your time is expired.

Mr. Lawrence Toet: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Next is Linda Bateman. You have five minutes on the same subject.

Ms. Linda Bateman: Good morning. My name is Linda Bateman and I'm a resident of Southland Park community. It came to my attention on November 21st that the City planned to build a hog plant within 2 kilometres of our neighbourhood. Due to the minimal amount of time that we've had to prepare and address any concerns we had, I feel it's unfair for the City to proceed with its current plan.

Again due to time limitations we were only able to speak with 34 homeowners in the Southland Park community, which represents approximately one-tenth of its residents. Through these discussions it was extremely evident that they do not support this deal as it exists. I am confident these concerns would drastically increase if we had more time and the City was more open and forthcoming about its plans.

The main objections or concerns raised by the residents are: Why did the City keep this so quiet? Why were the citizens not given more time and opportunity to express their concerns? If it is such a good thing, why did no one at Olywest return my calls? Why did I have nothing but the run around by both the Mayor's office and get no straight answers from any of the City Councillors regarding this issue?

The second concern is why is the plant being built so close to residential areas without any consideration to the residents? This plant will impact both property value and resale value of our homes. Our homes range in price from approximately $150,000 to $400,000 dollars and the City does generate huge revenue from our property taxes. These homeowners have made huge investments in their homes and deserve to be informed of the City's plans. We currently are impacted by the sound that's generated from Symington Yard and now the odour from this plant will only decrease interest in new residents entering our community.

The third concern from my neighbours is the increase in traffic flow and the other concern is the concern of how many more plants will be opening up? Is this just the beginning? I want to assure you we're not opposing the plant. We're simply opposing the location. I ask you before your vote, would you want this plant in your neighbourhood?

I'm submitting the names and signatures of the Southland Park residents that we were able to reach in such a short amount of time. I hope you will consider our plea to rethink this deal as it exists.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you and up next is Jim Stevenson. You have five minutes.

Mr. Jim Stevenson: First of all I'd like to thank the Mayor and the Councillors for

the opportunity to express my concerns on this issue. I'll begin by informing you that I operate a business in the St. Boniface Industrial Park and reside on Foch Avenue, less than two kilometres from the proposed site. So I'm sure you can understand my concern in the issue.

I will start off by pointing out I'm in no way against progress but I would also like to mention it was very progressive thinking on behalf of the City Councillors of Brandon to move their facility of this kind five kilometres to the east of the town. The facility in Brandon does not operate a rendering operation from which I'm told most of the stench is driven by but the proposed Olywest site does.

And further to that from something that was mentioned earlier, I would like to know where Saskatoon was planning on putting there part, their plant. I'm sure it wasn't in a residential area.

I'm told that the tax revenue generated by the plant is one of the main reasons for the motion coming forward and I'd like to point out that taxes generated on my street alone I believe are in excess of $150,000 dollars. This is money that's our money and I think you have a right to us to make sure that it's spent by where we want it to be spent.

And I would also like to point out that the taxes that could have been generated by the expansion of the Southland Park development might exceed this potential gain. I'm sure that that development won't go as quickly ahead with the stench that will permeate on top of it. This is on taxes and taxes alone. Alone the cost that will be incurred by the City to allow this to go forward.

I would also like to point out the site selected I think, although I believe first and foremost should be changed due to the smell and deterioration of life in our area is also a problem because of the fact that the main drinking water aqueduct for the north and west portion of the City runs directly in front of it. Something that was covered earlier and I didn't know it was public knowledge.

Your Executive Policy Committee meeting of November 16th, 2005 laid out some of the potential negative impacts of this plan. Firstly odour and that's what you guys said was a concern. So it's definitely a concern. And I'd like to ask you, if your house was located two kilometres from this plant, would you be voting for it? We're the people that voted for you.

The second concern was traffic issues. Approximately 140 truckloads of pigs may pass by the front of my house, or close by, a day in the future and once again I ask you that question, would you vote for that to go by your house? Do you believe that that's a correct decision to make?

This brings me to another point that was brought forward by an Olywest representative on the talk show on CJOB yesterday. It was suggested that they would possibly buy out housing in surrounding areas. I mean that was a wonderful thing to suggest. I mean they didn't say they would do that, but they didn't say that they wouldn't do it. They said well there were situations in Quebec where we looked at that. I think this admission shows you that at least that this is not a trivial concern and it is a real problem.

I have to also say due to the fact that I'm self-employed and I don't have a pension plan as the City Councillors do, my house is an investment in my future and I'd like to sit on the deck at some point you know and enjoy it and at some point sell it for something so I can retire. And I don't know whether you'd like to sit on my deck on a nice summer evening, 30 degrees above zero with the wind wafting through from the plant if it goes through. Maybe the City would like to guarantee the value of my home. I had an assessment done this summer. If you did that I would be happy to you know go along with that.

I have to mention a letter I received from the Public Works department yesterday to do a construction of a sidewalk and sewer line on Dugald Road and a meeting coming up to discuss this. It surprised me is the timing was uncanny that I got a letter to say they want us to come down and see what we think about a sidewalk

going down Dugald Road. Where was the public meeting for this venture and why wasn't I invited to it? Why didn't somebody say something to us before we got to the point that we're voting to pass this through to the next stage.

I'm not a very political person and I'll have to say the biggest surprise I got from the situation is the lack of involvement and information given to my elected MLA, Councillors and MP's. I think today when that was asked on the radio talk show and Mr. Katz responded to it, his response was that you know they should have come out of their cave. Well you know what? The people of Transcona, maybe we're coming out of the cave now. You know it's a, we didn't know about it and we voted.

I have to close by saying that I hope a suitable location is found for this venture and will not affect the quality of life for so many people and I plead to you, at the very least to vote the referral in so the homework can be done before we proceed with what I feel is a mistake. Please consider what other cities have done and locate this plant out of the residential area. My hope is that our City will grow and it cannot grow inward. It is sure to surround this plant at some point. A decision to proceed in passing is a problem to our children. Thank you very much.

(Councillor Eadie in the chair)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Mr. Stevenson. Mr. Daryl Reid.

Mr. Daryl Reid: Thank you Mr. Chairperson, Your Worship, members of City Council. It's been a pleasure to be here with you this morning to talk about an issue that's vitally important to my community. Usually I don't get involved in issues that are involved in the civic nature but since this issue crosses those boundaries and involves both the civic and the provincial governments, I felt it was my duty to come forward to represent the viewpoints of my constituents as they have expressed to me over a period of time.

I want to start off first by saying that we are proud to be part of a Provincial government that has tried its very darnedest to build the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg. We're proud to be part of a government that has made those strides. We're also proud to be part of a Provincial government that has taken very seriously the issues that have faced the agricultural community of our Province and in fact the issues dealing with B.S.E. and pork production in our Province. So we're not here today to say that we're opposed to the economic opportunities and the jobs that are attached to the industry that is being proposed here because we very much support those jobs coming to the Province of Manitoba.

We want to say first one of the issues that I want to relate to you what residents I think are most concerned about because they have communicated with my office and with my colleague Bidhu Jha, who is also here today, has constituents have expressed to us a number of concerns that I think are very, very serious and need to be dealt with prior to any decisions being made. And what the residents have said to me is that they are most concerned about is the location, not the opportunity for these jobs to come to the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg. That's what my residents have expressed to me.

Now one of the issues that I've determined through the conversations that I've had with my constituents that there seems to be a lot of miss or perceptions that are out there with respect to the industry itself. That is an important point that I want to stress here today. That we need to deal with that right on, head on, and we need to give the opportunity to the local community residents to come out to public meetings.

And I have, as my colleague and I have had the opportunity in the last week, to meet with the plant proponents, the Olywest folks, including Hytek, and we have encouraged them to come into the community of Transcona and to invite the community residents to participate in an open, public and transparent community

meeting. To give the residents the opportunity to be heard first, for them to express their concerns second, and to receive answers that will give them a base of knowledge and a comfort level with the proposal that is being made to us. If that comfort level is not achieved by the community, then I think the decision is wrong with respect to the location of this plant because we want very much for the plant to live in harmony with the residents of our communities.

Now today this issue is affecting the community of Transcona. Perhaps in future days and weeks that come there will be other proposals that will come forward that will affect your communities. So I want you very much to be aware that the residents of Transcona want this opportunity as your constituents would want as well.

Now there are a number of questions with respect to the proposal regarding the location and I'm acutely aware that this facility, this, this plant proposal is going to be located, if it should pass through all of the hoops, there is a potential for it to be in an M-3 zoned area. The concern that I have is today it's a hog processing plant, tomorrow it could be other industries that are of serious concern to the community of Transcona.

And I have stressed to my colleagues at the Legislature at every opportunity, and I stress it to you here today, Transcona is surrounded on three sides by heavy industry and we are proposing to put another industry along the borders of Transcona.

I have fought very hard to make sure that the residents of my community and other communities in this Province are given the opportunity to be heard and just this past year in legislation we brought in an Act that would allow for that consultation process to take place. I'm proud that we brought that Act in. But this applies between municipalities and I want to make sure that communities are also involved in that process.

I want to share with you the issue with respect to decisions you may make in the future to what is located in that park because no one has ever said to me that industries such as petrol chemical, steel, some form of steel manufacturing would go in to communities like that. Is it possible for a munitions industry to be located in the St. Boniface Industrial Park?

Mr. Speaker: Sum up Mr. Reid please.

Mr. Daryl Reid: There are issues like that that are important. Thank you Mr. Chairperson. The residents are concerned about the perception, the risk of odour impingement on the quality of life in the community. They're concerned about the traffic volumes and flows and direction and its impact upon the residential homes that are in the Transcona, south Transcona community.

There are concerns that this plant, while it's being called state of the art, who here today can define for me what state of the art means? I do not have a clear understanding of what state of the art means and I think it's important that the residents of the community have the opportunity to come out to a public meeting that the proponents of the plant will be able to explain what they mean by that. Does it mean zero emissions? Does it mean some emissions? Does it mean that there will be significant impact on the quality of life for the community?

So I have said very clearly, Mr. Chairperson that we want to have the opportunity as a community. Show me that this plant can live in harmony with the community of Transcona and that's why I'm asking you today to make the decision to defer the vote on this, on the transference of this land to the plant proponents. What's the rush? We have made a $200 million decision here (In Audible)

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Reed I have to cut you off. Mr. Reid.

Mr. Daryl Reid: Make the right decision. Thank you Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Speaker: Don't intrude on our time like that please. Mr. Bidhu Jha, MLA.

Mr. Bidhu Jha: Thank you very much and good morning. I am very thankful to you for giving me the opportunity to speak here. I think this is democracy that works when you consult with people and talk and express your opinion freely. That is the society that I have chosen to live and that's Canada and I'm very thankful to you for having this open process.

I must say at the outset I am not against economic development. The Mayor should know and others should know that I come from a business background and I am very proud to say that economic development is the backbone of any community and any society to build on. So let it not be perceived that I'm against the farmers, that I'm against this particular industry that is being brought to Manitoba.

I also must say for, quote for the record that I also endorse government incentives to bring businesses to the Province and to the City and to the other jurisdictions within our areas, including Canada. Having said all that I think I'd also like to enforce that I'm proud to be a part of the government, as my colleague said that we have demonstrated in the past that we're very people oriented and we are very concerned about environmental issues.

Premier Doer goes on record to be the first Premier to have Kyoto Accord ratified and the rest of the Provinces followed. So the question is that we are not perceived to be for this or that. Why I am here with my colleague is the process of democracy to work and I think I request you to delay. Delay does not mean cancel. Delay until certain things are done.

Having said all that I must say as a representative elected by people from Radisson who are sitting there and there, it is their concerns that I must represent as their representative. It is their voice I that I must say here or anywhere outside or inside to express what they tell me and their concerns. Their concern today is that they are very, very nervous about the quality of life being deteriorated because of experiences in the past.

Now I am an Engineer by profession. I can tell you the technology, cutting edge technology, the world today can make things happen, but this is the challenge to the industry. This is the challenge to the business to come to the community and express and demonstrate that it is a perception. If there are only two things that could happen, either it's a perception or it's a reality. If it is a perception, let that perception be cleared by clear demonstration, talking to people, talking to my constituents that are concerned.

I have two properties there. One property that was available for sale because I bought another house. The gentleman that was going to buy he called me last night and says cancelled, looks like they're putting a hog plant next door. Your property is not, will be not sold. So I'm concerned. So are my fellow residents and constituents.

Let us reprieve that fear by demonstration through the work, through the consultation process, through the due diligence, that this fear is perceptive. If it is perception, it would be clear. If it is real, then let it be solved.

So my request to the Councillors today that let us not think that we are against it. Let us think how to make this, which I said in the letter with Daryl Reid, that let it be win-win. Let the constituents feel comfortable. Let the constituents feel not threatened by the quality of life being eroded by this plant and let the business feel very comfortable that they will have a friendly neighbourhood that will work with them and we will enjoy together an economic development in this Province.

My request is, my request is again to consider all these factors primarily to consult with the constituents who are here and in the communities to make sure that their fear is eliminated and they're consulted.

So I don't have anymore words to say except thank you for the opportunity and this is a big challenge for all of us and let us work together on seeing how we can do this so that there is no loser. Thank you.

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

Pursuant to the Council Order with regard to clause 4 the citizen committees, there were three delegations that will be heard on that, five minutes each maximum, no questions. Carol Polson, Theresa Ann Swedick and Margot Lavoie. Carol Polson.

Ms. Carol Polson: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour, Councillors, thank you very much for waiving the rules today so that we could all present and so that the citizen voice can be heard.

I'm Carol Polson with the Manitoba League of Persons with Disabilities. We're a non-profit consumer driven grassroots cross disability, Winnipeg and Provincially based organization, engaging in human rights class advocacy issues. Our work involves promoting equal rights and full participation in society for persons with disabilities.

Citizen participation is key to all of the activities that we, as a league, engage in. Civic government is also about citizen participation or should be. In the past week we have seen the rights of citizens eroded in a blunt, disregarding and shameful manner. Three key heartbeat committees were, which include the Access Advisory Committee, were dismissed by Mayor Katz who felt their purpose and usefulness didn't merit continuance.

Mayor Katz has since changed his mind after the citizens of Winnipeg in a unified scream of outrage, voiced their concerns about being excluded from the democratic process, losing their animated voices and being stifled from having expert input into issues affecting them which include making the City of Winnipeg accessible for persons with disabilities to the benefit of all citizens.

This heartbeat Committee, the Access Advisory Committee, has realized many achievements since its 1989 inception under Mayor Bill Norrie. Some of the highlights. Forming and adopting an Accessibility Policy. Also in 2001 the City of Winnipeg was the first city in Canada to adopt a Universal Design Policy and since now has a Universal Design Coordinator.

In the past the City of Winnipeg placed a high priority on making information, buildings, services, universally accessible through design. Promoting universal design locally, nationally and internationally as well. Its purchased equipment for close-captioning of Council meetings, redesigned the Access Advisory Committee website to include information about new initiatives and information about Universal Design. Implemented a successful Accessibility Awards ceremony celebrating businesses, government projects, organizations and designers involved with projects that are exemplary in creating a accessible environment in Winnipeg. And in fact we just enjoyed that celebration in September.

Development and implementation of a Sign Language Interpreter policy. Consultation on accessibility for election processes and I'm sure an election process is coming up in the next year or so. Consultations with administration regarding initiatives such as curb cuts, audible traffic signals and parking permit program. Recommended changes to by-laws, policies, regulations and budgets. Reviewing design plans of capital projects. And as recently as one-and-a-half months ago the Access Advisory Committee co-sponsored a successful community forum on Visitable housing design.

The above is a reflection of the Access Advisory Committee's progress in recent years. In 2003 the Access Advisory Committee delivered a day-long planning workshop with the disability community. Many priority issues were identified including a lack of accessible City-owned facilities, needed improvements to sidewalks and streets, and a lack of publication of ongoing awareness, public awareness, of the universal design concept and principle.

Please allow, please allow this Committee the opportunity to continue its

implementation of the recommendations coming from this valuable community consultation which took place in 2003. We are heartened that the Mayor will withdraw his motion to terminate the Access Advisory, Safety and Citizens Equity Committees. Persons with disabilities are eager and responsive to working with the Mayor, Councillors, staff, administrators and anyone else in the community to make Winnipeg a better place for all its citizens. Thanks very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Ms. Polson. Teresa Ann Swedick.

Councillor Gerbasi: Excuse me Mr. Speaker, I believe she had to go home because her sign interpretation time ran out.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Then we'll deal with Margot Lavoie.

Ms. Margot Lavoie: Mr. Mayor and Councillors, I thank you for allowing myself and others to say a few words concerning the decision that was taken last week. I am here to represent the Manitoba Oblate Justice and Peace Committee which is made up of priests, brothers, laymen and women who dedicate their lives to the promotion of justice and peace in our world through education of the public and through actions that show our solidarity with those who are excluded and pushed to the margins of our society.

It was somewhat uncanny that in the middle of our country, Restorative Justice Week, that our Mayor and the Executive Policy Committee would decide that three grassroots community committees were considered expendable to the life of our City. Restorative Justice Week is one where we celebrate the inroads made towards building communities that are becoming more responsible for its well-being and healing of its members.

Though Mayor Katz has since announced that the decision would be reversed, we want to show our appreciation to and solidarity with those who spend thousands of hours working at building up the confidence of folks who need and would not be, in need, would not be considered by those in power.

Through the work of the members of the Citizens Equity Committee, the Access Advisory Committee and Winnipeg Committee for Safety, folks have been engaging in working, have been engaged in working volunteering their time to bring the consciousness of the larger society to the needs of citizens with disabilities, immigrants, youth, the unemployed, the underemployed, the working poor. In other words those voices that are not heard in the so-called democratic society.

Those of us who belong to faith communities are compelled by our teachings and traditions to recognize in these brothers and sisters, the widows, orphans and strangers, and compel us to attend to their needs so we can build a just and compassionate society.

The different Committees that I mentioned above have been instrumental in giving a voice to those who are silent and giving them tools necessary to be able to claim what rightly belongs to them. These committees, by giving the forgotten people the time to tell their stories, by giving them the opportunity to find ways of solving the many roadblocks they meet in their life. By searching with them for tools necessary to achieve certain goals, are building communities healthy and strong. And that is the only way that our City will really become a safe city.

I have heard someone say it doesn't hurt to look at new ways of doing things. Well, I would like to tell you that a top-heavy administration is nothing new. It is nothing new to have a governing body that is disconnected from the life and needs of grassroots communities. What is new is the resurgence of vitality that we are witnessing in the communities where people are participating and working at solving their issues.

That is what our City has been experiencing through the hard work of the citizens' committees. The work done through these committees is foundational to a viable community. We want to work

to where the building of community where no one is excluded, where each citizen has a voice. Where each citizen can participate fully to the life of his and her City and where each one can take responsibility for his and her, for his and her City, I'm sorry, I'm getting a little distracted here.

We are hoping that Mr. Mayor and the Executive community will remember in the future you can only build a city from bottom up. You must encourage the groups that have at heart the life of the disenfranchised people in our City. You will find that it is by taking the small, painful steps that hurting people need to rebuild their lives that at some point these steps will turn to quantum leaps towards a balanced, inclusive and compassionate society. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Ms. Lavoie. That concludes the delegations for this morning. I'm going to suggest we call at 12 o'clock and we'll deal with, pardon me?

Councillor Lazarenko: Vote to adjourn to 1:30?

Councillor Wyatt: I was going to move that Mr. Speaker, but I was going to suggest that we stay through lunch and debate this with the residents here but seeing that the, I don't think there would be much support for that.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Councillor Wyatt: I will move that we adjourn but encourage all the residents here who are here to return after 1:30.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, the hour being 12 o'clock we will recess until 1:30 and Executive Policy Committee will be on the agenda.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of November 23, 2005 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors your presence is required in the chamber please.

All right Councillors, do we have a quorum?

The report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 9th, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 9, 2005**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the report of November 9th and move adoption of Consent agenda items 1 to 5.

Mr. Speaker: You heard the motion.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

All right. Just a second here, the report of Executive Policy Committee dated November the 16th.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 16, 2005**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the report of November the 16th and move adoption of Consent agenda items 1 to 3 and 5 to 6, and stand down 4.

Councillor Wyatt: Stand down 3 please

Mr. Speaker: Three has an amendment so it has to stand down and 4 is stood down.

So the motion is to approve clauses 1, 2, 5 and 6.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

We can go to, why don't we go to clause 4 right away because I think we want to move this be referred back to Executive Committee Mr. Mayor, is that? Clause 4 Citizen Committees – Access, etcetera, to be referred back.

Mayor Katz: That's correct. As everybody should be aware of, I've sent out a letter to all Council members as well all members of…

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor, Mr. Mayor, just, you are moving it be referred back for further consideration. That's all there is no speech on a referral.

Mayor Katz: Moving referral. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of the referral? Opposed? That motion is carried.

Clause 3.

Item No. 3 – Olywest Project: Economic Development Incentive Package
File FL-2.6

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I had to get up quicker than Councillor Wyatt, I barely made it, but anyways I will introduce this motion.

Before the debate begins, I would like to, once again point out the key considerations that are before us today. Today we are debating the merits of an economic support package, not an environmental license. As for the package, I firmly endorse it. We are talking about a $200 million dollar investment. We're talking about 1,100 jobs. This will provide more than $750,000 dollars in property taxes and $134,000 dollars in hydro and natural gas taxes directly to our bottom line.

Today's vote is important. It's just a first step, Mr. Speaker. A rigorous environmental licensing process awaits this project with comprehensive public consultation. I believe our City is ready, our roads can handle the load, our transit can service the area, our water and waste systems will handle the sewage outflows.

I can tell you we have identified an appropriate location. This is land that has the proper zoning. It is strategically located north of the CN Intermodal yard and close to the perimeter. We have the housing market. We have the labour market. I believe this is an excellent deal, when you compare it to past economic development initiatives.

Most important of all, I believe the Olywest Consortium is prepared to do what it takes to be a productive part of the City of Winnipeg. I don't believe they would invest $200 million dollars to make people angry. They are here to help Winnipeg grow and succeed. Those are the facts. I look forward to debate Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

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

WHEREAS citizens have raised numerous concerns related to the establishment of a hog producing plant in the community;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item No. 3 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 16, 2005, be referred back to the Executive Policy Committee with the following instructions:

1) That EPC direct administration to review the proposed Olywest Project and report back on all implications from the point of view of the various city departments, such as, though not limited to, Water and Waste, Public Works (Streets and Transportation), Community Services, Fire and Paramedic Service, Winnipeg Transit and Property, Planning and Development, and;

2) That the city conduct Public Consultations in the affected communities in east Winnipeg and report back the results of those consultations to EPC and Council prior to returning the said clause to Council, and;

3) That the Business Plan of the Olywest Project be made available to Council, with an administrative analysis of its contents.

Mr. Speaker: Motion number 2, moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Lazarenko is a referral back with instructions. Councillor Wyatt you can open debate on your motion.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker I would like to have this motion debated with, not concurrently with the other item. I want to be able to have it debated so that we debate it on its own and then move as the rules allow, for us to debate the clause depending on what happens with this motion of course.

Mr. Speaker: Our practice is Councillor after an amendment's been moved that they are debated currently. You'll have the chance to open debate on this. You also will have the opportunity to speak on the main motion.

Councillor Wyatt: But it may be the practice but not necessarily the rules, is it the will of this chamber if we could have debate this separately, that is the rules of the Council and Council's decision.

Mr. Speaker: You want to move that and I'll rule by Council's decision.

Councillor Wyatt: I will move that this be debated separately on its own prior to debate on the actual clause.

Mr. Speaker: Suspension of our practice.

All in favour of that? Opposed? Let's do a recorded vote, it sounded unenthusiastic. All in favour of that suspension please rise.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of Order Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We're in a vote now.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion is, yeah the motion is lost.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of Order Mr. Speaker.

(Point of Order)

Councillor Wyatt: Is it not the rules that we can allow, we can debate these separately and have it debated separately. Why would we be calling a question on the matter?

Mr. Speaker: We voted on the matter Councillor, there is no rule. In any event your motion was lost no matter how you look at it, so you may now open debate on your motion please.

Councillor Wyatt: This will be a matter that I will be referring to the Secretariat Committee for discussion.

What am I, I'm allowed how many minutes for the opening on the motion Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Ten minutes.

Councillor Wyatt: Ten minutes, thank you. The clock, thank you.

Mr. Speaker I moved this amendment, it's a referral to Committee with instructions for the principle reason that the Olywest project has come before us extremely quickly, before all members of Council, before the community, has had a chance

to have any input. Before administration has had an opportunity to do its due diligence and to look at all implications and aspects of this project for the City. And before we've even had a look at the very business plan which is now coming forward which will be part of this project, which we are putting money for, we're subsidizing, we're going into debt for and funding and yet no business plan has come forward to us, Mr. Speaker.

I don't think it is an unreasonable motion. The motion if you look at it calls for this Council to simply refer back this, the clause to EPC and allow EPC to direct the administration to report back on all of the implications for all the City departments, to allow for public consultations, and to allow for us to look at the business plan.

Mr. Speaker today we heard from many delegations, folks who have just found out about this plan. And indeed, technically, under the law and technically under our by-laws there doesn't have to be any public consultation because there is no reason for a zoning, a rezoning hearing. That is technically correct. But Mr. Speaker we as a City I would have hoped, have moved beyond just simply following the letter of the law when it comes to involving communities and the development and growth of our City.

Quite often, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we often engage those who are involved in business and encourage them to meet with the communities involved, to sit down with the communities involved before they even file applications for development at times when they do need a rezoning, though they don't have to.

I could tell you Mr. Speaker that today I have been getting, in the last number of days, many emails and many calls. And one email that I got, and this is an individual who, a very substantial businessperson in our City and read the report and read what was on EPC and he's asked for me to read the email into the record but not his name because of his position.

He said "I just read the report to EPC and I was astonished. Storage of 4,000 hogs onsite, 350 inbound trucks per week and 500 outbound trucks per week. No smell???!! That's a pile of ps, please excuse the pun. All of a sudden the City has $9 to $14 million dollars to spend on this project." This is a somebody who deals with the City on a daily basis. This is somebody who does business all over the City, who is extremely concerned about what is taking place and extremely concerned about his investments and the investments of his firm.

Mr. Speaker there have not been proper public consultations. The public has not been allowed to have any input into this and yet now we are making a decision for all intents and purposes, will set the wheels, set in motion the wheels of this machine, which is going to be building the plant at this location because we are giving the most important thing they need to start any project and that is the land. Without the land, they have nothing and they know it. And that is why they are here today.

And that's why here today when Councillors stood up and asked them the question, why can't you just lay this matter, why can't you hold off and let the public have some input, and some public consultation, allow for the public to be able to speak to this item, allow for the information to flow and, indeed, if there is not going to be any impact with regards to noise, with regards to odours, that will all come out through the public consultations.

And the answer from the industry was, sorry, we can't do that. We can't do that. We'll consult with you after we get the land. Well thank you very much. Thank you very much because at that point they'll have achieved what they wanted from City Hall, by and large. And now they just got to go get what they need from the Province.

No consultations Mr. Speaker. We've got developers who want to build 10 homes and we tell them to go and consult with people. We've got a $200 dollar million hog plant coming there's no public consultations in the community. To me,

that strikes as a, as, as, as a lack of courtesy, at the very least.

This is a new neighbour coming in to an existing community. And I represent a community which has many industries and many businesses and I can tell you that of all the communities in Winnipeg we probably have a lot of the major industries, heavy manufacturing industries. We know what it is like to live with industries. And of all the communities Transcona is probably the most tolerant in the City when it comes to living with industry. But this is not the way to start a process out and to build something like this. Engage the community and bring them on board.

Today, I have never seen this in my three years of Council and I don't know how often it happens, but to see one MLA out, never mind one, but two. And I can tell you right now that these MLA's, have shown a great amount of courage to come forward and to say today that this matter should be laid over, that we should be not rushing into this. It took a lot of courage and I know that they are under a tremendous pressure and stress for what they are doing but are speaking for their communities.

You now have two MLA's from the area that is east Winnipeg that is going to be impacted and you have the City Councillor, in only nine days, coming forward. After the announcement last Monday remember, which involved the City and the Province standing together at the podium. Now you have two members of the government caucus saying wait a minute, put the brakes on this, we need public information. We need public consultations. The City has to do its due diligence and get the facts.

Mr. Speaker this is unprecedented and for our Council now to turn around and just basically wash our hands and ignore what's happening out in the communities, shows how out of touch this Council Chamber has become. And that's why I plead and I, and I encourage Councillors on behalf of my, I'm not shameful Councillor Swandel to get on my knees and to help the people who are now going to be impacted by this decision. I will never hesitate to do that.

These, this is a community which has been directly impacted and the calls that Councillors I've been receiving, is not just you know we are against this. You know, we are against it because my wife is crying because we are worried about our property. We just built a house. Another call was we just built a house here and we've got a young family and we're going to be downwind from this plant. Others, who lived in the community for years, generations who cannot believe that this is happening in this day and age.

The Brandon plant, five kilometres out of town. I was at the AMM Convention the other day and I went to have a look at it. Five kilometres on the outside of the city, no houses to the north, no houses to the south, where the prevailing winds are from, and they don't have a rendering facility. And they're five kilometres beyond the property of homeowners.

This is right smack dab, houses to the north, houses to the south, housing to the, to the east. South Transcona was going to be developed one day into residential developments. I think you guys, if this goes through you can forget about that tax base. And maybe even forget about the joint venture that this City is now involved with. A joint venture which we're now involved with building thousands of homes, the City has a stake in this and yet there is no reports.

Mr. Speaker this motion also calls for the administration to do the due diligence that we need. What is the impact on the City from property development's point of view with regards future land developments of the area? What this is impact on our joint venture? What is the impact on water and waste and the treatment facility that we have? All the costs we refer to the report, this email that came back from the Mayor's office, I want to thank him for a response to my email but it created more questions than answers.

All of a sudden now it looks like we are subsidizing, we're going to be in the business of subsidizing the transit

service. When we had the Council seminar we were told, no, they were going to pay to extend the transit service. Now we're all of a sudden Mr. Speaker with regards to this report coming forward today was a lot of questions, and not very many answers.

And the debate, I realize, will not end here. If Council does not support this referral back, Mr. Speaker as far as I'm concerned at the end of the day the people of east Winnipeg will decide what happens with this issue.

But I believe that Council will be showing leadership today to simply take a step back and to say that we have a very good opportunity, yes, we want economic development, yes, we want jobs, but the way we go about doing it is very important.

And if this has been negotiated now, for the last three years which the industry is telling us, has been going on three years and intense negotiations for the last six months, what will hurt by having a segment of that time, a portion of that time being towards public consultations in the community before this Council makes a decision, what will that hurt to do that?

Very little. They've been talking about this for three years, negotiating this for three years. Why is this being rammed through today Mr. Speaker? There is absolutely no reason to do it. As far as the subsidies, which are before us today, we'll be debating that shortly I realize but there are so many questions with regards to this plan.

I believe Mr. Speaker that I have given an indication of how we can avoid having to, avoid having to have a confrontation on this issue and indeed makes things work and be a win-win for everybody. I would encourage Councillors to support this referral, to address these outstanding issues that have been identified by the communities being affected. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Benham on the clause and the referral motion.

Councillor Benham: Thanks very much Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support Councillor Wyatt's motion to refer, seconded by Councillor Lazarenko, and I think it makes a, Councillor Wyatt has just made a very good case for it and I would support him in some of those comments and I would make comments of my own.

I hope all Councillors support the motion to refer because I think it is the right thing to do. But if it fails I will be forced to vote against the main motion. I'm not necessarily opposed to the substance of the main motion. Nor am I in favour. I simply don't have the information as a City Councillor to do my job, to make a proper decision, and I would submit Mr. Speaker that nobody, nobody sitting in this chamber has all of the necessary information.

This motion is another example of this Mayor and the Councillors who support him, not wanting to listen to our citizens. I don't know why but they don't. Councillor Wyatt is quite right. The City insists on public hearings for minor rezonings, for small subdivisions. This is a huge project and we have not heard anything at all from the public except for a couple of delegations this morning here. And we were glad, and I'm glad to have heard that, that much at least.

Not hear from the public on a hog-slaughtering plant less than a mile from the nearest neighbours. Totally disenfranchise those neighbours and other Winnipeggers who have valid concerns. This shows clear contempt for the citizens of Winnipeg. It is a clear signal that the Mayor and the Councillors who support him around the Council chamber are not interested in hearing views other than their own.

We had an example of that last week, Mr. Speaker when the Mayor and the EPC passed a motion axing citizen committees. That motion has been withdrawn and I'm glad it has been. But, not before the Mayor and Councillor O'Shaughnessy made some very negative comments about citizens who volunteered their time to serve this City and this City Council. Still hanging and

dangling and twisting in the wind Mr. Speaker is the Civic Environmental Committee, we don't know what's going to happen to that citizen committee. So I am establishing a pattern. (In Audible)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham, Councillor Benham, clause 3 please.

Councillor Benham: I beg pardon.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 3 is what we are dealing with now please.

Councillor Benham: I understand Mr. Speaker and I'm establishing a pattern. So the most important point for me Mr. Speaker is that we must hear from the public about this proposal. From all Winnipeggers who wish to speak out on it but especially from the neighbours. That is only fair and right.

I do have some other concerns Mr. Speaker. Councillor Wyatt outlined a number of his concerns in his letter to the Mayor that he referred to. Truck traffic, we're looking at nine trucks per hour which by my calculations means one every five or six minutes. That's seems like a lot to me.

Odour, I'm not very satisfied with what we've heard about the odour. I'm not very satisfied with what we have heard about pollution. And I want to know, because we all know that the City pours raw sewage into the Red River many times a year, I want to know, will any untreated pig parts end up in the Red River? The City officials who briefed us as Councillors were unable to answer that Mr. Speaker and I think it is a very important question.

Secondly, I would like an answer to the statement I received from a Winnipegger by email yesterday, which I quoted to Mr. Koroluk, just one example of an environmental consequence of the slaughterhouse is that natural and exogenous hormones in hog blood will not be removed by wastewater treatment. So it will still be there, the bad stuff will still be there and those hormones can disrupt the endocrine systems and reproductive systems in aquatic biota. So for all the fears that we've had about Garrison and other issues Mr. Speaker over the years, we now have an issue where we could be seriously damaging the environment of the Red River and Lake Winnipeg, on the same day that we have received a report that tells us that we should start cleaning it up and we should start treating it like a 6th Great Lake.

And finally Mr. Speaker we have the information introduced this morning by delegation that Brandon does not mix pig and human waste but we will. I have no idea what the implications of that are Mr. Speaker but I'd sure like to know and I would like the engineers in our Water and Waste department who are paid by City Council and by the citizens of Winnipeg to study this matter and to tell us and to deal specifically with at least those three issues.

I don't believe it's good enough for us as City Councillors to wash our hands of the question of the environment and say, that's somebody else's problem. That's the problem for the Clean Environment Commission, that's a problem for the Province. No it's not Mr. Speaker. We have a responsibility to our citizens to ensure that we don't make the environment worse than it already is. And, certainly, that we don't spend a whole lot of taxpayers' money destroying the environment. I think that we need to have far more information as City Councillors before we vote. I think that's very important.

Our own report identifies lack of adequate existing public transit service. That is in our report Mr. Speaker as one of the major problems with this proposal. And Councillor Wyatt raised this issue in his email and it was replied to by Bryan Gray, Manager of EPC Secretariat. Councillor Wyatt said where the information on public transportation to and from this site. They need a large labour pool. Can our transit system meet these demands? We need a report from Winnipeg Transit. Councillor Wyatt is right, we do.

Bryan Gray, Manager of EPC Secretariat replying and I agree, I join in thanking the Mayor for his courtesy in having Brian Gray reply, but his reply on the transit

issue is simply inadequate. Transit has been in discussions regarding the possibility of establishing a special service that Olywest would subsidize so their employees can rely on our public transit system.

And Mr. Speaker the Mayor said earlier in debate our transit system can handle the load. Well Mr. Speaker no, we are conceding in this report and in Mr. Gray's reply that public transit for all the workers, all the workers in St. Boniface Industrial Park is inadequate.

But instead of upgrading transit for all workers which would be the opportunity we see in this, we're talking about upgrading sewers and we're talking about upgrading roads and putting in signals, but never once, never once do we talk about upgrading public transit so that the low-wage workers, who are working in that Industrial Park can use public transit to get to and from their jobs the way they do in every other major city in the world Mr. Speaker.

Instead we are talking about Winnipeg Transit establishing a private charter service for one company in the St. Boniface Industrial Park. What a step backwards Mr. Speaker. What a lost opportunity. What a total vision of a car culture. We know that those workers will be forced to buy a car in order to get to and from their work, whereas in any other major city they would be able to get to and from work by public transit.

There are some positive points in this proposal Mr. Speaker and I do want to talk about them. 1,100 jobs, that's a, that makes it an important employer. I like some of the people in delegation, question the jobs, I want to know whether the jobs cause injuries because that is not good in the long term Mr. Speaker, either for the workforce or for our health system or for the Worker's Compensation system. But they are 1,100 jobs, I concede that. I concede that our farmers generally support it. That is the farmers involved in the pork industry, generally support it. That it's good for Manitoba producers to have local facilities. And finally it is, it will have a multiplier effect on the economy.

So Mr. Speaker I am cognizant of those arguments in favour of this plant but on balance and I would like to say as well that earlier today Councillor Magnifico indicated that this would come back to Council.

Councillor Clement: I move extension.

Councillor Benham: Thank you very much and I will be brief. That Councillor Magnifico indicated that it would come back to Council, I see no indication in this report that it will Mr. Speaker and I challenge Councillor Magnifico quite frankly, I challenge Councillor Magnifico to tell us where in that process that would happen because I do not read that in this report. Quite the contrary, we delegate to the CAO all powers necessary to carry out what is Council's intent. So Councillor Magnifico can show me a place in the process where it returns. I would be interested. I do not see one now.

So on balance Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for the motion to refer because I believe it is the only honest approach for City Councillors to take which is to say we do not have the information to make a proper decision at this point. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Being as the seconder, I just want to make this very clear. I am not opposed to the application or the applicants. They have set a date, done due diligence. I believe they did with the Province. They've also said that they talked to various people to make sure that their plan would be in place and that would be a profitable plan for them and also the business they want to operate.

But where I've got a problem Mr. Speaker, is that due diligence and public consultation, I know we don't have to go and ask for public consultation but with the investment that we're, the monies we're putting in there, such as 100 acres of land, industrial land for $2 dollars, I think that should give us enough leeway to say look, satisfy the needs of the area

residents, any concerns they may have. They have that right. That is their right to say that I want to be able to impress this and I need some answers. We didn't.

And this started back in May 25th of 2005 when the table talks started, you know started talking with the proponents and that, and also, what gets me at that time there was Destination Winnipeg was involved. They had said that they give support, but we were never invited, we've never knew. I didn't know anything until the 14th of November when this came as a Council seminar and two days later it went before EPC, on the public agenda to pass this through. No chance of anyone appearing to hold and ask questions to hold the public's interest.

We owe that to the citizens of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker. I think we are letting them down. Failing to even to listen, to give that opportunity and when I asked the applicant later, would you be willing, he says, yes, if need be we'd go and consult with the public in the area of East Kildonan and St. Boniface to raise the concerns. And I'm sure that they are, people will be able to address the issue, that they'll be able to sell this.

And I don't know why members of Council are not willing to go in that direction. What is there to fear? We are not going to lose this. But, to go through just smack right through what we did with True North. True North proposal Mr. Speaker I was the only one to vote in opposition. I didn't vote against the building, the future building. I voted against the process.

And it was challenged. It was challenged Mr. Speaker. It took a year-and-a-half before finally, they were able to start and start building, one-and-a-half years. Because we refused, the former Mayor said no we don't need this, he walked it onto the floor of Council and there it was it was passed. Till later on we found out what we did was wrong.

I remember, remember Mr. Speaker back in 1974, 1975, in these chambers, only two of us are left from that era, is Councillor O'Shaughnessy and myself, we were dealing with the issue of Trizec. Trizec Corporation wanted to build on Portage and Main. This was brought to Council and it was just lucky that I was told not to vote for it and I did not vote for it, which until today I'm sorry that I did go in that direction, it was flawed, it was wrong from the beginning. It cost the taxpayers of Winnipeg a bundle of money, the air rights we lost. I mean there was such a mix-up, till today it still hasn't been settled.

But that just gives you an indication when you don't have the process take place as the way it should, to have this public consultation would have taken one day. True North had theirs, because they had no alternative. It took them two, it took them one day. It was in the cold. They set up the tents, people came there. They had a display and I'm sure that this proponent will be able to do the same thing to the satisfaction. You'd be surprised how many people who live in the area would be at ease then to say, well finally I've got some answers.

I thank our administration Mr. Speaker because they did what they were asked to do. Unfortunate that we didn't go into the direction that we would have been privy to speak to the various directors of each department, ask questions and get the answers.

I'll give you an example, what the administration has said possible mitigations and Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Benham had alluded to that briefly about the concerns that maybe with the truck traffic, also with the lack of adequate, existing public transit service. That in itself has not been answered.

I as one, how can I vote on something and say no this is good, this is great. This is not the end of the world Mr. Speaker. We can send this back and save the headaches to hundreds and hundreds of people, that would be at ease at least they have the opportunity to say we are living in a democratic society, we have a democratic Council members that listen to the people that pay their salaries.

But to ignore that I can't, I've not done it before and I have to go into the direction

like I had said, well I have said to the Mayor I said if I can't I have to go take what I've been practicing for so many years now. A few decades, that I've been practicing that same thing over and over again, don't forget the people that put you into office, never forget that.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Order

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker, I'm not speaking because I need some applause. I don't need them but it just shows you, it gives you the feeling, what the people are thinking now and what direction they want us to go.

We are not going to lose anything, Mr. Mayor and members of Council, to lay this over till the December meeting. Let the process, democracy take its course, to give the residents of that area that is their right. Don't take that right away from them. Give them that right to say now go and I'm sure that the proponents, Mr. Speaker, what happens here, the kind of a message we are sending out, to say, look, Council members have decided to go through even though there were some concerns, oh there's no public transportation, we don't know what's happening with all of this 1,000 trucks a week that will be generated now with an additional 350 and we don't know the roads, we don't know Plessis Road has to be resurfaced, or redone, reconstructed within the next 8 years or 7 years, or maybe shorter now.

These are the kinds of questions that people want to know. When people invest money of moving into an area they have the right to get that protection. They pay the taxes to get the information that they seek to make that community a better place to live. And all we are asking for Mr. Speaker, a common sense, a common sense approach to this, table it for one month till the next Council meeting and it will satisfy the proponents. They will go and meet with the community, with the residents, also within the Industrial Park, that they'll be able to meet with the adjoining property owners.

We had a delegation here this morning that had said that he had a concern, please, give him that opportunity. Nobody is saying that we want to kill it. I'd be the last person would say I want to kill it. I want this. I want this to go through. But do it in such a fashion, I don't want to be called later on, five years or ten years when they say you are the a-hole that did this to us. I don't want that Mr. Speaker. I haven't had that yet and I don't want to even start now, too old for that.

I used to jibber-jabber up and down here in the chambers back in the '70's and the '80's because you wanted to get some attention but I tell you it comes a point that you have to use common sense and say look here is what we have to do.

Mr. Mayor I'm asking you. As the, as the head of Council, I know that you've got your Executive Policy Committee Secretariat Committee, which sometimes I question their role. The *Cuff Report* we never went in that direction. I question that role, because so much of the information, ideas are coming in from across the way, that come and they counter attack on…

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Move extension.

Councillor Lazarenko: What the Mayor's staff has and what the CAO's Secretariat have to do. This is where all this has started. The same thing with the elimination of the three committees. That we had a delegation of people coming out here today. People in wheelchairs had to come here and say, beg us, please, don't do this. Come on I mean today's, today's age, today's technology, what you've got, I mean this is the purpose of having involvement with people. We work for the, you know for the citizens of Winnipeg.

So this quadrant of the City of Winnipeg I would suggest Council do this, do the right thing, let it go, it is not the end. The proponents will still be there. They will be satisfied because it's gonna take that off their shoulders, too. Because they'll say, well we're not part of those that railroaded

this right through without public consultation and to say that we don't have to do it.

You're darn right we have to do it because it's our investment that we have in there. And that something like this has to be done. Why do we have to hear? I don't understand it. I tell you any member of Council here, there is nothing to fear. We are not trying go through the back door and say, oh we're going to pull a fast one on you taxpayers.

No, we've got prime land in there that is suitable, give the area, those who are concerned, every human being has a right to get an answer when they ask. That is within their Constitutional rights. People came here, a few, those that could come here, how many of those that are affected they could not come here during the day?

Councillor Wyatt has a responsibility. Two MLA's were here, sure the question could be asked of one of the MLA's and both of them. Your government is endorsing this but their system works a little bit different than ours because the Premier and their Ministers they make most of the decisions, they don't have a chance to speak like we do. They don't accept any delegations to come before them like we do. Our business is open. It's open to the general public.

But that's one thing we have, and I believe that we should practice this, and to continue practicing this but we have to take a look and make sure what we preach is that we do that.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Councillor. I was waiting to hear about autobins. I was wondering how that could be tied into this. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll speak first to the amendment and then get into the clause. I'm getting a little confused. As I understand it what we are talking about here is a piece of land that is zoned M-3 and that the usage in front of us is a permitted usage on this land.

We seem to be, we seem to be getting down a path here where we're using an economic development initiative to try and have a couple of kicks at the cat on some environmental issues. If this had come to us with this, this plant was to be built there, there wouldn't be this in front of us right now. There wouldn't be no hearing on the rezoning of this. There would be no variances. It's a permitted use on this land. So I'm getting a little bit confused as to why we are going down this path arguing so much about this, when what we really have in front of us is an economic development package.

Now moments ago we all voted I believe it was unanimous, and it was by Consent to pass the closing of Fourth Street in Transcona. That particular piece, there was no transportation study attached to it. We talked about the closing of a street, the administration made a recommendation, we accepted it. We were more than willing to do that and we do it all the time.

So what we have here is we have a bit of a cart before the horse issue. We have the issue of economic development in front of us which triggers all the concerns about environmental issues, about transportation issues, about traffic, transit issues and so on and so on. But, without dealing with the economic development piece none of those issues exist.

But they're not meant to exist in our realm, they are meant to exist in other realms. For example the Clean Environment Commission will address the environmental issues and everybody will have their say in that matter. The Clean Environment Commission we accused not too long ago in this very chamber of being far too strict with us. That when they had made a recommendation to the Provincial government that we clean up our act with sewer and water treatment that it be done in a shorter period of time than we were anticipating doing it. And then from that the Provincial government even held us to a higher standard.

So Mr. Speaker you can't have it both ways. You can't be sitting here saying on one hand that the Clean Environment

Commission isn't an effective body and then on the other hand you know asking for us to go out into the public and do a lot of this consultation ahead of time.

So, on those reasons I won't be supporting the amendment. And there is, there is also the element, when we get into the clause, if we are going to use the argument that we're looking at Clean Environment Commission's, Clean Environment Commission hearings and other reports and public hearings prior to approving this, that we are actually, because of these, the usage already being permitted, that we are actually practicing a biased and discriminatory practice. That we're, if this application were to come forward without the economic development package we wouldn't have this opportunity. We wouldn't be able to hold these people to this standard. So as I understand it, we, we, we are obligated to look at this strictly in its economic and development piece.

Now, the last thing I want to make a comment on is the two MLA's that appeared in front of us. They came down to this building to speak to us, to ask us, to to use our process in substitute of where a Provincial process should be and I'm offended by that. You know I believe that if those Ministers want to properly represent their people they should go back to the government of the day and make that argument to Mr. Doer and the members of his cabinet.

This is not the place to come in here and to say to us, that listen, we couldn't get the job done in the Legislature, now we want you to do an end run around your rules and we want you to use your process or to, perhaps better put, to abuse your process to get done what we couldn't do at the Legislature. And I'm not going to stand for it.

I won't be supporting this amendment to refer this back. I believe there will be proper consultation down the road and I for one will be standing there at the Clean Environment Commission arguing to ensure that the level of diligence that is done by the Clean Environment Commission is protecting all the citizens of this City

I want to leave you with a bit of a quote by Winston Churchill. He said "I am fond of pigs. Dogs look up to us. Cats look down to us. Pigs treat us as equals". The only one thing that I am more fond of is respecting this chamber, Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Speaker, and if we were to refer this back, we would be showing this chamber a great deal of disrespect. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's a very large issue for a lot of people in our community that there has been no meaningful public discussion or information for residents and Winnipeggers as a whole on an issue as important as this. This decision has come to us very quickly, was negotiated largely behind closed doors, with little time to consider all the potential issues properly.

One of the reasons for this is that our current Zoning By-law allows this kind of use within the City. It seems like a good time to ask. Why does our Zoning By-law allow such an intensive industrial use within the City of Winnipeg? I would guess that not that long ago, plans of this size and scale in this industry didn't even exist. I would imagine with our current review of the Zoning By-law that this is already being looked at. Something like this should at least be a, a use like this should at least be conditional rather than an allowed use anywhere in the City so that we never have to go through this again where there is no public hearing on something like this that affects a community.

When you think of the little issues we have public hearings about, which we should have, something as big as this and there is no public hearing. It just doesn't make sense and I think that the Planning and Property and Development Committee should look at this very seriously and in the Zoning By-law make these kinds of uses a conditional use.

But in the meantime we're in this situation.

It is certainly important to bring jobs to Winnipeg. I'm very concerned about the type of jobs that are in this situation. We don't really know. We have been told that they could be as low as $10 dollars an hour. I don't know how you buy a house on $10 dollars an hour. We've been told the turnover rate is as high as 100%. When you look at the plant in Brandon, the Maple Leaf plant and what we know about it, there is 100% turnover, low morale, high rate of injuries and on and on and on.

Next is a question of odour. In Brandon they built the hog plant 5 kilometres out of town we've heard. This plant is 1.5 kilometres from residential and new residential, new suburban development that we're planning. If I was thinking of moving into that new development or anywhere near this, I would be having serious second thoughts today.

We haven't been given any clear reassurances. I have not heard anybody say there will be no odour and they can't say that. Shouldn't the quality of life for the people who live in nearby Transcona and St. Boniface be given more consideration? These people will have to live with this stench for years to come.

Another concern is environmental. We already have a massive pollution problem that we are required to fix under the Clean Environment Commission rules regarding nutrients in the water. I find it fascinating that now everyone thinks the CEC is wonderful when they spend most Council meetings bitching and complaining that they are too strict on them but now they're just a wonderful organization. But anyway this plant will be a huge producer of further contamination and pollution.

The idea that the administration may put a surcharge for the biggest polluters is referred to in the report. Well it's a nice possibility but will that really happen? No one can say for sure. Not long ago in 1999, this Council eliminated that extra surcharge for the big polluters after heavy lobbying from the business sector. Is this business focused Council really going to have the will to bring back this extra charge? I have my doubts and if it doesn't then we have an additional hidden cost that makes this whole thing less of a good deal for the City.

We also are not looking at the big picture in terms of the environmental impact. This is our Province too, not just our City. This plant will spur the development of more hog farms close to the City, and the Province further adding to the pollution problems that Manitobans are stuck with.

For some reason the NDP government has a blind spot when it comes to the environmental problems the industry causes, and I applaud the individual MLA's for sticking up for their constituents. It's not always easy but sometimes you have to stand up and do what is right even if you are under a lot of pressure to go along with the crowd. Something some Councillors should think about.

That doesn't make it right for City Council because the Province is committed to this. That doesn't make it right for us to blindly follow the Province's lead. We have a responsibility to thoroughly understand the consequences of our decisions. Then there is another, there is other issues of hidden costs, such as infrastructure. The infrastructure that is required to offset the impact of this development and the wear and tear on our roads, likely go beyond what's covered in the local improvement.

Furthermore the report clearly states the area is poorly served by public transit. It is likely the City will have to deal with this service problem and at what cost? It is also poor planning not to consider transit service an issue, especially when the workers in this plant may not have an option to buy a vehicle or live near by. We should be encouraging industries that can be accessed easily by public transit. When is this Council going to make a commitment to development that is sustainable?

The report that refers to the funding, funding will be required in 2007 in our Operating Budget to be put into the

Economic Development Reserve Fund. I'd like to know where the heck that money will come from. The current talk is of cutting community policing, giving further business tax cuts in 2007 and serious shortfalls in our Operating Budget. It won't be any easier in 2007.

How are we going to pay for this substantial gift we are giving to the private sector? And who will, what services will be cut to pay for it? All of these unanswered questions make us, make me wonder if this proposal truly makes economic, social or environmental sense in the final analysis.

I appreciate that there was a closed-door Council session to inform Councillors about it. Unfortunately I was unable to attend myself because of a family commitment. However, I understand that there wasn't anyone there from the Water and Waste department to answer questions about the environmental concerns such as the impact of wastewater.

It seems like we are being asked to make a quick decision without all the questions being answered and that is a very uncomfortable position to be in. The environmental concerns have simply not been adequately addressed. Each years our rivers and lakes, each year our rivers and lakes are more polluted and we as a City are required to pay the cost of that. It just isn't sustainable to keep pumping more crap into the system.

This shortsightedness could have a serious and costly impact. We are told about, that the Provincial process and environmental assessment will cover off any environmental concerns. We have also heard that the process is weak and inadequate. In any case the City has an obligation to be informed about the impact of its own decisions. We as Councillors have that obligation. Yet are we informed? I don't think so.

I'm a supporter of a sustainable economic development policy. However, each situation has to be looked at with the true impact in mind and the true cost benefits. It concerns me that some Councillors who are concerned about the impact of this on their local communities have not had their concerns addressed sufficiently and I would urge Council to reconsider this hasty decision and at least refer it back so that there can be some further information from the administration.

I applaud Councillor Wyatt for his huge effort in a very short period of time to alert his constituents that this is happening. It's unfortunate that that's how the public gets notified of things. I think, you know, even if our process isn't perfect, our processes aren't perfect, but we can be flexible, we could arrange public meetings. We've done it on numerous other issues. There is absolutely no excuse to not have full public meetings for the constituents that are directly affected by this project before we move ahead with it and I urge Council to reconsider this. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Fear. Fear of the unknown. Worse yet fear of something you think you know. And I understand that that's what's happening here and I can appreciate it.

This project is in my ward and when I first got word of this proposal, I did exactly what many of you are doing, many of the people are doing, I panicked. I panicked because what I knew that pig farms and rendering plants stink because well everybody knows that. We all know that.

So for the last six months, I have been researching the downside of this processing plant because I was eager to come up with some information that could, I could bring to Council and tell them why this project should be stopped. So far I haven't been able to do that to my satisfaction.

All the info that I received from existing plants, competitions, government agencies, etcetera, have convinced me that we are now obligated to go to the next step. And that's what this is, the next step. We are not voting to build a plant

here. We are simply voting to okay the incentive package which is a great financial deal in the long run for the City of Winnipeg.

Now the open houses for the public consultations can begin more readily. Now the Provincial environmental agencies can proceed with their work. And know this I will be watchdog for this the rest of the way, very closely. I have to this point and I will, and so will Mr. Wyatt and so will everybody else involved.

We are at a stage now that's crucial. We are at a stage now that will open the doors for those, and I believe Olymel has told me that January they are going to have open houses in St. Boniface and Transcona. They're going to have tours of plants in Montreal for politicians that wish to come down and they are even stretching to bring a resident from Transcona, a resident from St. Boniface to tour an existing plant, to bring back the information to their wards. That's where we are now.

All we're doing is making this process happen, starting today. All of this is in the works. But I understand the fear-mongering. I understand that people don't know what's going on and you know what, maybe there is a problem with the process. I'm not denying that. But if the process is at issue, don't use this as a ploy to change that process. Let's talk about that process another day. Let's make it a better process.

This itself is a great deal for the City of Winnipeg, so far. And until something comes along to change my mind I'm for it 100%.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to thank everybody for their comments and of course the delegations for their comments as well. A very, very important issue.

I think it's important for us as a community to acknowledge that even before we embark on the debate on this particular plant, that we've heard from a lot of people today who clearly have made a philosophical decision that, regardless of location, they are against the idea of hog processing, period. I'm not saying every delegation felt that way but I certainly got that sense from some of the delegations that came forward and I take no quarrel with their right to take that position. But I think we should be clear that some people feel that this should not be taking place, period. And when I hear some of the comments made about the conditions in the industry, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, I think that's where all of this is coming from. That's a separate issue.

The economic impact is outlined by speakers previous is pretty enticing. We haven't even really discussed the idea this afternoon or this morning, Mr. Speaker that the construction alone on this plant will be in the environment of $200 million dollars. $200 million dollars to build this plant that is going to exist in our community. I'll remind you that that's, I guess, that's 33 to 40% more than the MTS Centre. And we know what a boon that was to our economy, to the local contractors, to the local construction industry. We should start with that acknowledgment.

1,100 jobs, that's important. $2 million dollars in annual taxes and utility fees, that's important. And when we talk to people and we consider people who we might do business with, we should at least I think consider the players that we are looking at in this particular arena.

Olymel enjoys an excellent reputation right across this nation. They are currently operating 22 operations, almost from coast-to-coast. That means they exist right now in 22 communities in our country, seemingly without great incident.

Hytek, which is one of our own, existing in La Broquerie, Manitoba was voted one of the 50 best-managed companies in Canada. I don't know much about that but I can tell you that to do that from La Broquerie, Manitoba, I can't imagine it would be an easy feat. That must be a good operation and I'm certain that it is and enjoys a wonderful reputation right here in our Province. We can

acknowledge that and we can start with that and I think we can take some comfort in that. It is worth mentioning.

With respect I would rather not hear anything more about, this is not enough money that are paid workers, they won't be able to buy a house, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, okay? These jobs pay between $10 and $14 an hour. There are jobs that pay worse and if we want to eliminate those there is only one way to do that. Either we go to a different system than capitalism or we raise the minimum wage from where it is at $7 dollars under the NDP government, to above $14. Let's not waste any time with that.

The concerns here are smell, sewer, water and some concerns about Lake Winnipeg. In north St. Boniface currently, we have some smell concerns primarily with a mushroom farm and primarily with an out of date rendering plant. This is not a replicated situation. This is not even close. Anybody who looks closely could see that almost immediately.

I went and I met with Olymel and Hytek and Big Sky for a full hour and I talked exclusively about the issue of smell. In a million different ways using all of the terminology and technology and all of the extras they have at their disposal they did a great job of allaying my fears. But, they're an interested party.

So what I did was I phoned up a friend of mine, Larry Pimm from Red Deer, Alberta, who is a Councillor there, who I sit on the FCM board with. Olymel has a plant in Red Deer Alberta. The first question I asked Larry was how far is this plant from a mature subdivision? He said it's about 700 metres. Have you ever had a complaint regarding smell? No.

People are concerned about capacity of our sewer system. We are currently servicing a population of almost 700,000 people with our existing sewer system. Innumerable businesses, innumerable tourists, innumerable people passing through and we do it practically without incident. Regardless of how you feel about this project, you should understand that the output from this project will not register enough to change in any appreciable manner the amount of sewage that we deal with.

The same goes for water. People concerned about stuff leeching into our water system. We run an entire water system around hundreds of thousands of homes, tens of thousands of businesses right now. And again, we do so essentially without incident. This is, this will be such an infinitesimally small fraction of the service that we are delivering, that it really will not even register.

Thank you people for your concern about Lake Winnipeg, but bear in mind we are currently undergoing $1 billion dollars of water, of sewage treatment upgrades, and CSO upgrades. That's what we are spending by directive of the Provincial government, who by the way through the same process is kind of making us do it.

But it doesn't matter where you build this plant in Manitoba. The odds are that eventually whatever effluent is going to be produced is going to wind up in Lake Winnipeg, so thank you for your concern, but as far as I'm concerned, if we have the best and most efficient sewer system in Manitoba, maybe it should be here, maybe that's the safest thing that we should do.

The final comment I want to talk about is the process and want to remind people that this is a process and we are following a process. The Provincial government has been at the table with the City since inception and of course there is secrecy surrounding this. Whenever anybody comes to the City with an idea for economic expansion, it has to be done secretly because nobody wants to sort of lay all of their cards on the table at the first instance. That is not the way that business is done. It comes forward at the appropriate time.

And the way that hog barns and hog operations are done in this Province is that the municipality generally speaking comes up with a plan and then the Province does its assessment. That's how it works. Would you have it any

other way? Would you want, would you want municipalities having the sole discretion on the environmental issues? Would you want a small municipality with basically no administrative support having the final say on whether a hog plant in their area goes ahead? No, you wouldn't want that.

What you want is you want the Province which is responsible for Lake Winnipeg to regulate all municipalities. So at the end of the day we know that a common standard is going to be met throughout the entirety of the watershed. That is absolutely a necessary component.

We have really two choices here because no one here is against the Province doing their environmental assessment. That's what they do. They do health care for our citizens. They do education for our citizens. They do environmental assessments for our citizens.

Let's give the Province as much detailed information about this project. Let's tell them exactly where it's going to be. Let's tell them exactly how big it's going to be. Let's tell them exactly how much money we're going to spend on it. Let's tell them exactly everything, every detail that we can decide on today, let's get it all together, let's decide on it and let's send it to the Province and let's say okay, this is all of the information we have. This is as much detail as we can reasonably give you at this stage and we have decided this is what we want to do. Is this safe?

The alternative of course is sending this idea to the Provincial government with some nebulous thought as to where it may or may not be. With all due respect to Mr. Reid I don't want the Province making a decision on something that might go to our municipality if we can't even tell them where it is going to be. That would be a mistake. We are following the process that is meant to be followed in matters such as these. If this is unsafe, I will guarantee you, the Province will sniff it out.

I do not have a great deal of comments in some areas of the, that the Province has jurisdiction over but when it comes to issues such as water protection and environmental safety, this really is, I think, their strong suit and oftentimes rather than not dealing with the issue they will go overboard. I have every confidence that if we follow this procedure at the end of the day we will wind up with a project that is good for everybody. I would ask everybody in this chamber to follow this process through and see where it leads us.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. You know, I'm supporting the referral because I think we do need a lot more information. You know in the a, in the package we're being given with the agenda, it says this in part "due in part to the Provincial licensing requirements for the facility, which may require public hearings", which may require public hearings, doesn't say public hearings are going to be held, this may require public hearings, "the facility will likely break ground the spring of 2007 with plant openings scheduled for January 2009." So it says "may have public hearings."

And then we have a letter from the Mayor that was out today to the two MLA's and in it he says "I hope", in this letter he says "I hope you point out to them that it will be a decision in your government whether public hearings are staged or not". So we have no guarantee of public hearings. So all these people that say environmental concerns, it's all up to the Clean Environment Commission, da, da, da, da, da. It may not happen. There is nothing to guarantee that it will happen.

Now, I'd like to draw attention to these jobs, 1,100 jobs. Now if there are 1,100 jobs that would be a pretty persuasive argument for me. Creating work so people can buy homes and live decent lives, that's a good argument. But these 1,100 jobs, these 1,100 jobs are really jobs that people can't stand after three or four months. The Maple Leaf plant in Brandon had a 100% turnover. I don't know what it is now, I think it's improved a little bit but you know one of the spokespersons from the pork group said

today that we would be employing local people. The fact is the plant in Brandon is bringing workers in from Mexico, El Salvador because they can't find enough local people.

Now one of the things, one of the things about the, this whole industry is that they've brought down the, the whole, the wages considerably. So the result is that it is not only grueling work, with many people having accidents all the time and being seriously hurt, but they're also on wages that don't compare to what the work they're doing.

So, so this is not such a big deal, these 1,100 jobs, because they are 1,100 continuous, you know it's, we could even say it's going to take more people because the 1,100 aren't going to last very long. So we'll have a big part of our population going through this plant.

You know, we only had this information a few days ago. You know it seems to me that if it is taking, if it's going to be opening in 2009, and we've had, I've heard two years, three years work on this, then you know, maybe we should have a little bit more time as a Council before we make this weighty decision.

I support development. I support the idea of creating jobs. And it means a lot, let me tell you this project will mean a lot to people who produce packaging, the trucking industry. Many of our businesses will thrive. Even as pointed out earlier, even just the building of the plant will create many, many jobs throughout our City. Because of the fact is they buy material and those workers will buy stuff and it has a pyramid effect.

So, for the plant to go ahead there are many, many worthwhile things about it but surely, we should go ahead and look at the problems and see what the situation is before we go ahead and make the decision. Why should we rush? Not even a month. I mean that's ludicrous.

You know, there is an editorial in the *Free Press* that raised some points, not answered. We have very little information. Surely, we should refer and get some more information so we can vote on this in an intelligent fashion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Wyatt on the main clause.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise this, I think this has been read before in this Council chamber but I will read it again. "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed it's the only thing that ever has." Margaret Mead.

I say that not so much for the benefit of the Council chamber because it sounds by the tone of the debate where this is going but I say that now for the benefit of those watching at home, on t.v. and listening to this. And to those here in the gallery, that this debate is not over. And I say this also for the benefit of the Premier and Mr. Kostyra and members of the government caucus who are also watching this. This debate is not over with this vote here on Council.

The calls that have been coming in just today into my office and the calls that are still going to be coming in, tells me that this is a real issue of real concerns. A lot can be said that maybe the concerns are not real. And a lot can be said that maybe they are real but nobody really knows and nobody really knows because of the uncertainty that has been created due to the lack of information. If lack of information and the refusal to share information is what creates uncertainty and creates distrust and that's exactly what's happened here in the last nine days.

All of this could have been cleared up. If industry and government had been prepared to step forward and laid all the facts on the table and said this is the implications, this is what it's going to look like, this is what the odours will be, this is our experience in the plants. But now we are hearing promises that we may be able to see this in the future after we get the land and after we get the subsidies.

Mr. Speaker before us today is a report that is geared towards economic

development and jobs which is a good thing. But it does not take into context the due diligence and the work that should have been done by other City departments before we consider exactly what the implications and indeed what the costs are to the citizens of our City and to all of us.

We talked about the Public Works department. There's been no studies that I have seen or heard of with regards to origin and destination studies, or the vehicles coming to and from the property. There is no assessment on the state of Plessis Road and Dugald Road, though I can tell you personally that it is crumbling. Anybody could drive down Dugald Road, if you've got false teeth you're going to lose your false teeth because of the state of Dugald Road. If you want to go down Dugald Road now when you get past Plessis, which is apparently where most of the trucks are going to be coming in from, its down to two lanes and the shoulders are collapsing into the ditches.

And, when I, and it's not even in our five year Capital Budget. But these are where the trucks will be going and they're going to be going into the Capital Budget and I just heard a comment good luck getting it into the Capital Budget. But Councillor Steeves so that's the attitude of the chamber and members of EPC. Very interesting. Very interesting.

You know, Mr. Speaker let me tell you something that, these issues could have be sorted out ahead of time with regards to the infrastructure. And I guess it's because of the experience by the previous Council that made the decision and a previous Mayor that made the decision, along with the Premier again, in the same fashion, without any kind of public consultation with a huge announcement, we're going to bring the CN Intermodal terminal from Kenaston, because it makes too much noise for Tuxedo, and we're going to put it over in Transcona without any infrastructure or work done to the road work around there. Other than the fact that we put $900,000 dollars into improve their entrance into their property.

Any given day now, Mr. Speaker anywhere from 800 to 1,000 trucks coming to and from that property and growing. And growing. Most of them going north and right and through the middle of our City. If you want to see how many trucks are going through, go have a hot dog which I did at the corner of Portage and Main, and you watch the intermodal trucks with their piggybacks coming through the middle of the City, hammering the heck out of our roads because of a dumb decision without any public consultations. There is a decision destroying our road network. Meanwhile all their customers are on the west side of the City.

No consultations and what do we do? We as a community then struggles afterwards and we come before Community, we come before Community Committee and then we go to Public Works and we suggest that we should do this and we should do that and the issue is still not, is still unresolved and the residents' concerns still haven't been addressed. Why? Because we didn't do the due diligence ahead of time.

Water and Waste. We have a report that says well we're going to have a nutrient removal problem. Probably about anywhere from $400 to $600,000 dollars. That is at today's level of the plant. This plant apparently they want go, the want to double their capacity in ten years. So that would be double the cost I'm assuming. But again we don't know because we don't have the reports from Water and Waste. If that's the case then it's a wash, we are not making any money on this, we're actually losing money.

The report refers to some promise that we are going to look at having some sort of sewer charge. But none of the industry has been consulted. The top 10 or 12 water and waste producers in this City and water consumers, nobody's talked to them, we are going come out and charge you in about a year or so they were saying for this, for that fee. Guess again. This was the industry that demanded we reduce the charges on it. Which we did. A previous Council did.

Nothing in the report with regards to that and the implication and the costs. Nothing in the report with regards to Winnipeg Transit and the costs there. We were told that they would be hiring transit and now we're hearing we're subsidizing. We don't know what the costs with regards to Transit are. There is nothing in the report from our Planning department. No report from our Planning department, Mr. Speaker with regards to what the implications are in the community.

The Planning department had full intentions in the next five years to do a secondary plan to outline how development will occur in the community of south Transcona. Which is right now large acreage lots and agricultural. They were hoping that there, this formerly hoping it was going to be residential someday down the road. That is now highly unlikely. The question of whether that ever would become developed other than farmland now would be really questionable.

The results of the joint venture that we have Mr. Speaker that right now we've formed. And it puts a whole question mark over that because if that odour is coming north, you can be guaranteed people will be thinking twice.

Mr. Speaker there is no housing strategy. Housing. When I asked the question in the Council seminar they said oh don't worry Councillor the market here for housing is a lot looser than Brandon. Well has anybody realized what the vacancy rate right now is in Winnipeg? Or what the cost is to buy a house and how the prices have shot up? And somebody who's making $10 or $12 or $14 dollars an hour can afford to buy a house?

There is no housing strategy but they've made a deal apparently behind closed doors which I'm hearing now about immigration, the Province, and with regards to bringing workers in because the industry needs it. They've got to have workers on the front line there to produce but to the heck where they're going to live.

No strategy on employment hiring. We have some of the lowest income folks in the City, in the inner city, no strategy on employment and nothing in this report. And a business plan that, well you can be guaranteed Gary Doer and Eugene Kostyra have got the business plan and maybe our administration does and are not sharing it with us. You can guarantee they have an analysis of it because they're investing $20 million dollars into this. They're not only giving $7.5 million in infrastructure, they're putting up a $20 million dollar loan. They are now, they're a shareholder in the company. Whether it succeeds or not, the taxpayers not, pardon me, not they, the people in Manitoba are now owners in this company.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about the Clean Environment Commission process and I would like to say that we heard today in questions on the Council floor and also from other delegations the questions of the Pork Council that a lot of the issues that I've just raised are not covered through the Clean Environment Commission audits. They are our issues, they are municipal issues. Issues that we should be doing due diligence on. Issues that this report does nothing to address.

A guy named John Fetchuck once said "never impose or intimidate those actions that may affect the comfort of others, that you or your family would not want imposed on themselves". And I think that sums it up.

Mr. Speaker a lot has been said about process and that this is a process…

Councillor Lubosch: Move extension.

Councillor Wyatt: and the importance of process. Or the lack of, or why we, why we shouldn't be so concerned about the process. And that this is our process so live with it. Well Mr. Speaker the only thing that separates us from the baboons is process. If we don't have a democratic process, we don't have democratic principles, if we don't go and approach communities and deal with them as human beings then we are no different than animals.

And the fact of the matter is that right now we are completely treating, not just one community, my community, but other communities surrounding this with complete disrespect. They've been paying their taxes. They pay their taxes on time, the vast majority of the homeowners. They obey the law. They contribute back to the community. They want to live in a healthy community. You talk about *Plan Winnipeg,* you talk about quality of life, there is no way to put a value on quality of life.

The industry, when they ask the questions about odours, they trip over it. They don't have the answer because they know there is going to be an odour problem but they are not willing to come out and say it because they know the implications by saying that, that this is the wrong location.

And, today, you heard from the members of the Legislative Assembly who came here today, who have the courage to speak, and it's not an easy thing to do when you are part of a government caucus. I know it's hard for members sometimes of EPC, and they do speak out once in a while, but in a government caucus they never speak out. And for them to speak out and come forward and you've got two members of the Legislative Assembly plus the City Councillors saying hey, give us some time here and let this, lay this matter over and everybody is saying no we've got to push forward, it's sorry it's a done deal, when we've got still another five, six months to go with the CEC. There is no reason or rational good reason to push this through today.

Mr. Speaker we, I guess, maybe, I want to be cautious, and I think the community wants to be cautious. I never, everybody I've talked to in Transcona is in favour of economic growth and jobs. But we've had problems with New Flyer that we are still dealing with. We've had difficulties with Palliser with air pollution we are dealing with. We've had problems with CN Intermodal and now we have Olymel. And the history is there. We have learnt from our history in our end of the City but I clearly, it looks like we haven't learnt City-wide.

I would encourage this Council not to, to support the amendment and not to vote for the clause, that it doesn't go through. So, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor. Any further debate on the clause? Councillor Lubosch. Anyone else? Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Councillor Wyatt and others are, are absolutely right. The entire issue before us is really more of a process than anything else because ultimately if we had a proper process here and one that respected every member of Council and every citizen that that member of Council represented, we wouldn't be getting into these divided debates which ultimately should be and could be good news stories for everyone concerned and everyone involved.

It's because this, this project got off, I believe very much on the wrong foot, that we're having this debate here in the first place because as Councillor Benham pointed out, he saw benefits to this project and could, if the benefits far outweighed the risks and if the risks were mitigated, he could even find himself supporting the project. And I believe Councillor Wyatt has indicated the same, the same position.

But ultimately the majority of members here found out about this, either through the grapevine or, through a media release. There was a story leaked out some weeks ago, which wasn't followed-up very thoroughly and most notably, less than two weeks ago. So unless you are on the cutting edge of the hog-producing industry in this City and this Province chances are you wouldn't have heard about it because you would be busy fielding calls about snow-clearing and tree-pruning and other issues.

But the fact remains Mr. Speaker that while we're sitting here debating whether or not there is going to be a smell or whether or not there is not going to be a smell, those kinds of debates Mr. Speaker and the anecdotal evidence that's being presented here about somebody talking

to their FCM buddy in Red Lake who's gone up to a plant and hasn't smelled anything, that's kind of like walking into a crowded room smelling some human flatulence and having somebody explain, hey, don't look at me, my farts don't smell and then getting into a debate about that. But quite frankly Mr. Speaker, that's about as much science as is being, as is being applied here today.

And with that kind of unobjective evidence, I'm finding it, it very hard to have a coherent, credible discussion on this matter. You would have thought, Mr. Speaker that at the very least with the most recent appointments, and I have been appointed as the Secretary for Urban Environmental Strategies, that maybe I would have heard about this a little sooner and had some opportunity to react to it. But the fact is when it comes to matters of the environment, it's tokenism at best around this Council. A little bit here, a little bit there, to keep the tree-huggers happy, but beyond that nothing of any consequence or significance.

And the concerns that we have with, with a project of this magnitude is that while we have heard about some of the benefits, an additional million, million-3 perhaps if we don't carve up the business tax too soon. in new taxes netted. New infrastructure in an area that wasn't supposed to see infrastructure for some 20 years based on our *Plan Winnipeg.* I don't even know if we're going to require *Plan Winnipeg* amendments to facilitate that. And the potential for charging additional sewer rates which we'll probably, we'll probably discount initially going into the deal in the first place, which is the precedent that we've set with other deals of this nature.

I don't see any real huge benefits, Mr. Speaker. The, what I do see, based on the historical evidence, not the anecdotal evidence that is being presented here but the historical evidence, that we've, that we've gleaned from the Maple Leaf experience in Brandon, that we have seen in Iowa, that we've seen in Kansas, that we've seen in other cities, both in Canada and the US, is that there are some serious irreversible risks and contingencies to large scale hog production.

The fact is when you look at a hog production business the literature that I have read suggests that processing a thousand hogs a day is the optimum amount of hogs for the best return on investment. Your, your costs and your revenues are optimized at that rate of production. So, if you are pushing that rate of production to 3,000, 5,000, even 8,000 hog as day, you are doing it purely for profit. Not because you are going to be able to run your facility at some predetermined optimal number. And it's when, when hog production or animal rendering gets to these, these extreme levels that we find these irreversible impacts both on the environment and on people.

And I don't know, I'm having a hard time standing here justifying creating essentially a Wal-Mart type industry which is not going to, which is not going to provide employment for a lot of university or college grads. Which is going to, and again I'm citing the literature that's been presented to me on this issue, apparently the typical employee of one of these plants is a single parent without a job. It's people who are in dire straits. I have it here in my notes. I'm prepared to share it with you. If you, if you want to talk to me after Councillor Steeves, seriously I can share this information with you.

The fact is Mr. Speaker if I've ever seen this Council get lulled into buying a pig in a poke, this is the, this is the time. This deal is richer and albeit with fewer benefits that I can see than investing in our ballpark or investing in our downtown arena. And quite frankly when you consider the risks that it's going to be presenting to the, to the stakeholders that have already made their commitments in the St. Boniface Industrial Park and the surrounding Transcona area, I think the risks at this point far outweigh the benefits.

And this is why Councillor Wyatt's motion was perfectly in order. What's the rush to judgment? If this deal has been in discussion for seven months, possibly longer, what's the big deal in taking a month to answer some of these questions and to allay some of the concerns and

fears that people have? I don't think it's unreasonable to fear the unknown. That's why people don't jump out of perfectly good airplanes without parachutes because they don't know what's going to happen to them when they hit the ground. It's not the fall that kills you, it's the landing.

In this case, once this thing is built and up and running, we're going to have very few opportunities to, to mitigate any of these risks. And as far as the CEC procedure is concerned, that process is fine and well. But I can tell you folks, when it comes to noxious odours, whether or not you determine so many parts per million hydrogen sulphide or not, the Provincial legislation is extremely weak on these matters and it, it, you only have to call the Province up to ask them to go out and test a noxious odour. They won't go out with any scientific equipment. They'll send somebody out to do a fresh air test with their nose and if they determine it to be noxious…

Mr. Speaker: Extension has been moved.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councilor Lubosch: If they determine it to be noxious Mr. Speaker, they may go and talk to the offending party and ask them to address it but unless you can demonstrate that the noxious odour is a significant and measurable health threat they don't do anything about it.

So as one gentleman today pointed out, sitting on his, on his deck on a warm summer evening with a southerly breeze wafting the smell of the rendering plant over to his home, it may not cause him a serious measurable health impact, it may not make him, make him physically sick, but it may be so unpleasant that he won't be able to enjoy his quality of life. And that may be the case for thousands of other people in the area. Not just the one individual that we heard from today.

So I, I'm at a loss Mr. Speaker. I would love to support an economic development opportunity like this in the City of Winnipeg. I would love to as the appointed Councillor in this chamber for Urban Environmental Strategies to be able to tell you that without a doubt this is a, a flagship operation and this is good for both the environment and the economy. That we're achieving complementary objectives here but I can't do that Mr. Speaker based on the evidence and ultimately the lack of evidence and information before me.

And so with that I'm, I'm going to, I'm going to implore Council one more time, especially the Mayor and members of Executive Policy Committee who certainly have had the advantage of being much closer to this issue than the regular Councillors that represent the other half of the 700,000 citizens in this City. I'm going to ask that we take 30 days and try and answer some of these questions. And then maybe we can come back and we can, or at least the majority of us can support this. Because it's really too bad and I think it sends an unfortunate message to this industry and other potential industries when Council is so, so significantly divided on what really should be a good news story for Winnipeg. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'm sure when the Mayor sums up he'll be able to address some of the technical issues and generic ones related to the investment in our community that is about to happen within the next several years.

I would like to be as kind as possible, but what a wonderful, mystical web of deceit is being laid on us here. We go from odour to stench. We talk about anecdotal evidence being presented because a colleague of ours calls a notable person in Red Deer, not Red Lake, and gets some factual information. But you are talking in broad anecdotal terms about how this may or may not be good for the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to remind everybody and those of the younger generation that this kind of business is

what their forefathers have created here in Manitoba and in Winnipeg. We are an agri-business Province. This is the essence of what we do. It's one of the five major sectors in which the Province and this City invests in, including aerospace and technology and education and biotechnology. I think you have to remind yourself of what we're about.

We have a *Plan Winnipeg* that designated a proper M-3 industrial site. It's in the area which was the foundation of the largest meat and packing industry in Canada until about 15, 20 years ago. It wasn't in Toronto. It wasn't in Brooks, Alberta. It was here. The economics of the time have changed things. We are now about on the cusp of making a shift and recapturing what the essence of your forefathers had put in place here.

No, it may not be perfect, but you know, there's no perfect location. I can tell you where an imperfect location would be. It would be outside the municipality of Winnipeg where there's no transportation, where there's no support systems for water and waste and for water.

So on balance what you have here is recapturing something that is going to be very important to future generations. If you focus on the negative, you'll end up with negatives. I don't think we have a split Council here. I do think that this wily web that's been spun here today of how negative this is is frankly deceitful.

I think this is good for the City. I think there will be opportunities to continue to mitigate. It's going to go through some rigorous evaluation standards at the Clean Environment Commission and I've heard anecdotal evidence that really this organization won't have any power. They won't be empowered to do anything.

I mean there will be an opportunity for public input. Remembering what we're doing here today. We are partnering with the rest, the members of this Province, the community at large, to make an investment in our future and with the private sector.

As I look around this Council floor, it is really regrettable that there's probably only four or five members of this Council floor that have ever used their private sector money to do an investment in anything. I mean, this is very significant. That what, when we start partnering with industry who are going to make major investments in this community, we follow a very rigorous process of consultation so that we don't kill the opportunity for success.

And that's what we had here. We've outbid, outperformed a very demanding competitor in western Canada which is in Saskatoon. And there are others. And I think that says a lot for the capacity of our City and its citizens to take on meaningful opportunities for growth.

The spin-off of additional jobs related to this industry will be very, very significant. Most of you can do that extrapolation and will find out that it will be of huge benefit and goes much and above and beyond the $10 to $14 dollars an hour that will be paid to some of the workers who will have an opportunity to grow and do other jobs. So please don't belittle this kind of labour activity. This is the essence of what this country's been made of. And it's your forefathers that put this in place.

So Mr. Speaker I will just conclude saying I'm very supportive of this initiative. I know we'll have opportunities should we have some challenges that need to be mitigated, that can be done. And I encourage, as Councillor Wyatt uses that term, I encourage the citizens throughout this community at large and within the community of this plant to think about the opportunities this may present. And we know that there will be very little impact on their personal lives and the City, as we have to do everywhere else, will have to deal with roads and transit and water and waste. It's built into the system.

We are an economic entity in itself as a whole and we deal with these things. That's the nature of our business in municipal government. I would support it and I'm very pleased to support the Mayor's initiative on this particular project

and what the Province has done. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Wyatt, closing debate on your referral motion.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In the three years that I've had the opportunity to serve on Council, I've always gone out of my way to attempt to accommodate and to build bridges with those who want to invest in our City and to make opportunity happen.

As a matter of fact I'm proud to say that applications that have come forward, with the exception of one, everything got approved through our Community Committee process, with development, businesses wanting to build, businesses wanting to build houses that in the ward of Transcona. And there's always been difficulties and there has always been challenges but we dealt with it through public consultation, by taking time, by working through it at the Community Committee level and hearing people and trying to find compromise but it's worked. And because of that I think a lot of development growth is happening and it's positive.

But I think that sets a tone with regards to how you actually proceed and how you do this sort of development and growth. I don't see anybody here arguing against the economic development and jobs related to this plant that I have heard of so far. What I have heard Mr. Speaker is over and over again people talking about the lack of consultation.

And I guess I stress, I stress the fact that it was under the previous Mayor actually, Mayor Murray, when I raised my concerns regarding the police station amalgamation and the closure of police stations and I implored him that if you're going to do this, and it was a decision that was made by the previous Council, but I implored him that if you're going to proceed or you're going to do this, or you're going to, or you're thinking about doing this, you should at least consult with the people and talk to the people and he agreed and allowed for public consultations, 11 throughout the City at that time.

Our new Mayor, when it came time on the rapid transit debate and I know we've had many discussions around this, this table at that, around rapid transit, but through the work of the Task Force that I had the honour of chairing, we had the opportunity to do public consultations and I can tell you they were very useful because they gave us some very good ideas and feedback that we would have never have received had we not done them and we would not, and the report would have been half as good as it was. It would have been half, well, it would have been, it would have been a lot less useful in my mind for the citizens of this City. And that was through public consultations.

We do more public consultations when we talk about closing down a bridge for repairs. We'll go out of our way to form a Committee and do advertisements and even talk about compensating the local businesses through advertising and helping them out in advertising to keep their businesses alive, whether it be the Provencher Bridge or the Norwood Bridge or when we had the Main Street construction going on.

We're willing to do it for that, yet for a community we're talking about thousands and thousands of homes, and nobody can stand here with any certainty and say that there will be no impact of odour and have any idea of what the road implications will be. Nobody can stand up here and say that because they don't have a clue.

Mr. Speaker the least we can do, that we owe the public, is to go and have the public consultations to talk to the public, to let them have input and to let them see what the process is and to actually be able to affect the end result and that's a radical concept in our democracy, to actually allow people to have to an impact and to allow them to have an end result and how their community is going to grow and develop.

We are elected with a trust in a representative democracy and we're

judged every four years. But how we conduct ourselves in the actions on a daily basis and everything that goes on with regards to development is crucial. And I feel Mr. Speaker that by pushing this forward today, we're breaking that bond that when we're, yes, we're here, we're elected to represent, but when it comes to major decisions like this, it does not hurt, it helps, to go back to the public and talk about it.

You talk about forefathers and our history and the history of agriculture in this Province. Well I can tell you right now our forefathers were never building $2.25 million dollar a year hog plants that would go up to $4.5 million dollar hog plants, 8,000 a day. They weren't building the hundreds of hog barns around Manitoba and they won't be building, our forefathers never built, which is going to happen in the future, which is going to be, believe it or not another 400 hog barns to build finishing barns to finish these weanlings off. That will be 100 miles around this City.

This issue has just started. It just started the debate but it would have been nice for us to take a step back and to set the debate through public consultations and giving people an opportunity to have input and address the concerns and maybe find even a better solution and even help, believe it or not, help the industry in the tasks that they have ahead of them with regards to this.

That could have been done but instead it was done quietly. It was done secretly. It's a secret enterprise that was announced to the public with the information flowing last Monday. A rah-rah session with little information and details to even the elected officials here today making this decision.

So I would encourage Councillors to take time to review, to allow our administration to do the due diligence so we can know for sure what the cost implications are with regards to this. This is a subsidy package we're putting together for the industry and we're giving them land and once we do this, it's done. Let's take some time out and allow for us to know exactly what all of our costs are going to be and then we can make a decision on whether or not that is in the best interest of the citizens of this City. A couple of months. That's it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor. Mayor Katz closing debate on the main clause.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I stand before you as the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg. That includes Transcona, the Maples, Windsor Park, Inner City, River Heights, etcetera, and whenever there's an important decision to be made, I always try and make what's best for the entire City of Winnipeg.

I will tell you it's not easy making hard and important decisions. Actually the most difficult part of making a decision is actually making one and sticking with it and knowing that something you believe is best for your community.

There are times I stay up in the wee hours of the night thinking about the decisions that I'm going to make, that Council's going to make and I've been accused by my friends of caring too much. I don't believe there is such a thing as caring too much. I've heard some very good debate here today. I respect all the comments that have been made. I feel it's imperative that I do comment on a few items.

Number one, the administration doing its due diligence. I believe the administration has done their due diligence. They've identified everything that they, that could possibly be anticipated, the good and the bad. It's been a very frank and comprehensive report. We've had departments including Public Works, Transit, Water and Waste, Finance, Planning, Property and Development and Legal. All have their input.

We talked about process today. There has been a lot of talk about process. I very much believe in process. I very much resent anyone implying that anything today has been railroaded through, or there's been something secretive, or the information has not been

shared. It was actually at the last Council meeting because of a report in the media during Question Period, I was asked whether this was something we were exploring and I said yes we were, but nothing has been confirmed at this particular point in time.

I know certain Councillors were made aware of this over a month ago. I know that there was a Council seminar held 10 days ago, where unfortunately some of the Councillors here who did raise concerns, were unable to attend. But don't say we're not following process. We are following the process.

And I must confess, I very much respect and appreciate what Councillor Wyatt, the issue that Councillor Wyatt is raising today. I understand where he's coming from. And I understand his passion and I'm very much motivated by his passion.

By the same token, it's a matter of doing the right thing for our City. And I'd like to thank all the delegations that appeared here today. But unlike Councillor Wyatt who showed me passion because he cares, I can't say the same thing about the two MLA's who showed up here today. I have a very different opinion then Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Wyatt raised his concern right from the beginning. He and I have spoken on this on many occasions and we've had good conversation on it.

But you know what's interesting, is we had two MLA's here and I, and I welcome them. I hope they show up on a more regular basis. They're more than welcome to our chamber anytime. Our Premier, their Premier, is the most outspoken Premier in all of Canada when it comes to issues of water and air quality and quality of life. And I wish I had had the opportunity to ask the two MLA's is that, do they have their confidence, do they have confidence in their Premier and in their government, okay, to listen carefully to the recommendations from the CEC and to make sure that there will be public input? Unfortunately Mr. Speaker, I was not able to ask that question.

The other question I would have asked of Daryl Reid is that, who appeared here today, it was only 10 days ago where the same MLA attended the announcement of this event. He supported this. He endorsed it. He even publicly ridiculed Councillor Wyatt for interrupting Minister Wowchuk at the same time. I'd loved to have asked him why he was here today having a complete change of heart, but I did not get that opportunity.

The realities are quite simple. On the economic package, it's one of the best things that's ever happened. We will be repaid in two-and-a-half years. That's the reality of it. The land we're talking about, no one's been interested in that land for God knows how long. It enhances the value of the land next to us. Dollar and cents this is a win-win situation.

But you know what? That's not what's really important. What this is all about, and this morning I was up at 7:30 doing an interview and having residents of Transcona ask me questions, and the question that was asked over and over again, was odour and quality of life. And that's what this is all about because the people of Transcona are entitled to the same quality of life as each and every one of us, no matter what part of the City of Winnipeg we live in. And you know what? No one has given a very specific answer to that.

But here is what I do know. I know that Olywest has invited Councillors, as well as citizens, to go to Montreal and to explore their plants and ask questions. And I can assure you that if people come back and have concerns that I will be with them at CEC raising those concerns because it's important we always protect quality of life. Each and every one of us are entitled to that.

I am definitely going to support this economic package because it's good for our City. I also intend today and as long as I am the Mayor, to protect the quality of life of all our citizens, no matter what part of the City they live in Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. We'll do a recorded vote on both these, I'm sure that's going to be asked for so let's deal with it right up front. On Councillor Wyatt's motion number 2, all in favour of the motion, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion is lost.

On the main motion, all in favour of the motion, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried.

We have motions.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS on April 27, 2005, Council adopted Item No. 7 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated April 13, 2005 entitled "City of Winnipeg Museums – Heritage Preservation Policy Committee";

AND WHEREAS this item called for the creation of a committee to make recommendations for a Heritage Preservation Policy, with a report back to Council by December 31, 2005;

AND WHEREAS the terms of reference in the item called for a consultative approach with all museums funded by the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS visitations to and consultations with each of the museums by the Heritage Preservation Policy Committee has taken longer than expected;

AND WHEREAS it is the opinion of the Heritage Preservation Policy Committee that ensuring a complete consultation process with all museums is critical to ensuring an accurate and fully explored report that meets the needs of the City, the Museums and the public;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the date for the Heritage Preservation Policy Committee to report back to Council be extended to May 31, 2006.

Mr. Speaker: Motion number 1, moved by Councillor Steeves, seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan. It's a request for an extension of time. Taken as read.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Benham,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

WHEREAS sustainability is identified in Plan Winnipeg as the first of six principles the City of Winnipeg will adhere to in addressing the challenges that Winnipeg faces;

AND WHEREAS on July 18, 2001, City Council approved creation of the Civic Environmental Committee (CEC) to provide advice to Council and the administration, facilitate community consultation and education and monitor progress on environmental and sustainable development issues and opportunities;

AND WHEREAS on October 27, 2004, City Council approved in principle the CEC report Sustainable Winnipeg: A Comprehensive Environmental Strategy that identifies environmental challenges facing Winnipeg and recommends policy objectives and key strategies that the City of Winnipeg can take to address these challenges;

AND WHEREAS City Council has adopted the Administration document Embracing Sustainability: An Environmental Priority and Implementation Plan for the City of Winnipeg 2004 - 2006 developed in response to the CEC report, to which the Administration will be reporting back to Council in December 2005;

AND WHEREAS the CEC reports directly to the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee and that the Mayor's Action Plan for a new Winnipeg pledges that the Mayor will consult with the Civic Environmental Committee to consider priorities and how to act upon the CEC's Environmental Strategy;

AND WHEREAS this consultation between the Mayor and the CEC has yet to occur;

AND WHEREAS there is also a need to independently monitor and report on the City of Winnipeg's progress in achieving its environmental priorities and targets;

AND WHEREAS the Mayor has indicated a desire to reduce City of Winnipeg expenditures on external consultants and that the CEC is composed of volunteers;

AND WHEREAS the CEC's current mandate expires on December 31, 2005;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. City Council reaffirm its support for the Civic Environmental Committee.

2. City Council extend the existing mandate, policy assistant, budget and membership of the Civic Environmental Committee.

3. City Council co-operatively develop, as soon as possible, a renewed mandate, budget and membership for the Civic Environmental Committee that reflects a shift from developing environmental objectives and strategies to establishing priorities and plans for implementing these strategies and monitoring progress towards meeting the City's environmental objectives.

Required to stand as Notice of Motion in accordance with Rule 17.1 of the Procedure By-law

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 3, Councillors Benham and Smith. Oh it's a notice of motion, so it will stand to the next meeting.

Councillor Benham: Mr. Speaker I notice there is a mistake on that. It's referencing EPC. It's a notice of motion for December's Council meeting. I apologize that I didn't catch that when I signed it.

Mr. Speaker: Yeah, well it's a, it will stand to the next meeting so that's okay.

Councillor Benham: That's okay even though it's says referencing EPC at the top? Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: By-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-law No. 219/2005 be read at first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 219/2005.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that By-law No. 219/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 219/2005.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 219/2005 be read a third time and at the same time be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Executive Committee Question Period. Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Gerbasi.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question has to do with the new gas tax deal that's been signed. I've done a bit of looking into what some other cities are doing with their share of the funds and in Vancouver, Edmonton, Toronto and Ottawa, 100% of their gas tax money is going to transit. In Quebec City and Montreal, 25% is going to transit. In Calgary, 50% is going to transit.

I understand that we have 10% that's required to go to transit at least that's how I read it. Will the Mayor give any consideration to something more like a 20-80 split in terms of transit and road construction with the gas tax money? Or is it already completely set at 10%? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Mr. Speaker as I'm sure everybody here knows it was a long hard battle but fortunately we have crossed the finish line on the gas tax. And I think, as Councillor Wyatt alluded to earlier, there obviously are problems with our roads and our infrastructure and I think it's a good thing we have these monies that will be available over the next five years.

We fought very hard for the 10% allocation to transit which is approximately $12.5 million dollars. The balance of the money Councillor Gerbasi will definitely be going to our number one priority, roads and bridges.

As some may be aware of, Bill C66 I believe, was approved and that would probably have more money coming to transit to the tune of approximately $28 million dollars over two years, approximately $14 million dollars per year.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary question Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Would the Mayor consider restriction on the, it's going to be 90% for roads and bridges, a restriction that that be maintenance or renewal of existing infrastructure? Or is that 90% also include brand new sprawling infrastructure?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you. The 90%, which of the total represents approximately $103.5 million dollars, over five years, will be set aside for renewing our infrastructure. We will let the department decide what those priorities are. And I believe our department will make wise decisions where we should be renewing our infrastructure first, whether it's a road in a certain part of the City or a bridge in another part of the City.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just, I have a question on a slightly different topic. Just, when will the

chairperson be appointed to the Housing Steering Committee so that the Committee can actually look at administrative reports that are ready so we can determine what's happening with the Housing Policy?

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. I believe that is something that we should be dealing with immediately and I will make that my next endeavour and hopefully we can have that resolved before everybody breaks for Christmas.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Benham question?

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker given the Mayor's decision to keep the three citizen advisory committees, will the Mayor commit himself now to keeping the Civic Environmental Committee and not allowing its mandate to run out?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Benham. Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Benham, we have, I had a meeting with the chair of the Environment Committee. I've also had at the same time a meeting with several of the citizen volunteers who serve on that Committee and we are planning a strategy for that.

As Councillor Benham has stated, I believe their sunset clause is December 31st and once again I believe that we can put more focus and refresh that Committee and there appears to be a consensus at this particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I have a new question. I thank the Mayor for his answer and on a new question but relating back to the gas tax agreement.

Will the Mayor agree today to apply this gas tax money set aside for public transit, both the $1.4 million top-up from the Province and the money from the Federal government in years 3, 4 and 5, and what he has just referred to as C66 money, sometimes referred to as the Federal NDP money, will the Mayor agree today that that gas tax money will be applied to the capital cost of building bus rapid transit?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Absolutely not Mr. Speaker. What I will commit to is basically taking care of the number one concern of our citizens which are, is our existing road and bridge infrastructure which is crumbling before us. That is what we fought for. That is what the citizens want. That is what I am committed to. As Councillor Benham is aware of, we certainly fought hard for that extra 10% and we also have good news in Bill C66 as well.

But as far as our infrastructure, those monies will go towards our roads and bridges. We have new monies coming forward for transit and hopefully down the road there will be further monies coming. I do not believe this should be considered the end of monies coming from the senior levels of government. This should be considered the beginning.

Mr. Speaker: There are always the other levels of government, not senior. Councillor Benham final supplemental.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and the Mayor may have just misunderstood my question. I was referring to the public transit money. The money that has been designated for public transit in years 3, 4 and 5. The money that has been designated for public transit in Bill C66 and the money that was designated for public transit, $1.4 million dollars from the Province in years 1 and 2 of this agreement.

If the Mayor is saying still absolutely not, that the transit money will not be spent on bus rapid transit, that's fine. But I'm just not absolutely clear that he understood my question Mr. Speaker from his answer.

Mayor Katz: Thank you for that clarification. What I believe will be

happening is those monies will be directed towards our transit. That would be a combination of on-street improvements as well as rapid transit.

As you know we do have a director of that department and we certainly will be taking input from them but that is what the monies will be available for a combination of the two: on-street improvements and rapid transit.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yesterday or the day before I had the opportunity to go out to the AMM Convention and hear some of the debate that was taking place on the Convention floor. And at that time there was, it was, the debate was on the gas tax deal and the deal that was signed.

And there was a lot of consternation and concern based on the deal signed being expressed mainly from municipalities in the rural parts of the Province with regards to and of course the final settlement that was reached which was 10% off the top and then the rest per capita, which is in sense what it was agreed to.

So I guess my question is this. It's, at this point in time, we would I think, would the Mayor be prepared to lead Council in an exercise of strengthening our relations and keeping strong relations with the AMM by maybe setting up regular meetings, maybe once every two months or so, with the members of the AMM executive to discuss issues that we share with them?

Such as things like the school tax issue where we have common ground and where we can work together for the betterment of all municipalities in Manitoba. In light of the fact that relations right now are somewhat strained. To put it lightly.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. There is absolutely no doubt the example that you gave about school taxes that's something that the City of Winnipeg has been fighting for for a long, long time. That's not a new issue.

I believe your statement is an accurate one when you use the words "strained relationship". I believe Mr. Speaker those relationships are strained because when one makes a commitment and then reneges on it it's hard to have good relationships with people who aren't showing good faith. I've always learned to keep the channels of communication open.

By the same token I can say to you that I am certainly not pleased with the way the AMM handled this. They put not one but two proposals on the table. One in early May that they withdrew in September. Another one on November the 8th which they withdrew about 10 days later.

I don't believe they've acted in good faith. That certainly does not mean that I'm not prepared to talk and listen. But I also want to make sure that the AMM is representing all municipalities of the Province. That includes Brandon, Flin Flon, Thompson, Winnipeg, etcetera, which represents approximately 70% of the population.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Like any family Mr. Speaker, it's quite often they break down when it comes to fighting over money and our municipal friends in the big family of Manitoba, that sometimes can happen.

But having said that, that is now the history. Now that we have that in the history and we have resolved it and we have an agreement can we establish a process where we're going to have regular meetings with the executive, with all of Council being invited?

I know EPC has had a chance to meet with members of the executive on their own, but the chance for all of Council to be part of regular meetings with the AMM

where we can have dialogue and go forward with our, where we have common ground which is on many fronts. Would the Mayor be prepared to initiate that process?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. As you know Councillor Eadie is our representative on the AMM. He actually suggested that EPC have meetings with the AMM, similar to what you are suggesting. I can tell you based on your suggestion I am prepared to maintain an open mind to that. If we believe that would result in I guess, a positive, positive accomplishments, I'm happy to listen to that.

By the same token I'm not going to pretend that I'm not disappointed in what's taken place over the last five months. I'm extremely disappointed and as you probably heard other Mayors of other municipalities are considering pulling out of the AMM. I'm prepared to listen and see what people have to say.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: Does that mean, just to put a finer point on it. Does that mean that we would have a meeting as a Council? That that would be organized and that we would have a meeting as a Council in the next let's say, ideally before Christmas, but if not maybe right in January with the executive, members of the AMM and this Council being invited to sit down and have a morning of coffee and doughnuts and talk about issues? I'll bring the doughnuts Your Worship, to save on the costs. You know is that something that that we can potentially do? Is that something that you would be willing to do sir?

Mr. Speaker: You can bring the pork rinds. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's realistic for us to expect something to happen before Christmas. But I think in the new year it would probably be a good gesture to extend the olive branch and at least have dialogue. And I can assure Councillor Wyatt that if he doesn't have the room in his budget for the coffee and the doughnuts we'll help out, it will be our pleasure.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker seeing our hypocritical friends from Broadway here today reminded me of their government's commitment to help fund the sewer and water projects that were brought about by the Clean Environment Commission's rulings and the timing of which was accelerated by Mr. Reid and Mr. Jha's government. Does the Mayor have a solid commitment from the Province to assist with this funding?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Swandel. This is actually something that Councillor Clement raised at the last EPC meeting and I can tell you that we've had discussions. As you know this was supposed to be done over a longer period of time and then as a result of Minister Ashton it's a shorter period of time. We are still working in a cooperative fashion and to try and make sure that there is a fair and reasonable deal on the table.

Do we have a solid commitment? No we do not at this particular point in time. That is something myself and the Premier will be having further meetings on and we will be having one more before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor. Have we put forth a formal ask or at least a commitment to a set percentage of funding this, these projects?

Mayor Katz: We have looked at two scenarios. One helping us with the funding and we are looking at particular numbers and some numbers have been discussed, not based on a percentage. We've also recommended a longer term as well.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you again to the Mayor. Does the Mayor know what percentage of revenue the voter, I mean the taxpayers of Winnipeg represent in the Provincial budget?

Mayor Katz: No I cannot answer that question but if you know it and are happy to share it I'd appreciate it very much. But if you are asking me the question I'd be happy to get an answer to it.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Last year around this time I think I raised the issue of the City's Equity and Diversity policies and how they were not really being adhered to when it comes to high level political staff in the EPC Secretariat and the Mayor's office. It was pointed out at that time that all of the high level positions are held by young or middle-aged white males. And since that time we've now progressed to an all male Executive Policy Committee as well.

Recently the position of Advisor to the Executive Policy Committee was filled again by a white male business oriented individual. And I'd like to point out it's nothing against the person. I'm very fond of the fellow.

In this most recent hire did the Mayor attempt to seek out possible applicants from a wider pool that might include women or minority groups?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker just for accuracy, I did not participate, nor did my office participate in the hiring that was done through the EPC Secretariat. But I think what Councillor Gerbasi neglected to say that prior to that we had one male and I believe four or five females, so it, it's an interesting comment but it's actually the reverse and I don't recall any criticism for us having too many females in that department, so I don't understand what the comment is all about right now Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Gerbasi. No?

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, well I'm not sure which, I'm not sure if I can respond to it because I'm not sure which…

Mr. Speaker: No it's a question without preamble.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, I'll just move on to another question then. Councillor Steeves was talking about community policing in the media and I'm just wondering if the Mayor shares his view that we are reviewing the community policing program with an eye to possibly that we can no longer afford it, was basically what Councillor Steeves was implying as a possibility, and I'm just wondering if the Mayor shares that?

When I say community policing I'm talking about the beat officers of the storefront offices and some of the ones that we have in our community. Those 40 officers or 65, however many, are specifically working those areas.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Mr. Speaker I'm not aware of what Councillor Steeves had said in the media but I can assure you that community policing is a policy that exists with our department. And there are certainly different opinions, whether you speak to the Police Association, whether you speak to the department. I believe everybody believes that there should be officers walking the beat in communities. The presence of Police Officers is good.

I know that there have been comments made about whether you know sitting in offices is positive or negative. To my knowledge this has been nothing more than people voicing their opinions, some in public. And at this particular point in time it's not anything that we have been looking at specifically.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thanks Mr. Speaker. The, at the last EPC meeting I had opportunity, or one of the last meetings, to speak regarding school taxes, the motion that came forward from the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee to clarify the, our position on school taxes and to say clearly once and for all that we as a City are in favour of removing school from property, school taxes from property and to lobby the Province to do exactly that.

That motion was defeated at EPC but from the discussion that took place and that I heard there was a lot of feelings that, from many members on EPC, that there was a need for clarification. Since then I've had conversations with yourself and others with regards to this.

Is there a plan to bring forward a initiative or a motion to the next Council meeting to clarify the position once and for all of the City and to put this on the front burner with regards to our meetings with the Provincial government and the need to eliminate school taxes off the property?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. There is no doubt that that is a, one of the top issues at this particular point in time and I can assure you that anytime there is a meeting with the Provincial government we usually start off with school taxes.

The general consensus is that school taxes should not be on the property tax bill. Whether it comes out of the general revenue or some other source that's a decision for the future.

I believe as a result of your delegation along with the Real Estate Board, and I appreciate you appearing that day, what we decided was that we would get the stakeholders together and actually come up with suggestions on how the Provincial government can handle this matter without it being on our property tax bill. And once we come up with certain suggestions we would then meet with the Premier, possibility Cabinet, etcetera, and that's the direction we decided would be best at that particular point in time Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: In light of the fact that this is happening is there any timeframe on that, that plan with regards to bringing this together and having that position and when that would be happening?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I believe this is something that we will be addressing first thing in the new year and as far as I'm concerned we should move on this as quickly as we possibly can. This is a high priority for the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, thank you for the responses Mr. Mayor. The, through you to the chair, through the chair to yourself. The AMM they have a very clear position on the outlying municipalities. Would we be working with the AMM as we move towards having this because they might have some solutions themselves, by bringing them into the tent to develop this strategy and approach to take to the Province? Would that be part of it?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker as you know this has been an issue with the City of Winnipeg for a long time. By the same token, since we are prepared to offer coffee and doughnuts to the AMM, I'd love to get their input on this as well.

Mr. Speaker: The AMM is actually lobbying on our behalf because it was our motion that started it, so.

Councillor Wyatt: It was your motion.

Mr. Speaker: Well they're working for us. Time for questions is expired. We will move on the Standing Policy Committee on Fiscal Issues. Report of September 13th, Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED SEPTEMBER 13, 2005

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker with the indulgence of Council I would like to ask that the report of September 13th be introduced by Councillor Clement who chaired that Committee at the time the clause was generated.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Clause 1 of the report, MTC Entertainment Funding By-law Exemption.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to, I guess speak to this. I'm trying to think of the best way to handle this. When we had this before us a while back we laid it over. And when it came to Executive Policy Committee the other day we dealt with, the same way that Fiscal Issues did, we brought it back and we followed the policy.

I have a concern with this whole issue because EPC frankly is reviewing the whole Amusement Tax By-law right now and while there are numerous issues as we try to work our way through it, I think the intent is to be as beneficial to the arts in the community as we can be. And I'm aware that if, if MTC winds up with a shortfall, and I don't know whether they will or they won't, that it will create a problem with other revenue opportunities that they have at other levels of government, Mr. Speaker.

So I'm thinking that the most appropriate thing to do with this on reflection would be to refer this whole thing back to EPC for about 120 days so this doesn't come forward again in the short term because I believe within that time that there will be some kind of a movement in the Amusement Tax area that will solve this, or at least I hope it will.

And I think if we, I don't want to, on the one hand I don't want to do something that is outside of the policy, I don't think that that's fair to the other user groups who are all following it. On the other side, I don't want to cause a problem here either for a, an arts group that we all think very highly of.

So I'm thinking that we should refer this back Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to say 120 days because then it's going to, I believe that there will be no problem dealing with it in that timeframe. I don't know whether we're allowed to do that or not, but if we are, then that's what I would suggest we do.

Mr. Speaker: A referral motion would have been in order from you if you had said you were going to move it first.

Councillor Clement: Yeah, I know. I accept that and I knew that. I wasn't, I'm not the chairman of Fiscal Issues. I was asked to pinch hit here so I thought that I would go, I would approach it that way and maybe the chairman of Fiscal Issues might like to take the issue back now and maybe deal with it in that fashion Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Clement for your opening remarks. I just want to remind you that whatever we do we're dealing with items 1 and 3 of this report, 5 has already been stood down.

However Councillor Benham has been recognized to speak so I have to thank you for your finish. Thank you for your comments. Councillor Benham on the clause.

Councillor Benham: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear that there is political will for a motion to refer. I was very heartened by what Councilor Clement said. I was really only going to make those points myself but I think we need a more systemic approach based on the excellent work done by Councillor Magnifico and the Red Tape Commission. Is it in order for me to move a motion to refer back for 120 days?

Mr. Speaker: If that's the will of Council I'll accept that and as I say, we don't give speeches first and then move. (In audible). It's a motion to refer and I can explain why.

Councillor Benham: Mr. Speaker I move that this item, that item 1 of the report of the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues dated September 13, 2005 be referred back for 120 days. I agree with Councillor Clement about the time.

Mr. Speaker: To EPC. All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Thanks for that. The report of November the 8th, Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED NOVEMBER 8, 2005

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker I am honoured to move the report of Fiscal Issues of November 8th and move that clause 1 be adopted by Consent.

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

No motions. By laws Councillor.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker I'd move the following By-laws be read at first time, Nos. 211/2005, 217/2005 and 218/2005.

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

Clerk: By-laws Nos. 211/2005, 217/2005, 218/2005.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'd move that By-laws numbered 211/2005, 217/2005 and 218/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 211/2005, 217/200 and 218/2005.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 211/2005, 217/2005 and 218/2005 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions? Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I rise, through you Mr. Speaker to ask a question regarding the a, there was some speculation by some members of Council that the financial crunch the City is facing in terms of what the departments come forth for their ask based on City policy and what City policy is to supply the services that we're mandated to supply was somewhere in the range of a $35 to $45 million dollar shortfall.

What is the status of that? What is the shortfall that we are facing in terms of, in terms of the services that they feel should be funded at the levels that we mandate through our policy? For the coming year.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Preliminary report through Ms Stenning's office that based on requests from departments for the coming year, the Budget based on last year's tax levels and revenue levels would be approximately $45 million dollars short.

Along with that report Ms Stenning provided alternatives that could result in as much as a $5 million dollar surplus. Those are being about to be gone over by EPC which will then of course put a package together and put it before Council.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I thank you and I thank the chair for his frankness on the matter. The, would Council have an opportunity to see, all members of Council, see the various options that have been explored by the administration in terms of what is being looked at to go

from either, from the $45 million down to the $5 million surplus and everything in between? That's clearly (in audible) different options are being considered I would imagine.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Absolutely and positively not.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: In light of the fact would we be able to see what services in question are of concern to our administration with regards to the response that you just gave?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: To be as candid but as brief as possible, one of said items suggested by our administration was to save a relatively small amount of math by close, amount of money, by closing 171 tennis courts. That was booted aside within 5 seconds.

And I don't feel bringing such matters up at the early going and putting them out so that all the members of our community be lead into panic, would be serving their interests or ours at this point.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Maybe I got the wrong end of the stick. Mr. Chairman is very direct. The, Mr. Chairman, my question is more in terms of not so much the service cuts, but nevertheless what the administration is coming forward or what they feel that the funding obligations are and seeing a list of what those funding obligations are based on increasing costs, based on all these other options.

In terms of not so much what we can actually fund or what the number is we are going to be funding but in terms of what the obligation increasing pressures are on the various departments to find in light of what, and what that $35 or $45 million dollar shortfall really represents?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I have not been provided with a list of differences at this point between last year and this year. All I've been provided with is a list of departmental requests, after having been given a guideline by the senior administration and what they have requested. That is what made up the $45 million dollar possible shortfall.

And how that compares to the first request or the final Budget of last year I cannot answer. I do not have that information at this time.

Councillor Wyatt: When would we have that information and when can that be shared with Council?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: The Budget will be drafted by EPC with input and suggestion from Fiscal Issues as is the mandate and when it is, when EPC is satisfied that what they are putting before Council is something that can and should properly be debated, it will be put forward. But to put forward every idea that ever comes from any source would be nigh on impossible and I don't see what good it would do to do that.

The debate, if members of Council, if members of the public have questions and do question what's put forward they can of course bring it up but to, I don't believe in intervener funding and I don't believe in providing ammunition to those who want to take pot-shots. Let them go get their own ammunition.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: Would the chairman present to Council with proposed process on how you foresee the Budget to be coming forward to Councillors. Will it be any different then what we are used to? Would it be more open? Would it be more inclusive? What will the process? And if not, you don't have it now then is it something that we propose in the future?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I think the Mayor, as the chair of EPC will put a process, a timetable forward prior to the tabling of the estimates and I would believe that those estimates will show a balanced budget with no tax increase.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, (In Audible) Scott Carr even said "if pigs could vote then the slop bucket would be elected swineherd every time, no matter how much slaughtering he did on the side".

Seeing my friends from Broadway here today reminded me of conversations we had during the New Deal where the Province may or may not come to the table with some gas tax or fuel tax money. I'd like to ask the chair of Fiscal Issues if any of that money is forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Those inter-governmental matters are not within the purview of Fiscal Issues. They come under EPC and I imagine that question would be more properly directed to the Mayor who is in charge of inter-governmental affairs. I have no specific knowledge to add to the current information pool at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Mr. Speaker I, just a further question on transit funding. Has there been any increase in funding for transit from the Provincial government this year? Or in the recent years?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Not that I'm aware of. There has been nothing that I am privy to that would indicate an imminent change. The only change for transit funding that I know of, but we all know about, is the gas tax agreement which directs 10% of the funding toward urban transit.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Councillor Swandel: As chair of Fiscal Issues are you aware of any ongoing conversations with the government regarding increased funding for infrastructure in the Province, in the City of Winnipeg?

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Yes I am.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions.

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

Mr. Speaker: Standing Committee of Downtown Development. The report of April 4th has been laid over to December. We move on to the report of December, just a minute, October 31st.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED OCTOBER 31, 2005

Mr. Speaker: I'll let him introduce it first. Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent agenda items, oh wait a minute, we can't do that here. I can do 1, 2 and 4 because item number 3 I think we have to have…

Mr. Speaker: We have to stand down number 3 for a moment.

Councillor Magnifico: Stand down number 3 for a moment.

Mr. Speaker: So Councillor Magnifico moves the report items 1, 2 and 4 of the report of October 31, be adopted by Consent.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clause 3.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker if I may.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz on a point of order.

(Point of Order)

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm sure this comes as no surprise to everybody that I have a pecuniary gain or interest in this project as CanWest Global Park is, I'd like to recuse myself while this takes place.

Mr. Speaker: Through the, in accordance with the Municipal Conflict of interest Act, so.

Mayor Katz: Thank you.

Councillor Magnifico: Now we should all vote it down while he's gone. (Laughter)

Mr. Speaker: Clause 3.

Councillor Magnifico: Clause 3.

Item No. 3 - CanWest Global Stadium - Interim Lease – South of Water Avenue and West of Waterfront Drive to Riverside Park Management Inc. – Short Term Parking
File FI-2.2(32)

Mr. Speaker: We're moving the clause. Is there any discussion?

Councillor Magnifico: I would move the adoption of clause 3.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? That's carried.

There are no motions. Bylaws. Councillor Magnifico.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Magnifico: I move that By-law No. 207/2005 be read at first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 207/2005.

Councillor Magnifico: I move that By-law No. 207/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 207/2005.

Councillor Magnifico: I move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 207/2005 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Any questions? None.

Councillor Magnifico: If I may Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind everyone here for December 6th, from 2:00 to 6:00, at the York Hotel.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Send an email when you're done.

Councillor Magnifico: Christmas Cheer Board Fundraiser.

Mr. Speaker: Good. The Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development report or November 1st. Councillor De Smedt.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 1, 2005

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the report of the Committee on Property and Development of November 1st and clauses 1 to 12 as Consent.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Opposed?

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker record me in opposition to number 2 please.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves is recorded in opposition to clause 2.

The report? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

There are no motions. By-laws. Councillor De Smedt.

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

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that By-law No. 158/2005 of the City of Winnipeg to adopt a Secondary Plan for the South St. Boniface Area be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 158/2005.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that By-law No. 158/2005 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Additional By laws Councillor.

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker I would move By-laws No. 199/2005 to 205/2005, both inclusive, and 210/2005, 212/2005, 213/2005, 215/2005, 216/2005, now be read at first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 199/2005, 200/2005, 201/2005, 202/2005, 203/2005, 204/2005, 205/2005, 210/2005, 212/2005, 213/2005, 215/2005, 216/2005.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that By-laws 199/2005 to 205/2005 both inclusive and 210/2005, 212/2005, 213/2005, 215/2005, 216/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws Nos. 199/2005 to 205/2005 both inclusive, 210/2005, 212/2005, 213/2005, 215/2005 and 216/2005.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 199/2005 to 205/2005, both inclusive, 210/2005, 212/2005, 213/2005, 215/2005, 216/2005, be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Any questions for…? Councillor Gerbasi.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a question about the Zoning By-law review. Currently a plant such a the hog plant that we were dealing with today would have been, if it was considered a conditional use as opposed to a permitted use in the zoning, there would have been a public hearing.

And I'm wondering if the Planning Committee is going to be looking at that or if the administration is currently looking at making these types of major industries that have a huge impact, a conditional use and then there could be a public process without all this kafuffle we had today that at least people would have a voice and it would be a better process. Is that something that is being looked at in the zoning review?

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Councillor Gerbasi. By-law 6400 is being assiduously reviewed by the administration with consultation with an advisory committee and I'm certain it's one of the issues that would be considered. However, if you would like to just send me an email and I'll ensure that the department has, takes note of that and we'll just see how it all unfolds.

And of course as you know there will be significant discussion on this issue but we are working very determinedly to try and have something in place by next June. But of course I think if we could do that I

did hear you discuss that during your presentation during the motion debate. I guess in this case, if you've read recently *Charlotte's Web,* Wilbur will have escaped and come back home so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi second supplementary question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, you're going to make me cry if you start talking about Wilbur today.

But, finally I'd like to ask, I've heard the date June being talked about as the final date that the Zoning By-law must be ready by. And I also heard two members of EPC state that it has to be done in time for the election.

And I'm kind of concerned about that and I'm wondering why, when it was originally going to be a two year process, for it to be stated that it has to be done before an election concerns me when there's serious issues of public input that need to happen regarding the zoning review.

So can you just clarify what the timelines is and what the deadline is? And is there a deadline that this is, has to be done before the election?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I think it's, the accent is on the wrong syllable here. It's not that it has to be done before an election but I think it's important that we aggressively pursue the review and the analysis so that we have something in place that with the experience that we have around this table, some, you know some advice can be given in relation to the public consultation that is taking place.

You should know that the advisory committee is a very significant one that is providing you know high level advice and it's representative from all areas, from all interests of industry. I think when we take it through the public consultation I think you will find that there will be an opportunity for significant input to take into consideration as broad of the interests that you can.

But I don't think there is any need to be concerned about how fast we're moving. I mean it is a long process. If we had to start this from scratch it would probably take several years, but we have benefit I think of a consultant that's been actively involved in this kind of, in this kind of process and we have benefit from other jurisdictions that have completed a significant by-law review over several years.

So using that experience I think we are able to set realistic timelines that have nothing to do that next year is an election year though it brings up an interesting point. Would you rather not have the benefit of the wisdom of the people who have around this table, for some as long as I won't say how many years, but collectively 7 or 8 years anyway and others 20 – 25 years, who know what will happen next October when we start over again.

That is, I think it's important that we do it in as timely a way as we can. And I think it's achievable realistically in an apolitical way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Final Supplementary.

Councillor Gerbasi: Final supplemental. Just my major concern is just that there will be, when we were originally told it took two years I just want to be sure that there is adequate consultation with the public and with everybody because there is actual changes to some of the public consultation processes suggested in the *Red Tape Report* and those are the things that I want to make sure are adequately explored. So I just want to be assured that that's the intention.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: If I can pick up on a point that perhaps Councillor Gerbasi is referring to in The Red Tape Commission report it is the dialogue about whether we would have Community Committee,

Property and Development Committee consultation processes continuing on. And of course that, that's a separate issue.

But in relation to this particular By-law review, I think it's because the department has the experience of other jurisdictions, because of the consultant that we have and because of the advisory committee that's been put in place, that we are very confident that it can move ahead in a proper way and that there will be the opportunity for consultation that I'm sure would take your concerns and concerns of other Councillors involved and their public. I hope that satisfies you Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Wyatt, your first question.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. I'd like to get an update Mr. Speaker on the status of the impost fee report or plan that's being brought forward with regards to charging developers impost fees on top of all the other charges. What's the status on that and where is that right now?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker, this is under the authority of the Executive Policy Committee and as you know the Mayor chairs that Committee.

Let me just say that I think to involve everybody at this point in time, I mean, the report is not yet ready to come forward for further analysis and I think when that happens, through to Executive Policy Committee, members of Council will be so informed and have an opportunity to comment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your second supplementary question Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that the members of the industry and business community have been consulted would it not be fair to ask that members of Council be consulted and informed ahead of time before the report comes forward?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Well when we reach that stage Councillor I would agree. When it's timely I think there will be an opportunity for members of Council to have, make representation accordingly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: But if, I guess I come back to my point, or ask my question again. Will we have an opportunity to be consulted and have input before a report is issued, at this time, as has industry has now already been consulted and Council is not?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Oh the wonderful web we weave around here. I think you know Councillor the industry had to be consulted at the outset initially so we have input to frame the analysis. The analysis is still underway and I think what I can say quite easily is that when we're ready to move ahead with the scope of this document I think members of Council will be invited to participate and to provide input.

I understand the significance of it and there is nothing that we need to fear about this, I mean unless you're happening to be getting called everyday by certain developers that have some degree of nervousness, but at this stage of the game we're not yet ready to move ahead.

(Councillor Eadie in the chair)

Mr. Speaker: The report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED NOVEMBER 7, 2005

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll introduce the report and move the adoption of Consent agenda, items 1 to 3 of the report of November 7, 2005.

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

There are no motions. By-laws none. Questions? Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Gerbasi.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Last week Councillor Steeves stated in the media "you may see us drastically rearrange our Police department. You might see us get away from community policing". And then he went on to say "I don't know that I as chair of this committee have the luxury of running a public relations service anymore".

My question is, is this your position that a community policing program is simply a public relations program?

Councillor Steeves: Thank you for the question. I did a number of interviews. This was a very, this was a very, I guess it garnered a lot of interest in the community when I suggested we would have a chat about community police.

And I welcome the question and I think it's a fair question because it's absolutely, it's absolutely true that I did, I did float the idea on CBC, on the Morning Show, and then did first the entire, the entire gamut of media outlets before it was done.

No I guess, to put as fine a point as possible on it, I don't see it as a public relations exercise. What I do think when it comes to community policing is that there has developed some skepticism as to the effectiveness of the program in its entirety.

Rightly or wrongly, based on my experience, and after talking to the Chief and after talking to the Police Association and their representatives, I guess I'm willing to admit that I have some skepticism with the current model that we're running.

I'm beginning to believe, rightly or wrongly and it is only my opinion, that perhaps the idea of community policing is an idea that strictly speaking might be more properly limited to areas of higher density and higher crime. That's where my philosophy is moving I suppose, is about as accurately as I can state it.

The comments I suppose that I made with respect to community policing are designed to I guess at once serve notice that I do plan on reviewing community policing and whatever form that might take. And that yes, I do have some concerns about the model that we're currently running.

And the comments are entirely mine but I think as chairperson of the Committee it's incumbent upon me to review what we're doing as an organization and to offer my advice, my suggestions as to what we should or should not look at. And this is indeed one of those areas. But I recognize it as controversial and I recognize it as one of those things where there is going to be different opinions and I do welcome those differing opinions.

Again I do want to underline that it would appear at least at first blush that the opinion is not entirely mine alone, it was certainly echoed at our last Protection and Community Services Committee meeting by the Police Association and their designated representatives.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Are you aware, is Councillor Steeves aware, the chair of the Committee aware, of the volunteer foot-patrol programs and ambassador

programs that exist in the Corydon and Osborne Village areas where there is close to 40 or 50 volunteers and that those programs, that cost us no money and would not exist without the support of the local beat officers in the community policing program, is he aware of what would be lost if that were taken away?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Well I guess the short answer is yes I am aware of what, of what would be lost if that would be, if that would be taken away. But I do want to underline that that wasn't what I was suggesting.

These people are not people that are employed by us necessarily. It may be that they're organized and that they're administered to a certain extent by people in our department and that might be a benefit that accrues to the City.

Again I want to emphasize that my comments I felt represent the beginning of a discussion on community policing. I welcome Councillor Gerbasi's I guess ability, to take my comments of review of a community, of the community policing model and automatically infer subitaneously that overnight I'm going to be eliminating these groups of 40 or 50 volunteers in our community. That isn't what I said. I never even referred to them.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker I guess I'm just wondering if Councillor Steeves is aware that I wasn't talking about eliminating those volunteers, but those volunteers in order to do what they do require the ongoing beat officer presence to keep their work going.

And that was what I was just wondering if you were aware of that that you take away the beat officer it would have the impact of taking away those other things. Are you aware of that?

Councillor Steeves: I'm aware that may be the case right now. I'm also aware that there is many different ways to skin a cat. If this is a valuable service that's being offered to the community then there might be, there might be other ways that we can deliver the exact same service.

I am certain that our beat officer in the community is doing a wonderful job of administering the program. That is not to say, that is not to say that there is not another way to do it. Maybe this is the best way to do it. Maybe there is another way to do it. Maybe this is something we don't want to touch. Maybe it is something that we want to touch.

But what's interesting though again, is that while it was something that was advanced, I think by the Winnipeg Police Association at our meeting, it would seem that despite, despite the wishes to have this reviewed by our own Police Officers and their elected representatives, one of our Councillors is unwilling to even talk about it. That's concerning Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions? Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes my question has to do with community policing as well. You know Councillor Steeves you said you had some concerns about community policing. Well I haven't heard what those concerns are. What makes you upset about community policing or some aspect of community policing at the present time?

Councillor Steeves: My concerns are thus. The impression I get is that we're facing some acute challenges in this City. And it's been manifested I guess in some very, very unfortunate incidences over the course of the last few months.

Councillor Gerbasi was one of the folks who I think quite rightly was instrumental in at least informing Council and people around City Hall of the attendance at a vigil in memory of a young man who was, who was slain in, in an accidental random shooting. And fair enough. I mean, then from there moved into a Protection and Community Services meeting, which I think was fairly controversial, and which I think was fairly emotional and difficult for all involved. What it did for me and may not have affected other people in the

exact same way but what it did for me is it caused me to reflect on the service that we're delivering.

After meeting with the Police Association, which I, which they offered to do, and which I sought out to do, and after hearing their submissions at our last Protection and Community Services meeting when they came forward and said in terms of us delivering our service we feel this is something that should be reviewed. We feel that potentially this is not the best use of our resources in its entirety. There may be better areas of the City in which community policing work. There may be areas where it's less called for. So that's where the debate started. And that's the concern I have.

It's a concern that I have and I perfectly welcome anyone on Council to share that concern or not to share that concern. But it is a concern that is heartfelt and that I honestly feel. So if Councillor Smith is asking me where does that consternation, or that angst come from, it comes from there.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary. You okay? Any other questions?

Then we'll move on to the report of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works November 8th, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED NOVEMBER 8, 2005

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the report of November the 8th and I'll move clauses 1 to 3 as Consent.

Councillor Swandel: Stand down 1.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 1 is stood down. Clauses 2 and 3.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clause 1.

**Item No. 1 - 2006 Water and Sewer Utility Rates
File WW-2.3**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement do you wish to introduce the clause.

Councillor Clement: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move this with the following guarded comments, I guess. I am completely frustrated with this issue but we don't have any choice given the circumstances that are in front of us right now and whether we get the Provincial government and/or the Federal government to participate in this huge expenditure or not, we are going to have to increase our sewer rates to pay for our share no matter what. So moving the initial increases, and this would be the third one, is an appropriate thing to do.

I say that I'm somewhat guarded over it because I was anticipating that the EPC Secretariat was going to create a motion that was going to come forward to this Council meeting that was going to allow Council to vote on it and give instructions to the Mayor to discuss this issue and the financing of this particular initiative with the other two levels of government over the next year.

And what I said at EPC was, and my position is thus, that without that discussion and without some kind of a commitment from the other two levels of government, I'm frankly of the view that we should put full halt on this whole issue and that we should stop increasing rates and that we should do nothing and let them react because what's been going on with this issue is absolutely and blatantly unfair.

We have a senior level of government directing us to change, to change our sewer treatment program from a 50 year program to a 25 year program. We have a $911 million dollar expenditure and all we have to date Mr. Speaker, is an agreement from the other two levels of government for $24 million dollars each. We can't afford $860 million dollars to do this and the only way that we can, we would have to have increases over the

next 10 years of 66% on the sewer rates in this City.

And I don't believe that that should be hoisted on to the citizens of this City in any way, shape and form. And I think that we have to make it very clear to the Provincial government and to the Federal government that this is an environmental issue that while I think everybody would agree that we should solve it and the sooner that we solve it the better.
I think we also have to understand and make note that even though we would spend $911 million dollars collectively, it's only solving somewhere between 8 and 10% of the total problem in the Red River basin. With no plan anywhere, on any radar screen to deal with the other 90%, Mr. Speaker.

So while I am here to move the rates go forward and I would suggest that my colleagues vote for them, I am looking forward for a document coming out of the EPC Secretariat, sooner than later and hopefully immediately, because I actually expected it here today, so that we can give our Mayor direction to negotiate this issue and this initiative with the other two levels of government. And I certainly hope that that motion is before us for the next Council meeting Mr. Speaker. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel on the clause.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. You know you may have sensed that I was a little angered today by our two friends from Broadway coming in here and taking the hypocritical stance that they did. I'm one who has counseled people before not to be oppositional with other levels of government and certainly to the Mayor's office and some of his staff, saying that you know it doesn't serve us any good to be challenging them or to be, to be oppositional to them. You know asking that you know, for as large a demand as we can get in certain areas.

But this particular issue has me troubled since the day that the Province accelerated the timing of the Clean Environment Commission's rulings, or licensing requirements for the City of Winnipeg.

Sitting here in front of us, we have, you know, a huge increase in where we started out in 2003. What it was going to be to the ratepayers for the sewer and water ratepayers in the City of Winnipeg. But yet we still don't have any resolution from the Province.

I'm happy to hear from the Mayor and also from Mr. Clement that there is some movement and we're looking at having something come forward in the near future that, of a strong commitment from the Provincial government to help fund this. But let me remind you that many people, and in my ward in particular the St. Norbert ward, we have no infrastructure that is combined sewer. But yet all of those people, and I'm willing to represent this, they are going to pay increased sewer and water charges for the greater good and this is because of an Act by our Provincial government.

At the same time in the St. Norbert ward we have people who don't have treated drinking water going to their houses. Their water is trucked in by cistern. We can't get dime one out of the Water Stewardship Board to assist us with bringing safe potable water to those people. You know residents are trying to strike a committee rapidly to seize the opportunity of MRIF funds to offset the cost to them and still we have no safe drinking water for these people. Well safe as it is in a cistern you know, but apparently the Water Stewardship folks are going to put a little more tighter regulations in before they can shut these, so that they can take some of this drinking water away from these people and perhaps increase the cost again.

The other item that troubled me in here, and this goes back to my folks at south St. Norbert who have water trucked in is there's an increased cost for water sold at standpipe. That's the water that's put into trucks and trucked out to these people in cisterns. It's unclear in the report and I'm hoping that Councillor Clement will address this. It says that, they rejected an increase to $10 dollars. That it be set

at $8 dollars. My understanding is the current rate is $6 dollars. So somewhere in there we started at $6, gone to $10 and ended at $8 but we're still seeing a 30% increase of the cost at standpipe.

So needless to say I'm troubled by this. I know it's necessary and I hope we're able to backtrack on some of this as the days move ahead, or the weeks move ahead and we get some commitment out of the Provincial government to help fund this monumentous undertaking that's been brought about by their actions. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Debate on the clause? Councillor Clement do you wish to close.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The only thing I would like to add I guess and Councillor Swandel raised it, under 4.a. it says that the water sold at standpipes per 1,000 gallons be reduced from $10 dollars to $8 dollars. In actual fact the price today is $6 dollars. And I don't know why it's worded exactly like this but there was a recommendation from the department that it be raised from $6 dollars to $10 dollars and the Committee landed on $8, which is a 33% increase but it wasn't as big a jump as what they had brought forward.

And when we questioned them about that they said they hadn't raised anything since 1998 and it was suggested at the Committee that they should do something a little bit more inflationary, you know on a year to year basis. That that would make more sense then to all of a sudden just nail these people with a huge bump after seven years. I don't know why it's been left but that was why it was done. It's not worded correctly and Councillor Swandel pointed that out. The fact of the matter is is that what this means is that people who are trucking their water will pay $8 dollars a unit per 1,000 gallons as opposed to $6 which is an increase of 33%.

And I'll leave that. And I'd like to think that we would approve this and get on with it but I certainly hope to see a motion coming from the Secretariat in the very short future so that we can send our Mayor on negotiation trip with our friends at other levels.

Mr. Speaker: Question on clause 1.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

By-laws, Councillor Clement.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Clement: Yeah, we've got some of those don't we? Sorry.

I'll move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 208/2005.

Mr. Speaker: And No. 209/20005.

Councillor Clement: Pardon me?

Mr. Speaker: And No. 209/2005.

Councillor Clement: Oh, I'm sorry there is one below it as well, I'm sorry. Nos. 208/2005 and 209/2005.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 208/2005, 209/2005.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-laws No. 208/2005 and 209/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 208/2005 and 209/2005.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 208/2005 and 209/2005 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions? None.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy moves adjournment.

Roll Call.

ROLL CALL

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

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 4:33 P.M.