COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday January 25, 2006

The Council met at 9:37 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Magnifico.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I would like to introduce our two pages who are going to be with us this morning: Elaine Manipol, who attends Kildonan East Collegiate and who resides in Transcona ward and Tayva Pannell of West Kildonan Collegiate who lives in old Kildonan ward. Welcome.

Welcome of guests and announcements, I think I will announce something that happened over the Christmas holidays and I'm sure that all members of Council will join me in congratulating our colleague Councillor Wyatt on his nuptials that took place during the holidays. Congratulations Councillor. Our sympathies to Mrs. Wyatt but I'm sure that she will learn to get along. No other announcements?

MINUTES

Councillor Benham moves the Minutes of the meeting held on December 14, 2005 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: We have one delegation appearing before Council this morning, Mr. Tom Simms, with respect, in support of clause 3 of the EPC report of January 18th. Is Mr. Simms here? Councillors.

Mr. Tom Simms: Thank you. Yes, I wanted to appear today to speak in support of the motion coming out of EPC to look at extending the Winnipeg Housing and Homeless Initiative till March of 2008. I'm going to just briefly go over this because looking around and Councillors seats already; a couple of twists in there just to add in for the sake of doing something different.

I wanted to just briefly talk about the social context importance of this extension, this recommendation to extend. A bit of the economic context and how it impacts the community is the third thing I would like to briefly talk about today.

I called this presentation; we're all in this together, because I think this is something about our whole City. It isn't just sort of the inner city and the suburbs, it's as we as a City working together on this issue. I like that theme of "we". I know the United Way uses that theme quite a bit and this is about "we".

And one of the, I think huge challenges in our City that not many people are talking about, but I think we need to talk about, is this whole issue of high school graduation rates. And the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy in 2004 did this really important study that looked at how many kids are graduated from grade 12 in our community and that we see overall in the City in high socioeconomic neighbourhoods about 81% of the kids are graduating; in low socioeconomic neighbourhoods, 37% of students graduating. When we drill that down in the downtown area, 27% of the students are graduating from high school and in the North End, one out of five young people are graduating from high school.

We know this has tremendous impact, not only now but for future generations as we grapple with building a healthy City and a healthy community. And housing has a role to play in this. There is a whole bunch of people, we need to play a role in this, but housing has an important role in trying to affect this issue.

One of the major challenges in inner city schools is the issue of student migrancy Kids moving from school to school to school for a number of reasons but one of them is because of inadequate housing. Dufferin School where I work you have kids that are in grade 2 or 3 that have been in five schools and it's really hard to get a good education when you start out that way. Last year we had a little girl in grade 6 that had been in 13 schools. We know what the life trajectory is going to be when you're facing that kind of disruption.

So we think that housing has a really important role to help as one of those factors in stabilizing neighbourhoods. So it isn't just about bricks and mortar it's about families and future potential of our young people as well.

The administration's report I thought was a very impressive report and I just wanted to highlight, to me, one of the most significant pieces in this report, was that for every $1 that the City of Winnipeg is contributing to the Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative, $10.20 were leveraged from other public, private sources. And I think as we talked about earlier, at EPC this probably is one of the best leveraging investments that the City makes, getting a buck, for every buck getting 10 bucks in return.

We also see an important impact of the investment in neighbourhood renewal. Back in 1990, and this is coming from the Real Estate Board numbers, average value of sale prices. In 1990 in the North End, the core of the North End the average value of a house was $42,000 dollars. We saw during the 1990s that housing prices in the inner city just plummeted and it created a lot of different pressures.

One, we saw a huge arson crisis develop out of it. We kind of bottomed out in 1999 on that. And that's when the Winnipeg Housing and Homeless Initiative kicked in and as I said previously, obviously there is market forces at play but I think there is also an important role for public and third sector investments that came into play that we see now. The average sale price of a house from 2000, has gone from $21,600 up to $42,000. And I think that's in part of this partnership that has been worked on over the past five years.

I wanted to talk about specifically, how this plays out at the local neighbourhood level and in the Centennial neighbourhood where we're working. When we were looking at the boarded-up houses in the neighbourhood in 2004 we saw there were 19 boarded-up houses in the neighbourhood. Only 3 were on the City of Winnipeg's official housing registry. And this is really important because people have to take out permits in order to board-up a house and it's a way that the City is able to monitor these boarded-up houses and put, have some leverage on the landlords to, and homeowners to try to get these places fixed up as soon as possible. And so there is a real gap there that we see in 2004.

After working with the local housing committee, the residents housing committee in the neighbourhood, unfortunately there were 27 boarded-up houses the next year, but you can see that that partnership had 23 houses now on the housing registry that we can now do some work on, in terms of enforcing the boarded-up and vacant housing By-law, and we see that as an important step. So it's something that the City staff couldn't have done on their own. That partnership with the community and the City working together is an example of some of the things that people can do on this to support Council policies.

The other piece I wanted to talk about is just some of the challenges in the inner city around infill housing programs. We were able to build modest 1,000 square foot homes for $120,000 dollars on infill lots in inner city neighbourhoods. A lot of the lots are transferred to nonprofit groups for a dollar with these partnerships with the City. Market value of these houses is about $50,000 dollars, and the tax credit initiatives that look at providing a 50% rebate on property tax payments over a five year period would yield approximately $5,000 dollars worth of credit.

I think these strategies are really important strategies for a wide range of neighbourhoods but you can see a $5,000 incentive on $120,000 investment isn't in and of itself going to encourage inner city infill housing. So that's where that partnership of everyone working together, the three levels of government working together, to bridge those market rent gaps, are important. And I really support EPC's recommendation in acknowledging that and the importance of the three levels of government working together.

The other thing I wanted to talk about is just specifically in the Centennial neighbourhood, how this plays out. This past year we've been able to acquire two boarded-up houses and with the Winnipeg Real Estate Board, renovate them and sell them to local homeowners. One boarded-up house couldn't be fixed up it had to be demolished. A new vacant, on the vacant lot a new house was built in partnership with the North End Housing project. Two new houses were built first time in all of Canada, in about 15 years in the Urban Native Housing program. Kinew Housing is building 10 new rent geared to income family units in the neighbourhood on vacant lots. And there is a total of 79 vacant lots in this neighbourhood.

And I guess I would argue that these lots, because they're 25-30 foot lots, dispersed throughout the neighbourhood are not going to get developed by the private sector. When you look at those numbers in the previous slide, people are not going to invest $120,000 dollars on $50,000 dollar streets. We need those kind of partnerships to make those things happen. So I think these lots, essentially, will remain vacant unless these kind of partnerships are made. And it requires those partnerships of the private sector, the nonprofit sector and the three levels of government to make these things work. So in the past year we've brought 13 new property tax ratepayers on to the stream for the City out of these strategies.

Very quickly I just wanted to sort of give a history of the contributions that the commitments that have been made over the past three years, and would encourage for the next step of a budgetary process, to look at reinstating the, a level of funding that has historically been there at about $1.25 million.

And a last point that I think, with the Canadian Federation of Municipalities and the Big Mayor, the Big City Mayors, this issue of how do we fund housing in the inner city is really important. And that the City is a junior level funder definitely in here. The Federal government has massive surpluses in this CMHC, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, we can see these are coming right from their annual reports historically and what they project, that it would be very important that the community and the municipal levels of government urge the Federal government to invest these surpluses in the inner city rather than just accumulating them and seeing the kind of challenges that are unmet around housing in the inner city. Thanks very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I believe Councillor Smith you had a question. Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Tom, when you talk about boarded houses, how long have you, these houses been boarded in the Centennial neighbourhood? Can you give us some idea about the length of time some of them have been boarded?

Mr. Tom Simms: Well some, you know five years, 10 years, that's why we really appreciate the work that City Council did in bringing in the boarded and vacant housing buildings by-law because it now gives a tool now where permits need to be taken out and people need to pay permits and there is an escalating fee on those permits so that we have seen some landlords really, you know, speed up some of their improvements on opening up the houses because they don't want to pay the fines that are levied so I think that's a very positive thing.

I guess we're very interested in seeing other neighbourhoods be included as designated housing improvement zones, so that we can have some tools to do something about these boarded-up houses. It's one thing to get the registry

more in line and looking at some enforcement issues. What are some of the strategies in terms of how we acquire and fix up some of these boarded-up houses? We've done three. We would like to do more. We think with additional designations of neighbourhoods, like Centennial neighbourhood has housing improvement zones, those kind of activities could take place.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes thank you very much for the presentation Mr. Simms and thank you the other day also for presenting at the Housing Steering Committee and with the detailed report that you did or with the organization has done for plans for renewing Centennial.

How important is it with regards to the housing improvement zones we have now in the City and the success that they've had, the work, how is it, how important is it to ensure the success of Centennial to be designated a housing improvement zone? What difference does that make?

Mr. Tom Simms: Well there is a whole sort of range of potential resources that Centennial neighbourhood isn't able to access right now because it's not a housing improvement zone. So that was one of the key objectives of the resident association, to work with the City and we've been working closely with our local Councillor Mike Pagtakhan, to, for the past couple of years to work towards being designated a housing improvement zone so that some further work around housing improvement could be done in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes and this is more of a thank you and the Committee is going to take a tour of the Centennial neighbourhood and I invite any other Councillor who wishes to attend as well. So thank you for the presentation.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks very much Mr. Simms. Thank you Mr. Simms. Thank you.

Okay we move to the report of Executive Policy Committee of January 11th, Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 11, 2006

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent agenda items 1 to 7.

Mr. Speaker: I believe clause 5 was to be referred back. It needs to be looked at again.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz moves clause 5 be referred back to Executive Policy Committee for further consideration.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

The balance of the report has been moved.

All in favour? Opposed? That's carried.

The report of January 18th, Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 18, 2006

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent agenda items 1 to 18.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Gerbasi: 3 and 4 please.

Mr. Speaker: 3 and 4. Anything else?

Councillor Benham: And 8 Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Number 8; 3, 4, and 8.

All right with the exceptions of clauses 3, 4 and 8, Mayor Katz moves the balance of the EPC report of January 18th be adopted.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clause 3.

**Item No. 3 - Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative - Midterm Evaluation of Operations
File EX**

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker the clause is very obvious. What I would rather do is I'll defer to Councillor Gerbasi and see if we can address whatever issues or concerns that she may have Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi on clause 3.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm actually making some positive comments that I would like to put on the record, and I think this, when we have a Consent agenda we often whip things through very quickly and the public, there is nothing on the public record about important decisions that we make, so I did want to make a couple of brief comments.

First of all, I would like to thank and applaud the administration's analysis and the diligence that led to the excellent evaluation in this report. It clearly shows, shows objectively that these programs in the inner city have worked. The administration indicates that the programs are performing well and that there is strong support from the community. This is based on an independent consultant study.

The report goes on to say that these housing programs have enhanced neighbourhood stability, increased property assessments, provided affordable accommodation and generally improved the overall health of Winnipeg. I'm not sure what more evidence could be needed to justify these programs.

And in addition to the information in this report, members of Council will recall the outpouring of positive stories and information that was brought to this table during the last year's budget discussions. Communities are utilizing these programs. The people using these programs came here to tell you and all of us how beneficial these programs have been to the fragile recoveries that are occurring in our most vulnerable neighbourhoods. As a result, Council continued, decided to continue to fund the programs in 2005. We all understand that the health of the City as a whole depends on the recovery of the inner core. All Winnipeggers benefit from Council taking these positive steps to address these issues.

Council has also come to understand that these programs are not charity and they are not handouts. These programs are investments in our neighbourhoods, in our people and in our City, and the pay back is enormous. For every dollar spent as was mentioned earlier, the leverage is at least $10 in private and other dollars. But not only that, our property assessments are rising significantly in areas where they were collapsing. And even more, this fragile revitalization is giving hope to people and resulting in more and more spin-off investment as people choose to stay in their neighbourhood and fix up their homes.

I think it's important to note that there is a reason why these programs are as successful as they are. They didn't develop in a vacuum. These programs were established on a sound policy basis. These programs are grounded in the development of neighbourhood plans and grassroots participation. These programs were designed based on what is really happening in communities and what is really needed to make housing projects happen.

At the time that these policies and programs were developed I remind you that no levels of government were at the housing table. The City under former Mayor Glen Murray took the lead and put the first $3 million dollars and set out the policy framework. That brought the other levels of government on board and now over $50 million has been allocated to housing programs in Winnipeg's inner city. This is a huge success story and all members of Council should be very, very proud.

Finally, I understand that a press release from last week indicates that EPC intends

to put a million dollars in the Capital Budget for 2006, for the Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative. Not only are people in neighbourhoods such as West Broadway and Spence neighbourhood appreciative of this but residents throughout the City recognize the value of a healthy core to our City and see that this is good for all of the City of Winnipeg.

So I would like to thank the Mayor and I would like to thank EPC and I really look forward to continuing to work together to continue to make change in our inner city and move our City in a healthy and safer direction. So thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith on the clause.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. You know I think EPC has done a wonderful thing. You know basically, you know we've had in the past rumblings from some Councillors that this was not a civic responsibility, that this was an area for the Province and the Feds. I think with this evaluation, this report, it clearly establishes that we, we benefit, and thus it's worthwhile for us to invest.

So you know, I think it's a right direction and I think for years to come, we should be in the housing area. And so, let's get the job done.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Thomas on the clause.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you I also wanted to thank Executive Policy Committee and Council for continuing with this initiative. I served as the chair for some time and was also on the Committee for a longer time and there was a time when every second week, I was going to an initiative that was put forward by the community in Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative. I saw the impact in the William Whyte neighbourhood, the Broadway Spence neighbourhood, and various inner city areas, and it was exciting to see the changes that have occurred.

And before I got on City Council, I actually, when I worked for the Federal government, part of my area that I was assigned to, was the William Whyte area and to go back to that area, which was very much at risk, and to see, although it's still an at-risk area and certainly needs a lot of assistance to see the impact that, that volunteer-driven community initiatives has been able to achieve with just 10% of the dollars coming from us, the Federal government is there, the Provincial government is there, and the community is there.

And the excitement that you see by people who aren't directly affected by it, who now feel their sense of ownership in their community, has been acknowledged, and they respond by doing all sorts of things to their own homes and feeling now they can wear their pride and the community on their sleeve and suddenly new sodding is taking place, new windows. And people are staying because they know their community is being supported by us.

So I would like to thank all involved for coming up with this initiative. While I'm no longer on the Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiatives and have moved on to other things, I still on occasion, do go back when the Committee meets to get an update because it's so exciting and I would encourage all of you to drop in and listen to the reports from the community on the many things that have been done. And thank you so much for continuing this initiative.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker. I also want to rise in support of the clause that is before us. Also, with the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee, the administration.

The history of homeless people goes back many years. I remember a number of years back and I don't want to go back into this 30 years ago, whatever. But at that time we had a lot of the homes were occupied by people that lived in those

homes, older people. When they passed on, the children did not want to move in to that home so that home was put up for sale at a cheap rate, price, and the landlords were purchasing these houses at a massive rate and putting in people that have no place to live or people who were coming in off the reserves and whatever the case was for people to provide a shelter for them.

They were neglected to a point that the landlords were not doing anything with those properties because we didn't have strict by-laws in place and I as one in 1977 I made some comments about the landlords of the City of Winnipeg. I classed them as slum landlords, I used that word at the radio show one time and I was sued; defamation of character. In 1977, I went through some hard times because I had to borrow money to pay off my cause; either I apologize publicly or else I was going to be taken to court.

And I wish the thing would only come back now because I was still new in politics and I got scared because I, from the beginning I had the support of the Province and the Attorney General at that time was Howard Pawley had said, "Harry, do what you're doing because we've had problems with some of these landlords and we have to get to them." And when I was threatened with the court case all of a sudden they backed off and I was left all alone. So I had to do what I had to do. I made a public apology and I till today and I still do not have my release papers saying that they were satisfied.

But the one question Mr. Speaker, that had to be addressed and no concern was really raised by politicians of all three levels because the neighbourhood that was digested where some of these houses were boarded-up, began to be boarded-up, fires were caused in some house. It was a ghetto that was created for the unwelcome undesirables who were frequenting the area dealing with prostitution, drugs, and etcetera.

So when groups, agencies had come on side and they wanted to do something for the neighbourhood, okay funding has been provided. But one thing that I've been raising in the past and I'm still raising, that we seem to be forgetting about the seniors who are living in some of those communities, and I have, I'm representing the William Whyte area now. Some areas in there that people have been living not even in their own homes. Their living all by themselves; they get the Wheels on Meals to be delivered to them but they are not being asked to say look, we will provide a shelter for you. Your later years.

I have right now a building on Main Street that is designated to be used, for a renovation to take place and to house something like 24 suites. No parking provided in the area, right on Main Street. And what is happening now, the Winnipeg Homeless and Housing Initiative is involved with this and I've asked them, this program that you have here you're supposed to have the community's involvement, community input. There wasn't any and I'm trying to get this underway because some of the people who were born here and are living here, never owned a house in their life, are not being included, Mr. Speaker.

And this program is selected people especially some of the government agencies that we have in place, drive this forward and say look this is what we have to do. This is what is needed. The particular building that I'm talking about on Main Street was designated to be a home for refugees and immigrants. Twenty-four suites, no suite designated for a caretaker, in-house caretaker to be established. There was no business plan to say who is going to monitor people that are just moving in, into the City of Winnipeg whether refugees or immigrants, nothing. And I've said we have to take into consideration people that are moving in that are new to the City of Winnipeg, you should have someone that has been in the area for many years, to have a senior or someone in there that does not have a home, to take them to live in that same premises that can tutor them.

We've had cases now Mr. Speaker where people were not, the society and the atmosphere changes for them drastically

when they're coming in from a third world country and they think that they're still there and there is no guidance for them and what happened just in the West End area a few weeks ago where a person was killed by one individual person that people, and the police had to come there and they shot the other person that killed the first person.

So this has to be addressed Mr. Speaker and I hope that the Mayor and EPC will take into consideration when they talk about community involvement, you must have the community involved like we do with zoning. The sign goes out. People can come in from the area and get involved. I haven't seen in the report here which I intend to work together with some of the government agencies, is to see that we should have the seniors association involved here also. People that were born here. Some of the people that don't, like I said before, do not have, have never had a home in their life of their own to call it's our home.

And a target is selecting people and I feel it's wrong to select just only specific people because in other words you're creating more or less like a segregation, a segregation is what some agencies wanted to have specifically, only one group of people and not the others to be involved. And you cannot have that go on because if you have a community, a community is people that are living in and who work together.

And the problem we've had Mr. Speaker also, the new by-law that we passed in place is allowing boarded-up buildings to get their permits. In my area I've got one solid block that just about every second house that is boarded-up and will be boarded-up for about four or five years, that is not solving the problem. People who are living in that area are caught in that web that have their own property, right in the middle of these boarded-up houses are saying look when is this house going to be renovated because I want to renovate mine. If I can't I will not spend my money if nothing happens here.

So the action that has to take place, we've allowed them year by year to get the permits to say that I can keep my building boarded-up but some of them, there was no need for it to be boarded-up because it all depends who are the owners. We have absentee landlords who are living outside of the country or living outside of the Province and they have agencies that work and they come and make the application to get the permit and that house or that building remains to be closed and stays closed. They, our people have to chase after them to keep cutting the grass they have to go there because if somebody comes along and opens up there, breaks through the back, kids get in there, they have to notify them and it's a matter of enforcement and also monitoring what has been boarded-up.

So all this Mr. Speaker has to be taken into account that Council, the Manitoba Legislative Assembly members and also members of Parliament, should be fitted into this picture and go and see really what, go to the neighbourhood and see what is it that you want? Basically when you're spending tax dollars everybody is supposed to be involved and ask the neighbourhood in the community what is it you would like?

I'm now looking at the boarded-up houses that the City owns to try to see if we could get an interested person that would come and buy this property and do the renovation with the condition they would have to do the renovation, give them that house at a rate. Mr. Speaker, at the rate, like we're giving some government agencies and some community groups were giving them the property for $1 dollar. And to rejuvenate the community, this way we have immediately a tax base that is formed that will get our taxes.

I remember in 1974, I moved a motion that tax break on all home renovations and it's in place now but it took so many years to get that implemented because we had a condition that was imposed that was not that attractive. We've opened it now to a point that people are taking this. People had to fear I renovate my home and I'm going to be taxed. At that time I had said a five year tax freeze and that's exactly what has happened Mr. Speaker.

So I will be supporting this but these are some of the concerns that I raise because these concerns Mr. Speaker, are coming to me by constituents that phone me and they ask me, I've never owned a house in my life, I'm an older person and I would like to be able to say that I am living in a subsidized house that is helped by the taxpayers but they still live in some of these ghetto houses that they will most likely never get out.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt please.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think I'd also like to rise and thank EPC for bringing this forward today and for supporting the extension of the program until the expiry of the MOU.

And I think it's fair to say Mr. Speaker that there has often been a debate, sometimes either on Council or among, in the Council corridors that housing is not a primary municipal issue. That housing is not something that municipalities or the principle issues that a municipality should be worried about. That things like policing, fire, road repairs, these are the principle municipal issues.

I think it's fair to say Mr. Speaker that it is a principle and primary municipal issue at least when it comes to, when it comes to subdivisions that we're constantly approving quite often in the suburbs. We are in the housing business whether we like it or not and we are approving constantly new subdivisions going in. The market justifies this of course because raw land is far more attractive to develop on than inner city empty lots, quite often owned by us.

But nevertheless we are in the housing business and the question is how do we find a way Mr. Speaker to develop housing in the City which is equitable and ensures that everybody has an opportunity to have home ownership if they wish it and that to ensure that the quality of housing is there.

And that's the greatest challenge we have in the City of Winnipeg. Other municipalities not only have the issue of quality of housing but also housing affordability. Affordability is an issue in our City but it's not as much an issue as it is in cities like Toronto and Vancouver.

Quality of housing is crucial. I guess one of the stories that we heard many delegations at the Winnipeg Housing Steering Committee recently, when they've met, the first time in awhile, and one of the delegations spoke about exactly what it meant to have quality housing, and how that directly impacts people's lives and the example of the story given was actually of young people.

And young people who often, quite often now have to move from school to school to school to school and why are they moving from school to school to school to school Mr. Speaker because they cannot get access, their families cannot get access to quality housing and they are always having to move and find somewhere else to live which means that they always have to transfer their schools. And that disrupts the young person's education and indeed it disrupts the future of that individual's life. And I think that has a direct impact on our City.

So there is a direct link Mr. Speaker on how quality housing makes a difference in the lives and the wellbeing of our City. Let us not fool ourselves Mr. Speaker that we could go back, easily, slide back easily to 1999 when we had arsons raging across the City. And I'd like to commend, actually also the last Mayor, who had the fortitude to bring this program forward, along with a Council of that time, in '99, and 2000 and also the Provincial governments and Federal governments.

I think we have to say that this has been a success and it's clear that it has been a success Mr. Speaker. And I think we have to not only say it's been a success but now we must look at ways not only to go to 2008 but to go beyond 2008 to ensure that we are doing our part to ensure that there is quality housing for all the citizens of the City.

Let us remember that we as the City of Winnipeg Mr. Speaker are now one of the largest property owners in the inner city,

lot after lot after lot. And wouldn't it be nice to have on those lots homes where the very people that Councillor Lazarenko was talking about, who have never been able to have an affordable house to live in or to be able to put a down payment for a mortgage, or be able to live in a house they could call themselves, wouldn't it be nice if these people could have in their own homes in their own neighbourhoods and strengthening those very neighbourhoods that quite often we find we could easily walk away from.

This is a positive program Mr. Speaker. It's not an issue of right or left. It's an issue of doing what's right for the City and we should work together as a Council to keep on this and not let this matter drop whether it be up to 2008 or beyond 2008. Thank you Mr. Speaker

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker I will be really brief. I just wanted to say that there is a huge challenge ahead of us and if you look on *Plan Winnipeg* Policy Plate D you'll see the major rehabilitation areas of the City of Winnipeg. You see that there is, there is areas in Councillor Gerbasi's ward, Councillor Smith's ward, my ward, your ward, Councillor Wyatt's ward. We have a huge challenge ahead of us and not enough funds to do it. But I want to say I would acknowledge and thank the Mayor and members of Executive Policy Committee for making a planned decision.

Mr. Speaker for the last couple of years, the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee have actually planned and made a conscious decision of putting funds into the Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative. That's the very first time in the history of this program that this Mayor and Council have actually done that. I think that's a positive signal and definitely good work and I think there is some definitely good work to come.

But for some time Mr. Speaker before I was elected, I always wondered and I said you know there is five housing improvement zones right now that the City of Winnipeg is involved in. But yet there is 12 or 14 neighbourhoods within the City that are classified as major rehabilitation areas that actually need political intervention to make those neighbourhoods turn around. And I've actually wondered how does the City of Winnipeg do that with the limited resources that it has? But I think we're taking the right first step Mr. Speaker by actually making a planned decision to put money in there.

What we've got to do, we've also have to look and find creative ways till we've hit the wall financially Mr. Speaker. We've hit the wall a couple of years ago, I think. And all I can say is is that we have to look and be creative and find ways where we can actually bring more housing improvement zones and help them.

Areas like West Broadway Mr. Speaker, I'll just talk just generally speaking about that, that's an area that I think that we want to work towards, where there is homes that are now selling for market value. New homes are being built in that area. We have the Winnipeg Housing Rehabilitation Corporation which has a great board of directors and composed of Councillors from this chamber and they're doing fantastic work, Mr. Speaker, that turn neighbourhoods like West Broadway and Spence and William Whyte around.

So that's the type of area that we have to aspire to and bring, the challenge is to bring in more neighbourhoods Mr. Speaker, that are identified in Policy Plate D of *Plan Winnipeg* that need political intervention, to this table's housing improvement zone.

But I wanted to thank the Mayor and Executive Policy and all of the Councillors that have spoken before me to give support to this particular issue and say thank you very much for acknowledging that. I think we are on the right track and we definitely have more work to do. And I'm very happy to support the extension of the Winnipeg Housing Homelessness Initiative to March 31st of 2008. Thanks Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz do you wish to close debate on the clause?

Mayor Katz: Very briefly Mr. Speaker. First of all I want to thank all members of Council for sharing your thoughts. I appreciate that. I also very much want to thank David Stansen and the department Mr. Speaker, for the very thorough and precise review they did, which made it obvious to everybody what a valuable initiative this is. And as well as I would like to thank Executive Policy Committee for having the vision and making the tough decisions to basically for the very first time, put money in the Budget to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker I go to bed at night sometimes wondering how in a country such as Canada, with all the wealth and all the resources we have, that there are people who do not have a roof over their head, and people who go to bed hungry. And I believe every level of government has to do what they can to basically eradicate this dilemma, as well as citizens, as well as corporations. And hopefully within my lifetime we will be successful.

But I do believe we're making a very good first step and I certainly hope that all of Council will support this and it certainly sounds like they will. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Question on clause 3.

All in favour? Opposed? That's carried.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Magnifico,
Seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,

WHEREAS the Manitoba Special Olympics, Inc. has submitted an application for exemption under the Entertainment Funding By-law No. 7710/2000 for its 2006 Winnipeg Wine Festival and ancillary events;

AND WHEREAS the Manitoba Special Olympics, Inc. is currently listed in Schedule "A" of the By-law for all events and performances directly held by the Manitoba Special Olympics, Inc.

AND WHEREAS all events of the 2006 Winnipeg Wine Festival do not meet the criteria set forth in Schedule "B" of The Entertainment Funding By-law No. 7710/2000 to qualify for an exemption under the By-law;

AND WHEREAS section 5 of Schedule "B" of the By-law provides that Council may list an amusement in Schedule "A" notwithstanding that an amusement, or place of amusement, that is not within the scope of sections 2, 3, or 4 of Schedule "B" where Council is satisfied:

(a) such a listing is in keeping with the Listing Principles set out in Schedule "B";

(b) the organization demonstrates that compliance with a term, or terms, of the By-law causes unreasonable hardship; and

(c) where possible, alternative arrangements proposed by the organization present a reasonable alternative in the circumstances of the particular organization;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, pursuant to section 5 of Schedule "B" of the Entertainment Funding By-law No. 7710/2000, the following exhibits and events of the Manitoba Special Olympics, Inc's 2006 Winnipeg Wine Festival be listed as an amusement in Schedule "A" of the By-law:

i. April 30, 2006 - Wine on Wellington at a private residence

ii. May 1, 2006 – "Grapes Anatomy" at the Celebrations Dinner Theatre

iii. May 2, 2006 – VQA Canada Tasting at Earls Polo Park

iv. May 2, 2006 – Fetzer Vineyards "Great Beginnings Appetizer Challenge" at the Delta Winnipeg

v. May 3, 2006 – VQA Canada Wine Dinner at the Liberty Grill

vi. May 3, 2006 – Hola Chile

vii. May 3, 2006 – Wines of Spain "Celebrity Grape Stomp" at the Delta Winnipeg

viii. May 4, 2006 – Down Under with Distinctive Reds at the Fairmont Winnipeg

ix. May 4, 2006 – Gala Dinner at the Winnipeg Convention Centre

x. May 5 and 6, 2006 – Public Tastings at the Winnipeg Convention Centre

xi. May 6, 2006 – Aussie Barbie at the Winnipeg Art Gallery

xii. May 6, 2006 – Trade Tasting at the Winnipeg Convention Centre.

With the concurrence of the seconder, Councillor O'Shaughnessy, and with the permission of Council, Councillor Magnifico withdrew his motion.

Before I move to the next item I just, a small procedural matter on, there is Motion No. 4 that was distributed earlier, moved by Councillor Magnifico and seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy. The mover Councillor Magnifico has asked to withdraw this motion. Is that agreed? Agreed. Motion No. 4 will be withdrawn.

Clause 4.

Item No. 4 - Federal Gas Tax Revenues - Funding Agreement between the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg
File FR-2

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Once again Mr. Speaker I will defer to Councillor Gerbasi and of course I will try to address the issues once she brings them up. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi on the clause.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Just a little distracting with conversation going on right here. Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wanted to put some comments, we're signing a pretty important deal again today and again I think with the Consent agendas and not big audience here it seems like we're doing nothing but I think we are doing important things here and we should have a discussion here about it on the public record.

It certainly is a happy day to see some new funding come to Winnipeg and I think we're all of course very happy to see the gas tax money finally arriving here in Winnipeg. I would like to acknowledge the people deserving of thanks for this. Of course our current Mayor and Council have advocated for this and certainly deserve acknowledgment for receiving this gas tax deal.

I also, I would also think it's fair and right to acknowledge our former Mayor Glen Murray who championed the concept of a new deal for cities when he was Mayor. He did a lot to bring this issue to the national stage.

And another point I know many of you recall the extensive public consultations in the City of Winnipeg that were held around the new deal, and I think that served to raise awareness in the public about the issues that cities face, particularly the issue of how little of every dollar that citizens pay in taxes actually comes to cities and it helped to increase the awareness of the whole issue and to build support for the City in going after a larger share of the pie. And also the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and as a result of their lobbying and efforts a new deal for cities is now something that's understood pretty well by all political parties.

So I think the world has changed a lot since four or five years ago when we here or many years ago where we've been talking about this, in this chamber for many years so it is nice to see that awareness on a national level and the local level happening.

I would also like to comment but I think we now, now that we have this new money, we have to make the decisions in our upcoming Capital Budget about what choices we're going to make and what we're going to do with this new money.

And my, my recommendation is that we take a balanced approach in our Capital spending plans. And what I mean by this

is that I think we should spend about 20% of the gas tax money on transit and active transportation infrastructure and 80% on maintenance and renewal of existing infrastructure. We all know there is need to improve the condition of our streets and existing neighbourhoods but we can't afford to continue to expand and expand and widen new roads on the far edges of the City. The new developments should pay for themselves. And if new tax revenue from these developments can't pay for themselves, then why are they being built at the expense of older and existing infrastructure?

This deal that we're signing today requires us to spend 10% of the gas tax money on transit, 10%. Well thank God this Council is being forced to invest something in transit or I worry we probably wouldn't even invest that. But what we need is more political will, more leadership, more money is needed to make a significant and meaningful change to our transit system and we have a plan for this. We have a plan the Mayor has approved and Council approved.

We have a moderate reasonable plan called the, that the Rapid Transit Task Force at the cost of $250,000 dollars, came up with and that plan would work if we were to spend 20% of our gas tax money on transit. If we just do the minimum it won't be enough and I'd like to point out that other Canadian cities are making huge investments in their transit system; Vancouver, Ottawa, Edmonton and Toronto are spending 100% of their gas tax money on transit infrastructure. Calgary is spending 50% and Montreal and Quebec, Quebec City, is spending over 25% of this deal in their cities. So for Winnipeg to spend 20% is a reasonable and modest investment that would actually get something significant going.

Ultimately these decisions are up to Council and the Capital Budget. And I put to you that if this Council really supports an investment in a modern transit system they will not only spend more than the minimum 10% that they have to spend they will also spend 20 but they will get going in lobbying the other levels of government to contribute more so that we can make the Rapid Transit Task Force report and stuff happen.

The first step is to put $4 to $5 million dollars per year starting in the 2006 Capital. We know the detail design studies need to be done and they need to be funded and we need to start putting away this money for this. The talks can start right now with other levels of government. We can show them that we care about this issue. If truly we've come to see the importance of this as has been stated. Spending only the minimum and putting no effort into bringing these other partners in immediately, with more new money will only mean one thing, that the Task Force report will sit on the shelf and will have been a waste of $250,000 dollars.

It's also I would like to point out, it's not enough to spend the small amount, fix up a few bus shelters, buy a few buses, maybe put in a diamond lane or two. Cherry picking a few parts of the recommendations without moving on the most effective ones will be sorely inadequate. We need to get going on the parts of this report that have the most impact such as bike paths and busways to the U of M in the south of the City and the eastern part of the City. If we don't do that part of the report which is most significant it will mean the same old transit experience for Winnipeg Transit riders.

So if this Council wants the right to talk the talk on active transportation, on transit and on the environment as we've been hearing all the sincere words on all of these issues, then we better start showing some leadership, some enthusiasm and some action. Words fall flat when all the public sees is a cancelled transit project, a dead wind smart plan, a defunct Environment Committee, not to mention embarrassing comments about global warming not being caused by human beings.

You know, people may start to question this Council's sincerity on environmental issues. A key plank in Mayor Sam Katz's election platform I might add and I take him at his word that he has come to

understand and care about these issues so let's see some action to back it up.

Our citizens want some hope that there will be more of a vision and the kind of City we're going to have brought forward by this Council then simply roads and bridges alone. We need that basic infrastructure but we need more. We need more of a vision. What kind of, what's going to make young people want to live here? The fact that there is a perfect road you can slide a bowling ball down? That's not enough.

If we take this balanced approach that I am suggesting. If we implement the *Rapid Transit Task Force Report*, we will begin to join the ranks of other modern Canadian cities to which we have been slipping and we will not languish back into some bygone era that these other cities have long left behind.

So I'm supporting this agreement today but I wanted to use this opportunity to suggest where we go with this money and what we can do with it. And I urge this Council to be creative in the next Capital Budget to open their minds to not just do the minimum but to give citizens the vision they want to see; the bike paths, the active transportation, the modern environmentally green city that they want to see because I believe that's what our citizens want. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I certainly agree with much of what Councillor Gerbasi has said as well and support her comments. I will make one exception in a moment.

Mr. Speaker of course I will be supporting and voting for this report today and I do welcome the gas tax money for the City of Winnipeg. It is very important that we have it. I represent River Heights-Fort Garry and we have tremendous infrastructure needs in River Heights-Fort Garry. In fact Mr. Speaker, of all the indexes we've seen around here net present value and all the interesting ratios that people do, I think if you were to take assessed property value and thus the taxes that people pay versus their infrastructure needs, they are very great in that ward and we know that the infrastructure needs are great all over but we certainly need some road repairs and some back lane repairs in River Heights-Fort Garry and it is appropriate in my opinion to use a large portion of gas tax money to do that.

So I want it make my position very clear as the representative of River Heights-Fort Garry on both those issues. I want to see roads and back lanes repaired in River Heights-Fort Garry but I also want to see a vision and some investment in the future Mr. Speaker. And in that regard I completely agree with Councillor Gerbasi that we have an excellent *Rapid Transit Task Force Report*. She sat on that Task Force as we know along with Councillor Pagtakhan. It was chaired by Councillor Wyatt and we had some excellent representation from citizens.

It is I think worthwhile to note at this point that this was a bit of a bumpy road to the gas tax revenues. That we did not in fact lead this process in the sense of getting an agreement even though this City was in the forefront of looking for Federal gas tax revenues and Provincial gas tax revenues. That in fact this was one of the last major cities and certainly the last major city in western Canada Mr. Speaker and I believe one of the last major cities across Canada to sign this agreement.

Why is it Mr. Speaker? Well we know very publicly there was a feud with the Association of Manitoba Municipalities and the feud was about how much money Winnipeg would get, whether some money would go to public transit or not and so on. So it was a bit of a bumpy road getting here but there is no question that this Council, this and certainly this Mayor and definitely the former Mayor as has been mentioned, supported the notion of gas tax revenues coming to the City to be used for our transportation infrastructure needs. And those needs in my opinion should be a balance between public transit and private transportation which is what our roads and bridges represent when we think about them just

for cars. That's private transportation and maybe we should start using that term and start thinking of it that way.

One of the things that got lost along the way and I really regret as a Councillor and as a citizen that it did and I'm not sort of blaming anybody because I was on Mayor Murray's staff at the time and it kind of disappeared from everybody's point of view, is once we got the promise, okay, you'll get some money, you'll get some Provincial gas tax money, maybe they're going to be moving shells around and I know Councillor Clement feels strongly about that, you will get some Federal gas tax money if we can negotiate a deal. We kind of gave up collectively, on the central idea of the new deal which was not to increase our opportunistic begging as J. Jacobs calls it and as former Mayor Murray used to refer to it. Opportunistic begging which is all this is. It was about finding new sources of revenue. New sources of revenue that would be controlled by the City and that we as City Councillors would set a rate and we would rise or fall on the, on our ability to manage our finances, given the ability to access some new revenues, some new revenue streams.

Once we were bought off with a little gas tax money there is no guarantee that that gas tax money will continue into the future. We certainly don't have the power as City Councillors to set the rate. Once we got a little bit of cash in our hands we said thanks very much and we're running. We don't want to sit down and do the really heavy lifting that involves shifting some taxation points into City Council's ability to stand and fall and to set the rate. The Provincial government sets an income tax rate that's a percentage of the Federal rate. The Federal government collects it. The Province gets the money. Not complicated.

What if we were to have a small percentage of income tax? I know that we get, again we get some Provincial income tax given to us and if we're polite we might get as much as we did the previous year. Well what if we set a rate on income tax? What if we set a rate on sales tax? Mr. Speaker we have a newly elected Federal government that has announced it's going to vacate two percentage points of the Federal Goods and Services Tax; one immediately and one over the next five years. Could that be an opportunity for a City sales tax? Could we in fact institute a 1% or 1.5% City sales tax and take political responsibility for it? Go to the voters and say yes we're responsible for that extra percentage on your Goods and Services Tax and here is where it's going and show in a transparent way how Winnipeggers could pay for these infrastructure needs.

That's a challenge Mr. Speaker and I lay that challenge out to the Mayor as the chair of EPC. I lay it out to the other EPC members and I lay it out to all of us as individual Councillors. Maybe we should be thinking more about the long term. Maybe we should be doing something other than just taking the cash, thanking everybody politely, and then exiting the stage. Maybe we should be taking responsibility for raising our own funds.

So that's the main point I wanted to make Mr. Speaker. I would just again totally agree with Councillor Gerbasi's notion that this money should be, that a good portion, at least 20%, should go to investment in public transit. We have the blueprint to do that. As I said before on Council floor, the real measure will be whether or not this Council sets aside $5.5 million dollars; whether the Budget that is proposed by the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee includes the $5.5 million dollars we need to start setting aside now in order to start building bus rapid transit. That of course would decrease road congestion. It would decrease wear and tear on the roads and it would in fact have some very positive effects.

And finally Mr. Speaker the only point on which I'm concerned is that Councillor Gerbasi said that this money will in fact be dedicated to public transit starting in this budget year and I hope that that is true, Mr. Speaker but I see that at the end of this report it says simply that it will be part of the budget process and my concern is that none of it will flow through to public transit. Not the 10% that should

be guaranteed which in the first two years is represented by a $1.4 million dollar payment from the Province of Manitoba, that was the price the Provincial government paid to bring peace to the dispute between the City of Winnipeg and the AMM, and Mr. Speaker, I certainly expect to see all of that money in the Capital Budget for public transit and I would say at least twice as much. I would support Councillor Gerbasi's suggestion that it should be at least a 20/80 split, at least 20% in favour of public transit.

So Mr. Speaker I will be supporting this but I urge all Councillors to think in the future about new sources of revenue and about investment in bus rapid transit for the future. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all this was a significant process. I'd like to start by thanking the Federal government for finally acknowledging that there is an issue with infrastructure in the municipalities in Canada and they've taken the initial step to provide some money. Notwithstanding it's not as much as we'd maybe like to get, it certainly probably not exactly where we'd like to see it coming from because it doesn't provide any growth specifically, but it's certainly well intentioned and timely.

I'd like to speak a little bit about the process though seeing as it was just raised because while I'm aware that for several years that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities brought this issue to the forefront, nothing ever happened with it. It just sat there and the process just spun its wheels. This thing got into high gear two or three years ago when the Big City Mayors and I think there is about 22 of them, pursued this with the Prime Minister and his close associates. It wasn't FCM that made this deal happen, it was the Big City Mayors. It wasn't the Manitoba Association of Municipalities that made this happen it was the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg that made this happen frankly, and that's the part that I got a little frustrated with in terms of the ultimate process and some of the discussion that took place.

This money; when we went out, and I was at five of the seven meetings where we were out hammering away at new deal, and I can tell you that two threads were very common. When people found out that we only got 7 cents on the dollar they were flabbergasted by that and of every tax dollar that they spent. That was the first thing. But they made it very clear and it's interesting hearing some of the previous comments because they made it really, really clear. They don't want new taxes. They want this infrastructure funded from the existing money that they're already paying and that's where it should come from. And the other two levels of government have got the money and they don't need to raise taxes in any way shape or form to provide this money to the municipalities and the municipalities don't have to raise more in that regard either. It should already be coming.

That's actually the unfortunate part of this process and I'd like to congratulate Mayor Katz frankly for standing up for Winnipeg and making sure that this money was being spent on roads and bridges instead of the nonsensical theatrics that came out of the Federal government frankly, in terms of how the money was supposed to be managed. And notwithstanding that, the amount of time we are having to put our administration through, to filter the money through to the place where we want to spend it which is roads and bridges. Which is what we fought for Mr. Speaker. Which is what everybody spoke about at those new deal meetings. It was all about roads. It was all about bridges and that's what was being discussed with the citizens of this City and that's what they were supporting.

And I congratulate once again Mayor Katz for making sure that the money that we got had the ability to flow where it's needed and that's to roads and bridges. And all you got to do is do a little polling in this town and you'll find out that the highest priority that citizens have besides crime, is roads and bridges, Mr. Speaker.

Brings me to the people who aren't at the table frankly, and I'm a little bit frustrated by it and that's the Provincial government. They could have participated in this. They did in a very general way. They gave direction. They were the ones that said to the former Mayor, go out and talk to the public. So that's what happened. Then we were told well we can't deal with a new deal because we've got to get a health deal. And then we were told we've got to get the floodway going. And it's gone on and on and on and every time that those things get put to bed this still doesn't come on the table Mr. Speaker.

And then interestingly they pulled something that we weren't supposed to figure out last year. They created the Manitoba Fund. Well what a whiz bang deal that was. They went out to the public and said we're going to take gas tax money and create the Manitoba Fund and we're going to make sure that every cent that comes from that Manitoba Fund gets spent on roads and bridges. Well wasn't that interesting?

So they've got the public thinking that they've actually bought into this whole process and that these meetings were somewhat meaningful. When in fact what all they've done is they've taken and they've provided money from that Manitoba Fund and then taken money away on the other side so that it was a wash Mr. Speaker. They haven't given us 5 cents towards what we were fighting for in new money, not 5 cents.

And while we're at this, they've not only not given us any money towards this process whatsoever, they've turned around and dumped a $911 million dollar sewage treatment issue on us without, well pardon me they wrote one cheque for $25 million, even though the report that came from the Clean Environment Commission which they commissioned, which and where they control the appointments and the Commission suggested that they should pay for a third of it. We so far have got $25 million out of $303 million dollars, Mr. Speaker.

So, while I'm thrilled personally that this money is available and that we're going to be able to spend it on roads and bridges and spend it as wisely as we possibly can Mr. Speaker, it's really unfortunate that the other level of government isn't here at the table so that we could do much more and a lot quicker to solve some of these problems. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I'm here to support the clause and people were talking about history and I don't often personally brag but I'm going to take a moment to do so.

If you recall where this idea first came from, it was actually former Mayor Bill Norrie who brought it up. And it was in the January meeting, State of the City Address that was given to the Chamber of Commerce back in 1990, he brought it forward. The Chamber of Commerce didn't really know what to do with it. They didn't pooh pooh it, they didn't agree with it they just sort of went "oh".

I was listening to that. I got excited. I did some research on what Bill Norrie was saying at that time was that we needed 2 cents. So I did the research on it and I brought it to Bill at a Council meeting and said if you move this, I'll second it. This is the research on it and he said no Lil you did the research on it, you be the mover, I'll be the seconder.

So it passed Council unanimously and then I was charged with bringing that to at that time it was the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities. I went there to bring it forward and then one of the Councillors who had actually voted for it came and spoke against it. Said it was a close vote and just barely passed Council and we really didn't need to do it. So I spent a lot of time trying to convince the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities that we really were together on this and had to bring forward the motion; that we actually did show that it was unanimous and they still weren't sure because this Councillor came to speak against it.

But in the end we got Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities on

side. And it was from there that it went to Federation of Canadian Municipalities. And it was from there that they started to work on it and they worked on it for many years. Not working on it and not have people listening to you are two different things. So I just wanted to say to the previous speaker that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, and Jae was on there for a time and was involved in the lobbying efforts for many years to get, to get the Federal government to listen.

And then finally, finally we had at an FCM meeting, the Finance Minister at that time announced he was actually going to go for it. He was going to go with what FCM said. And the next day he lost his portfolio and so and then we were off again, struggling from the beginning. But then he became the Prime Minister and we pushed him and him along with the Big City Mayors who had come on side and a whole bunch of people who started on side, we actually got it to come forward. And it was, and they decided what we had been asking for 2 cents. They decided to go at the Federal government from 2 cents to 5 cents but they were going to give it to us in pennies, but...

And then we started to look at a plan that came from here. That came from this Council, that was started here, that was actually started by Mayor Norrie that came here. Started to see our plan, not be at all what we had asked for. So I'm glad that it's here. I look forward to spending the money. Yes, I agree with Councillor Benham that we should have been able to do more on streets. This is how we started this. This was why we started it. Let's all pat ourselves on the back because it was our idea guys. Started by former Mayor Bill Norrie. It was his idea. He brought it forward and pushed it even though it's on as me as the mover it wouldn't have got done without all of us being united and together on this.

And it doesn't quite look at how we planned but we could still use the money. We've been asked to make all sorts of upgrades to our sewage treatment facilities and we can use the money for that. Maybe that will free up money, other money to use on the roads if we can get the $941 million or whatever it is at this point, the number keeps going up, that we need for sewage treatment upgrades that we've been, that it's been demanded for us to achieve.

Yes, I want to see more for bike paths. I think that's really important in the City. We started something there. We have $300,000 dollars, went up to $500,000 then it went down to $100,000, if we could put a consistent amount into bike paths and sidewalks. There are different forms of transportation, not just the single vehicle here that could be taken into consideration with regard to this.

We started an initiative with regard to hybrid buses. How many have we got now? Four? Is it up to four? How bout if we had a whole fleet of hybrid buses, then we could save money on gas so that we would be getting the money without being so much a contributor to that tax that we're getting from it.

But right now, I think we should all look at each other and congratulate each other for a job well done because it's now Federal policy. We're getting some money and thank you to everybody involved along the way over the past 15 plus years because it's been, it's been a long haul and I'm glad we're here for this moment. Bravo to everyone. Thank you so much.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker, I support the clause but you know it seems to me that the real attack and pressure to get this money from the Federal government came from the Big City Mayors. You know, Glen Murray, we owe a lot to Glen Murray. He showed leadership.

But, you know the Prime Minister then extended it to all the municipalities, diluting the funds that would come to the large cities, to the major cities. And you know, for some reason the Big City Mayors have not spoken out strongly enough on this. We have been cheated of the money that we pressured the

Federal government to give to the big cities to all the municipalities of Canada because the Prime Minister of course knew an election was coming up and wanted the votes.

You know I really wish that Mayor Katz and the other Big City Mayors would stand up and say, look at, this belongs to the big cities. This is where the infrastructure problems are crucial. They're not crucial in Minnedosa, Neepawa, Thompson, you know it's ludicrous what we're doing. We should be telling the Federal government it should go to the major cities, the big cities that proposed it, that urged for it and fought for it and we shouldn't be diluting it through to all the municipalities in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: I think there is a bag of feathers and a bucket of tar waiting for you the next time you're in Minnedosa Councillor. (laughter) Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to speak briefly on this and as soon as the conversation started I jumped onto the FCM web site to look at their Policy Statement on Municipal Infrastructure and they're, they have a Statement of Principles and it struck me that not just a Statement of Principles but also under the sub-heading of Holistic Perspective and Systems Thinking and I'll just read them both to you very quickly: "Municipal governments are in the best position to determine the needs and priorities of their communities and must be equal partners in multilateral initiatives to enhance infrastructure. The national guide for sustainable municipal infrastructure, (InfraGuide) is a growing national collection of published best practice reports for use by decision-makers and technical personnel in the public and private sectors. FCM's national board of directors endorsed the InfraGuide principles for sustainable municipal infrastructure in 2003. Municipal governments are encouraged to apply these principles when making decisions about municipal infrastructure." So that's the Statement of Principles.

Then it goes on under the sub-heading of Holistic Perspectives and Systems Thinking it says: "consider the whole system as well as its parts, recognizing that seemingly unconnected projects, activities and their components are in fact interrelated and interdependent". And then under Equity to says: "ensure that equity issues are considered; that benefits and costs are distributed fairly over space and time."

And I mention those three specific things in relation to something that Councillor Benham said. And that was when we started the new deal, the whole conversation around the new deal was our statement that we are far too reliant on property taxes and we need to look at alternate revenue sources. But in doing that we need to look at it in its big picture. When we're dealing with infrastructure right now especially in new development areas when we do our cost benefit analysis we do it relative to the property taxes and the revenue that will be generated from the property taxes. We don't consider the shape of these things as they spread out over the spectrum of time in the analysis.

So it's not just about transit. It's not just about roads and bridges. It's not just about property taxes as a revenue stream. It's not just about water, sewer, the environment and sustainability. It's about how all of these things interact together. And that very careful consideration has to be given to them. And how they interrelate because if we focus solely on transit; if we focus solely on roads and bridges; if we focus solely on you know, water and waste issues we really lose sight of what municipal infrastructure has to be in the future and how it is interrelated.

And certainly when it comes to budgeting practices. We can't just stand up one day and wave a flag and say this year's budget is only going to be about transit; or this year's budget is only going to be about roads and bridges. We have a responsibility to be leaders in this. While the citizens can say that roads and bridges are our number two priority after crime, you know, in the big picture when you look at it from the perspective of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities

and Big City Mayors, we may have to weigh that in consideration of some of the environmental and sustainable development issues. So there is a lot more to this.

So I'll leave you with those words of I hope wisdom and remind everybody that we need to look at the big picture and not just the individual pockets that are in front of us.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker I just want to be put on record, comments have been made you know where this originated from. Back in the '70s Mr. Speaker when the late Mayor of the City of Winnipeg was Steve Juba, he was the one that championed, championed the other two levels of government, especially the Provincial government when the new *City of Winnipeg Act* was implemented of 1972 of January 1st. There were, we were faced with a problem because the Provincial government was telling us what we must do and what we cannot do and from there on it just continued until now we've got the, now we're dealing with a new *Winnipeg Charter*.

At that time, the late Steve Juba used to more than once he used to raise on the floor of Council about getting our fair share of taxes from the Province because we had two-thirds of the population in the Province of Manitoba. The Provincial government with the power they had under *The Winnipeg Act* that was implemented by them, refused to listen. More than once that time, the late Steve Juba who I said before was a champion on fighting for the rights and getting more share, more to the citizens of Winnipeg, he was able to go as far as to say to challenge the Ministers of the Crown at that time, and there was one with the late Russ Dorn, who was the Minister of Public Works, but he went, the late Steve Juba went to his office to meet with him and what happened, the assistant of the Minister comes out and he had said "no I'm sorry, the Minister is too busy to see you."

So, late Steve Juba left, come back here and told his assistant, Dave Grant, he says I want you now to get me a contractor. I want to rent out a biffy. And I want that biffy to be put right on Osborne and Broadway right across the Legislative Buildings where the outhouses are there now because at that time the Province refused to listen to the City and the late Russ Dorn had said at that time "hey I'm the boss. I don't have to listen to you".

Steve did differently and when he put that biffy up there and he put a sign "This is the Official Office of the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Dorn". Well at that time we had the media attention that was coming in from all over. Steve got the message loud and clear. So talk about someone who was championing to say that Winnipeg needs its fair share.

The late Magnus Eliason, unfortunately just passed a few months ago, was one that followed with him on that. I was in Council here. Councillor O'Shaughnessy was in Council here in the '70s. We heard all that. And we were coat-tailing on them to say yes this is correct. This is why I've made speech in here I've said where is the fair share of the Provincial government's money and the Fed's money because what are we getting in return?

The majority of the vehicles, all the vehicles being used all pay PST and G.S.T. to the Federal government. The gasoline tax goes to the Province and to the Feds and what do we get? We were getting zippo. We have to repair the streets. We have to repair the roads. We have to build bridges but no help from them. It was so unfair and still is unfair.

What is before us here now, and I know Mayor Katz is going to, has taken a lead role, he's been communicating and now we have a new government Federally, and congratulations to the Conservatives that have formed a minority government. It's good to have a change. We'll see what going to happen now. They've made some promises and now is the time that our Mayor will be negotiating with the new Minister who is going to be responsible along with the new Prime

Minister of Canada, to say that we want a fair share for the cities and Winnipeg is one of them, the cities of Canada and all of the other municipalities.

So when you take a look and saying where is this money going to be earmarked. I can tell you right now that the people that I represent told me, made it very, very clear, fix my back lane, fix my street, fix my sewer, my water, this is what I want; the infrastructure that is the number one priority. And we have to abide by what, as to what they tell us.

So to argue and to praise and to praise former members of Council or former Mayors sure it's good because they took on the fight. Councillor Murray, Councillor Murray, then Mayor Murray was on the threshold, this particular person sometimes I was wondering was he an NDP, a Conservative or Liberal or who. He never indicated because when he went to the Leg to talk to them he was NDPer. When he went Federally he was a Liberal. Just shows you the leeway and what kind of games that were being played. And we have the same thing this the Leg and we have the same thing in Parliament.

You know the thing is, is what is their priority and how are you going to satisfy the needs of the customers, the ratepayers, the citizens and the taxpayers of Winnipeg, to satisfy them to a point and to say look this is what we want. We bicker back and forth, back and forth.

Now Councillor Clement is correct. We talked at that time about the issue, it was streets; the streets, roads, sewers, to be serviced and to be repaired. We've got one of the worst road conditions, the potholes, how many of the sinkholes do we got in the City of Winnipeg that sometimes a vehicle drops right into the hole because of the erosion that takes place underneath because of watermain breaks? We've got these huge problems that have to be addressed and I'm saying that I'm for this but communicating that is the key.

Communicate and raise the issue and all of us would be on the same side, use the same political platform as Council, to say that look, we are with together here and we want the Province to because they're the ones who have been telling us more than anybody else because the money will be there, we have to communicate with them.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I thank all my colleagues for the comments previous. Listening to them I'm reminded of the old saying, I hope I have this right, "there is no limit of what can be accomplished if nobody cares who gets the credit". I think that was, that pops to mind when I hear this discussion. Listening to different Councillors talk about who is responsible for the gas tax, in my estimation is a, is a little bit dangerous, and maybe a little bit exhibitive and I wouldn't encourage Councillors to go down that road because I think frankly listening to everybody talk I think everybody is correct.

I heard Councillor Clement talk about the Big City Mayors and the role that they played in securing the gas tax for municipalities and he is quite right. I would remind however, the Big City Mayors group is actually an arm of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. So when Councillor Thomas says that the Federation of Municipalities, Federation of Canadian Municipalities is one of the lead bodies who is responsible for securing the gas tax, she also is right. They are actually one in the same.

A little concerned about Councillor Smith's comments about who should be the beneficiary of the ultimate funding that comes from the Federal government. I think Mr. Speaker, he made a comment that is a bit apropos, but I do want to raise one issue that may put this in context for Councillor Smith and others who might be tempted to think like him. And I, as people around this table know, I'm one of the representatives, the Vice-President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, and at the time when it was I guess alluded to quite strongly from the Federal government that there would in fact be Federal gas tax funding coming to municipalities, it wasn't long after that

announcement was made that the discussions such as who should be the beneficiary began.

And discussions as to maybe it should be the big cities and not the smaller municipalities. Maybe there should some percentage allotment that is this or that was discussed. Interestingly though, as a person who attended Big City Mayor meetings personally and listening to the discussion, I can tell you and this might I guess highlight the concern of that type of thinking that Councillor Smith raises. There was for a brief period in municipal thinking history, a time where there was actually a movement, not only for the gas tax funding to be directed at the 25 big cities only, but there was actually a moment in our history where some people suggested that the lion's share of the funding should go to three big cities in Canadian primarily. Why? Because they were the ones who had the larger rapid transit systems.

Now you can make that argument I suppose that Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver should be the prime beneficiaries of all this gas tax money because they are the ones who have the more formal and evolved rapid transit systems. But obviously, that didn't wash very well with the remainder of the 25 big cities in Canada who formed BCMC.

I just use that example to highlight the idea that there is no end to the lines that can be drawn if people wish to sort of say, that some municipalities should be the prime beneficiaries of this money and some shouldn't. I've always preferred the idea that we're all in this together. And I can tell you that as a person that's been to the BCMC meetings and the FCM meetings, although there are a few individuals on on, in both organizations who might purport to say that either small municipalities or large municipalities should be the prime beneficiary, the vast majority of people who comprise both the Big City Mayors organization and the FCM board, are of the mind that all municipalities should benefit and there should be in certain cases some consideration given to larger cities receiving an extra and fair proportion because of some of the extra challenges that exist. That's kind of where it evolved to.

And again and in terms of credit we did mention former Mayor Glen Murray who I think did yeoman's work in trying to raise the issue of infrastructure renewal into the psyche of Winnipeg taxpayers. But interestingly I'll remind people that where former Mayor Glen Murray and our Council landed was actually not in the arena of securing more gas tax funding. Ultimately we landed in the area of more G.S.T. funding for cities, which Councillor Benham raised, and by the way I don't disagree with him philosophically but I'll get into that in a moment.

But it's an example of how everybody has a role to play. Glen Murray did an excellent job in raising awareness and organizing the community and getting some community feedback which was wonderful. But his ultimate formula to deal with it was not at all what was either advanced by the Federal government or adopted by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, or the money that's flowing right now. Everybody played a role here. It doesn't matter who it was. We were all involved and we all deserve I think, the requisite credit when the time comes and it should be spread out.

The issue of the gas tax versus the G.S.T. and I mean it should be noted as Councillor Clement alluded to, that it was always the idea of infrastructure renewal that was paramount in this discussion Mr. Speaker. That's how the credibility and the traction was established for the ultimate debate. So while I agree with Council Benham and the idea that personally I would prefer G.S.T. funding if that were to be made possible and I think we found out fairly early in the game that that was not a road, pardon the pun, the Federal government was willing to go down at the time.

We were able to achieve a lot more by drawing that direct nexus of infrastructure deficit, municipalities responsible for the infrastructure deficit, gas tax funding on a user-pay principle going to pay for that

infrastructure deficit and to a lesser or greater extent it worked.

We're currently I guess in the process Mr. Speaker as you're aware, as the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, all municipalities right across Canada, of receiving a five year program of funding up to 5 cents a litre that will result in a large sum of money going to municipalities and it is going to evolve to a higher number at the end of the five years and municipalities will be able to cash in on renewing their infrastructure inventory at that rate.

I want to remind people if you're not aware, that the current FCM policy position on this as advanced during this Federal election is that we are asking, well we were asking during the election, all Federal parties to commit to essentially a few things. Firstly, that if a party was elected they would expand the five year commitment to at least a 20 year commitment. Secondly, that the, that any party would enshrine that commitment in legislation. Thirdly, that parties would, any party would continue to live up to the current, about $1 billion dollar envelope of funding commitments that the Federal government now makes outside of the gas tax to municipality in the form of green funds, municipal rural infrastructure funding, the larger infrastructure agreements, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. We don't only want gas tax funding we want the other additional programs that exist as well.

And of course we asked for a seat at the table to be formalized by way of a partnership. It is the current FCM position on your behalf that we are not asking the Federal government or any other government to look at the Constitution and change that in any way. We feel that's just too high of a hill to climb at this moment but rather, we are asking for an acknowledgment from the Federal government that we establish a less formal partnership to be consulted on issues of concern to municipalities.

So Mr. Speaker I trust that helps in terms of some of the history, in terms of some of the information where we've been, where we are now and where we hope to go and obviously you're all defacto members of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities by the virtue of the position you hold. These policy positions can be evolved and are always evolving and we look forward to your input. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz closing debate on the clause.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It certainly has been rather enlightening to hear so many of the views here. It reminded me of a trip I took about 10 years ago to Israel Mr. Speaker, where I went on a tour and they showed me King David's tomb. A few days later I went on another tour, and part of it there was an overlap, and once again they showed me King David's tomb. Two different locations. So very naively I raised my hand and I said "excuse me but the other tour I was on said it was over here". The answer was "over here, over there, what's the difference?"

And the reason I tell you that Mr. Speaker, to be very frank with you, I've heard comments about several Mayors playing a role in this. I've heard comments about the Big City Mayors. The Big City Mayors Caucus, the FCM, Councillors, the Federal government and on behalf of all the citizens of Winnipeg, I would like to thank them all for the contribution they made. So now we've cleared the table on that.

Mr. Speaker this was something that I thought should have flowed very smoothly because it seemed so simple. Billions are collected in gas tax. The gas tax is derived from those people who stop at the pump to fill up their vehicles to drive on our roads. It certainly makes sense that some of those monies, if not all those monies, should be going back to fix our crumbling infrastructure, our roads and our bridges. And I think if you talk to any citizen they would agree with that.

The scenario was, once you come up with the plan and it gets to the bureaucracy in Ottawa, it appears it changed. And a change took place unbeknownst to us

where there was a small little clause that said "only cities under 500,000 people can use those monies to fix those roads and bridges." Totally contradicting what we were told.

It was a battle that I decided to fight. I decided to fight because I believed what they were doing was wrong. And I took that fight to Ottawa. I sat in Minister Godfrey's office at the time and pointed out why what they were doing was wrong.

In addition to that, when we started this conversation, I will remind some people with the first meeting with the AMM we talked about 25% going to transit. They wanted 0%. Well once again, I decided to fight that battle for a minimum of 10% and I can assure all Councillors that if I fought as hard as I did to make sure we got that 10%, you can rest assured that 10% will go to transit. I can assure of you that and why anyone would think different I don't understand but I would love to hear about it.

The key thing is for everybody to know, we call this a great first step. This was just the beginning Mr. Speaker, okay. This doesn't end on gas tax. As Councillor Steeves alluded to, we're looking for an extension of this to make it long term. But by the same token I've been saying this to any media who's asked me the question, and I was very sorry to see it did not come out in the public forum during the election, but that what all cities need is more autonomy Mr. Speaker.

The realities of life are 90% of existing taxes go to the Federal and the Provincial government. In the case of the City of Winnipeg we get 10%. Half of that goes back to the Province in lieu of education taxes which leaves the government that's closest to the people that probably knows best what the people want, with the smallest contribution from that large pool.

So what we had said at the Big City Mayor's Caucus, as well as the FCM meetings, that we want the Federal government to commit to us getting a share of the other growth taxes whether it's income tax or whatever it may be, they're all on the table and unfortunately that really never came up. But that is our need. That is what should happen and that is what we will continue to do.

And I will remind some people, and I heard some comments here today, when you mentioned the term the new deal, I'll quote the Premier "there is no new deal. The new deal is dead. I wasn't elected to raise taxes." You may not like to hear that but that's what was said by our Premier.

So we are continuing to work on other avenues to get a share of revenues for the City of Winnipeg and to make sure that we can solve some of our major infrastructure problems. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question on clause 4?

All in favour? Opposed? That's carried.

Clause 8.

Item No. 8 – Citizen Equity Committee – Citizen Member Appointments File CR-1

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I believe Councillor Benham raised this and I would love to hear what he has to say and then I'd certainly be happy to respond Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham on the clause.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I will be brief. I just want to again as Councillor Gerbasi said sometimes things go through routinely and we don't note when things that are going through are good things. Generally they are just pulled off the agenda when opposed. So of course I will be voting in favour of this and in favour of all the appointments that are before us.

I just wanted to make the point that less than, or that two Council meetings ago we were on the brink of making a very

serious error, wherein we would have axed all the citizen committees, all three of the citizen committees who fall under this particular group. We do no longer have a Civic Environmental Committee and I think that's a darn shame Mr. Speaker, but we did keep this Committee.

The Mayor did in fact take a personal interest in this, talked to the Committee members. The ones that, the people who are being reappointed, I can say as a member of the Committee Mr. Speaker, are very capable people. They allow us as City Councillors to have direct conversations with people in the community about important issues and they allow us to carry on the very important work of the Citizens Equity Committee, which I will note Mr. Speaker, the Mayor has attended both meetings since that date and I know that he is taking part in some community celebrations this weekend, having to do with Black History Month.

And I would just say Mr. Speaker, certainly speaking on my behalf that I believe speaking on behalf of all members of the Committee that we welcome the Mayor's attention to this Committee and his decision to participate in it and participate in community celebrations that the Committee is interested in as well. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz summing up. Closing debate.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Benham. Mr. Speaker I think we can go straight to a vote on this issue. I think everything is Consent.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. All in favour of the clause? Opposed? And it's carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has seen significant administrative re-structuring;

AND WHEREAS salary costs make up the bulk of the expenditures of civic departments;

AND WHEREAS an understanding of the historical staff and salary trends is beneficial for Members of Council;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Chief Administrative Officer be directed to develop a report for Council identifying:

• The number of employees for each civic department and the City as a whole for the years 1995 to 2005, distributed by all bargaining units or associations including WAPSO Exempt and Senior Management.

• The total salary requirements, including benefits and bonuses, for each civic department and the City as a whole for the years 1995 to 2005, distributed by all bargaining units or associations including WAPSO Exempt and Senior Management.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this report be provided to all Members of Council within 60 days.

Automatic Referral to the Executive Policy Committee in accordance with Rule 16.1 of the Procedure By-law

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

WHEREAS the integrity and transparency of our administrative processes are fundamental to our democratic system;

AND WHEREAS activities at other levels of government have resulted in numerous questions;

AND WHEREAS there is a need to ensure that the City of Winnipeg carries forward its municipal operations with the highest degree of transparency, integrity and professionalism;

AND WHEREAS "whistle-blower" legislation would ensure continued transparency, integrity and

professionalism, while encouraging and supporting City staff;

AND WHEREAS, on January 18, 2006, the provincial government announced its intention to introduce the first provincial Bill of its kind in Canada to protect whistle-blowers in the civil service, crown corporations and other public sector agencies;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council request that the provincial government consider extending the proposed legislation to the operations of the City of Winnipeg;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council receive a report on the progress of this matter within 60 days.

Automatic Referral to the Executive Policy Committee in accordance with Rule 16.1 of the Procedure By-law

Mr. Speaker: Under Motions we have Motion No. 2 and Motion No. 3, which are the automatic referral to Executive Committee.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mr. Speaker: By-laws. Mayor Katz. For third reading only.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would move that By-law No. 131/2005 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

We have additional By-laws.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 150/2005, By-law No. 19/2006, By-law No. 20/2006, By-law No. 21/2006, By-law No. 22/2006 and By-law No. 27/2006.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 150/2005, 19/2006, 20/2006, 21/2006, 22/2006 and 27/2006.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would move that By-laws No. 150/2005 and 19/2006 to 22/2006, both inclusive, and 27/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 150/2005 and 19/2006 to 22/2006 both inclusive, and 27/2006.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 150/2005 and 19/2006 to 22/2006, both inclusive, and 27/2006, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

We have an additional By-law.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'd move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 33/2006 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 33/2006.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'd move that By-law No. 33/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 33/ 2006.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker I'd move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 33/2006 be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD**

Mr. Speaker: Executive Committee Question Period. Councillor Lazarenko, okay I've got…starting with Councillor Lazarenko. Go ahead.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The question is to Mayor Katz. Last Wednesday morning I appeared as a delegation before the Executive Policy Committee Mr. Mayor and I had raised the issue of what Council was not aware of was the elimination during the vote of January, I mean July 27th of last year that was contracting out the remaining garbage services.

I had raised a question to you Mr. Mayor and EPC that the proposed elimination of 900 roll-out bins or 900 residents were on the table to be, to be taken. It was not part of what we had discussed in Council. Could you tell me Mr. Mayor where is it at now?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you Mr. Speaker I thank the Councillor for the question. I also thank him for appearing at Executive Policy Committee. I have received some information as of last night and I'm happy to share that information with Council. And just for clarification Mr. Speaker that in the business plan there was a recommendation that the 890 roll-out cart locations be converted to manual collection.

Some Councillors may not have seen it but this wasn't anything that the administration was hiding. It was in the business plan and also the change was that it would be collected on Wednesdays and also to coordinate it the same day as they have their recycling collected which meant as opposed to 52 Wednesdays it was actually done 50 times.

Where we are at right now is that in order to maintain the status quo of the roll-out bins there would be an additional cost of $47,000 dollars per year Mr. Speaker. This calculation is based on $87.50 per house per year for roll-out pick-up. Plus there is a $5,000 dollar maintenance charge that's put in there and then it's less the $40 dollars per house per year which would be the cost of manual pick-up. So therefore the total additional cost to maintaining the status quo for those 890 roll-out carts would be $47,000 dollars.

In addition to that I can tell the Councillor that taking this into consideration, the net impact would be in the year 2006, there would be a $2 million dollar saving. That is over 10.3 months. In the year 2007 there would be a $2.45 million dollar saving. And in the year 2008 Mr. Speaker, there would be a $3.3 million dollar saving.

And to put this into perspective taking that adjustment into consideration of maintaining the status quo with roll-out bins that the cost of collecting garbage will be $39.67 per household. The cost compared to doing it ourselves was $76.55.

You can see Mr. Speaker that there is a significant saving and that we are prepared to maintain the status quo of the roll-out bins but I want to make very clear that this was in the business plan and no one was ever trying to hide that information, it was there. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Supplementary Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker and Mr. Mayor that is very good news to the close to 900 residents, single-family residents that I represent, I'd say about 90% of the say 890. My question Sir is I, once again I have to thank you and I have to thank also the, our Chief Administrator, Annitta Stenning because I had raised this with her prior to me going before the Executive Policy Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Question please.

Councillor Lazarenko: So my question Mr. Speaker is when will this, because I'll be getting calls. When is this going to be taken into effect that this will not be part

of the plan that you had said Sir it will be as status quo?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you, thank you to Councillor Lazarenko. In a normal circumstance when this was raised at the Executive Policy Committee by Councillor Lazarenko, EPC did move the motion to get the information and to bring it back to Executive Policy Committee. The administration is, has completed a considerable part of their report. I got some information ahead of time. It would have gone back to Executive Committee where this information would have been made available.

Since on the floor of Council I was asked the question I believe that Council is supreme, I was happy to share this information for the very first time with all Council members. So there will be a motion at Executive Policy Committee at our next meeting as soon as we get the report from, the official report, from the administration and it will become official at that particular point in time. So you should in effect see no change whatsoever and it will be official that the status quo will be maintained Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Mayor.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That's it? Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just rise on, Mr. Mayor on, through you, through the Speaker to you, on October the 19th Executive Policy Committee moved a recommendation that requested the administration review the report of the Rapid Transit Task Force and report back to Executive Policy Committee within 90 days on the analysis of options and advice with respect to point form implementation of the report recommendations; a list, a priority list of short-term improvements that could be undertaken in 2006-2007; timelines for potential implementation; cost of options being recommended; funding options for potential project costs.

That was on October the 19th. Based on my calculation January the 19th is 90 days. I've been watching the minutes, correct me if I'm wrong but I haven't seen an extension given to this matter. When, what is the status of this right now, this report?

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. Thank you Councillor Wyatt. I think your arithmetic is correct. I can tell you that we believe that report should be coming within the next two to three weeks. I can only assume that because of the holidays there was probably a little slow down in there but that should be coming very shortly and we will deal with it promptly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is a second supplementary question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Glad to hear that Mr. Speaker. My second supplementary is just with regards to the gas tax. In an email you sent to, that was sent to Council on November the 18th it was indicated that $11.64 million, 2005 cash, would flow within 30 days of signing agreement. We now have a report indicating that negotiations to set up an account with the Province and the Oversight Committee. How long will this take? When will we start to see the monies flow from 2005 into infrastructure in the City?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Once again through you Mr. Speaker I thank Councillor Wyatt for the question. My understanding is, is that '05 money has flowed, or is flowing; '06 will be as well so you can take that number and multiply it by two.

I believe right now the department is looking at their priorities and making recommendations how that money should be spent which means I believe you will see that money being spent I guess as soon as Spring hits when they can start doing physical work and right now they

are in the planning stages and allocating their priorities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your final supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: When will the rest of the Council have an opportunity to, when will the rest of Council have an opportunity to be part of that discussion and exactly what those priorities are and where that money will be spent? When will the rest of Council be brought into the picture?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I believe Mr. Speaker that we are hoping to have a Capital Budget completed by approximately the first week of February, at the same time hoping to have a Council seminar to share all that information with Council and so everybody will have their input at that particular point in time on our Capital Budget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith, your first.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Mr. Mayor the Executive Director of the Winnipeg Art Council left on September the 9th last year. We have not had a new Director, Executive Director. Why is that? What's the problem? Five months have gone by.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you, Councillor Smith I must confess I do not have an answer for that. I am happy to look into it and to get back to Councillor Smith on that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. That's it Councillor Smith? Councillor Benham, your first.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce has released this document *Selling Winnipeg to the World* and in it the Chamber proposes that the City hire a Chief Marketing Officer to sell Winnipeg to the world but it needs the Mayor's direct support. It suggests that this officer would report directly to the Mayor. And that the Chamber also privately advised against "throwing more money at Destination Winnipeg" saying that that would be the very worst thing to do. Mr. Speaker why has the Mayor rejected the Chamber's plan for a Chief Marketing Officer for Winnipeg?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Through Mr. Speaker to Councillor Benham, thank you very much for that question. I can tell you very frankly Mr. Speaker, it's not a matter of rejecting or throwing money. It's a matter of taking your very limited resources and getting the biggest bang for your buck for all the citizens of Winnipeg.

Destination Winnipeg is doing a phenomenal job in one, marketing our City; two, attracting new business to our City. There is not an event that takes place in this City that Destination Winnipeg is not part of. They run a very lean, mean machine and just because the Chamber of Commerce asked for something, contrary to what some people may think, I don't always agree with the Chamber of Commerce. And when I do not agree I am more than happy to share that opinion.

I believe right now we do have a marketing arm who's doing a wonderful job. That can certainly be substantiated by the fact that yesterday both the Premier of the Province and the Mayor put an additional $60,000 dollars each of funding for a total of $120,000 dollars into Destination Winnipeg. I believe so strongly in it and also as I mentioned earlier Mr. Speaker because of limited resources that money came out of the Mayor's budget.

So to be very, I guess definitive here, I am a major supporter, a firm believer in Destination Winnipeg. I applaud them for the success that they've had and I hope they'll continue to have more and even greater successes Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

(Councillor Eadie in the chair)

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker why would the Mayor allocate more money to Destination Winnipeg, as he's just said he did, without considering the Chamber's very serious criticisms of that agency and it's proposals for reform?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, no matter what an individual says or an organization says there is always criticism. You know just look on the floor of Council. One person has an idea, some people love it, some people hate it. Just because one organization criticizes something doesn't make them right. It doesn't make them wrong.

I am very much of the opinion that I am astute enough to see when an organization is doing good work and when they can do even more work. And based on what I have seen over the last 18 months, myself and the Premier made I believe a very astute, profound and good decision. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker will the Mayor reconsider his opposition to the Chamber's plan to hire a Chief Marketing Officer and meet with representatives of the Chamber to come up with a plan to sell Winnipeg to the world that would get the Mayor's support?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I think we better get clarification. I don't have any problem whatsoever with the Chamber hiring a person to do marketing. I don't have any problem with that. I mean they can go out and do that tomorrow.

I guess the unique thing is, is that they are coming to us the City for funding and if Councillor Benham is of the opinion that that should be one of the City's major priorities then certainly we will have the opportunity to raise that when we are talking about our Operating Budget because if you are adding money you've always got to find it from somewhere else. So maybe that's a conversation that will come up at a later date.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lubosch please.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I'll apologize in advance that I didn't have an opportunity to speak to the Mayor about this question. It might be coming a little out of left field but it does cause me some concern.

It's with respect to the Hemispheria 2006 Conference to be held in Winnipeg this year, May 31st to June 2nd. I understand there are going to be some very important delegates from around the world attending and this will require that the City of Winnipeg coordinate with the Province how they are going to manage security at this conference.

And I'm just wondering if the Mayor can either answer the question or take it under advisement and provide an answer to Council at a later date, how this contingency is going to be met, the financial contingency and how we are going to deal with it in our Current Budget?

And also the second part of that question, I'll get it out of the way now, is has the Province made a firm commitment in writing to co-sponsoring the event?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all so there is no misunderstanding this is the Province's initiative that's number one. Number two, Councillor Lubosch there is absolutely no need to apologize for asking any question out of left field or right field that's what Question Period is all about and I appreciate you coming forward with questions.

What I would be happy to do is this is still an ongoing conversation, I would be more than happy to gather the information and when I have it all definitely share it with you, it would be my pleasure.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Councillor Lubosch: No that's fine Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No. Okay. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor I just, listening to Councillor Benham's question regarding the Chamber of Commerce request and the Marketing Officer, prior, not too long ago we had the conversation around Creative Cities and we were we started to talk about the City Summit. I just wondered if the, it appeared to me that all of these things are the types of things that should be looked at in, within the City Summit and I just wondered if the Mayor could give us an update on where the City Summit is at and what we can expect to see at that time?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Swandel, I appreciate the question. It appears that there are still many people who are not aware of the City Summit which will be taking place I believe the first two days of June. It's an idea, it, it's, it's a, the whole purpose of that is to get people from different cities sharing ideas with us as well as getting input from citizens here in the City.

I think it is going to be very exciting. There will be some very special announcements in the very near future. You will probably see some more press releases and unfortunately at this particular point in time until everything is confirmed I am not in a position to enlighten you on that.

But I can tell you right now from what I have seen to date with the hard work that some of the people who are working on this I think this is going to be a very, very special event and I think it will be a very positive event for the entire City and all the citizens.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just to be clear what I'm trying to understand is will there be opportunity for initiatives such as that being put forward by the Chamber of Commerce and I believe the Winnipeg Arts Council to put something forward before in the Creative Cities concept. Will there be opportunities for that type of representation at the City Summit?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you. The answer is absolutely yes there will be. The whole purpose of this is to invite people to come to this and they will be our invited guests and I'm sure some of the entities you've just mentioned will definitely be on that list.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary. Okay. Councillor Wyatt on the second round.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. On January 17th a constituent of mine made an application under the FIPPA for Freedom of Information with regards to, oh I'll just read it here "that all contracts, correspondence agreements, internal memos, letters and funding sources relating to the Olywest Project, Economic Development Incentive Package, File FL-2.6." A very broad request for information.

Apparently when speaking to the administrator involved with this program or involved with administering this was informed that that even though they had made the request through FIPPA that they should not expect any more information than that which was supplied to Council and therefore made available to the general public.

So in light of the fact that the Council debate was quite a bit about the fact there was no due diligence done; there was a lack of reports coming forward from the various departments; a lack of information from the various departments, I would like to know Mr. Speaker whether or not the administration has been issued a gag order with regards to information pertaining to the Olywest agreement?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Wyatt, thank you for the question. First of all I can tell you this is the very first time I've heard of this. Number two, I believe that administration obviously got the same gag order as you. None exists. I've never heard of it.

I'm absolutely disappointed that anybody on the floor of Council would even think such a thing would take place but I can assure you that is absolutely incorrect and sometimes I think just making that statement basically leads to innuendoes that are totally false. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Wyatt: I thank Your Worship for the clarification of that and it is my understanding then, would it be correct to understand that you will do whatever possible, your office, to ensure that the information that has been requested with this FIPPA request is met and that information flows to the constituent who has made the application, to assist the process that we've outlined as Council policy?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I've never gotten into FIPPA requests. It's really not something I deal with. I can assure you that any information that I have I would be happy to share with Councillor Wyatt. If he chooses to share it with other individuals, that's his prerogative. There are no secrets whatsoever and I certainly hope that people will not even for a moment imply there are.

Mr. Speaker: Okay final supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: On a separate matter Mr. Speaker when would Council be having an opportunity, or my question would be why has Council not had an opportunity at this point, we are already almost through the month of January to have any sort of input or discussion with regards to the Capital Budget or the Operating Budget or both? No informal discussions have taken place. What is the status of that?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Wyatt, I will remind the Councillor that I myself took the initiative to call all Councillors to get some feedback on their thoughts on the Operating Budget or the Capital Budget to see if they had any areas where they thought we should be spending more or we should be spending less, ways of raising new revenues as well that number one.

Number two, as I mentioned earlier we're hoping to get to the point and I will remind Councillor Wyatt that there have been ongoing meetings lasting anywhere from three to seven hours. These are a very long, enduring, difficult meetings. They're not pleasant; they're not fun. It's hard work but we're getting to a point where with the help of the administration we believe we will have something available very shortly.

As I said earlier, I believe that would be in the first week of February which then we will give Council as much time as possible, lead time, to review it and have a Council seminar. I, for the love of me I cannot understand what more Councillor Wyatt would like but that's what we are in the process of doing Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Benham on the second round.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker of course in September of 2004 the Mayor supported by nine other members of Council rejected $43 million dollars in Federal and Provincial government funding for bus rapid transit. That money, that bus rapid transit line would have been built by now, I think it's worth noting.

I'd like to know the money that was announced under the Mayor's arrangement almost a full year ago, how much money has flowed under that agreement? Of the $43 million dollars in Federal and Provincial government

funding, how much money has flowed to community centres in Winnipeg? Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Benham. I guess this is for the second time on the floor of Council I've heard the comment saying that this would have been constructed. That is absolutely incorrect. That is absolutely not true. I could go further than that but I would like to possess a little bit of decorum, that's number one.

Even in the Rapid Transit Task Force review they specifically said it would take three to five years. Councillor Wyatt even stood at a press conference and said it could be four years before the first shovel hits the ground. But obviously Councillor Benham knows better then Councillor Wyatt and believes that would happen overnight even though there was no money allocated at the time. That's number one.

Number two, this is the same $43 million dollars that Councillor Benham alluded to was lost. I quote "we lost the money", at a press conference and told the world we lost the money. Once again Mr. Speaker not true. Not accurate. And at this particular point in time the administration has been working on a plan for our recreational facilities. I believe they have completed it. They will have projections and I believe you will start to see money flowing this year Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker is the answer then zero?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Councillor Benham: The original question being how much money has flowed?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker the answer is the administration has completed their plan, okay which is a very detailed plan. We now have a policy in place which never existed before for community centres and as I said, I'll repeat one more time for the hard of hearing, the money should start flowing this year.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Final supplementary.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker what assurances does the Mayor have that a deal that was worked out with a Federal Liberal Minister will be, that actually bent the rules severely, will be kept by the new Federal government?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I was actually very fortunate enough to have had the opportunity for Steven Harper to pay me a courtesy visit and it appears that all agreements are going to be honoured. And I guess I would, the question should be in reverse, if Councillor Benham has any knowledge that it's not going to be honoured I'd love to hear from him. If he doesn't there is really very little to discuss Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further? The time for questions has expired. We'll move to the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues of January 10th. Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I would note for members of Council that the report of September 13th which has been kicking around for a long time has been referred back to Fiscal Issues which we'll be looking at this next meeting.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED JANUARY 10, 2006

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: And it would be my pleasure to move the report of the Standing Committee of Fiscal

Issues of January 10th and move the Consent agenda, the Adoption by Consent of agenda item 1.

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

No motions. By-laws, Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I would move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 24/2006 and 26/2006.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 24/2006 and 26/2006.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I would move that By-laws No. 24/2006 and 26/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 24/2006 and 26/2006.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'd move the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 24/2006 and 26/2006, both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

There is an additional By-law.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Additional By-law. I would move the rule be suspended and By-law No. 25/2006 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 25/2006.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I would move that By-law No. 25/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 25/2006.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I would move the rule be suspended and By-law No. 25/2006 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Fiscal Issues questions? Councillor Wyatt.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm wondering I, through you to the Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the Mayor did phone everybody and give us about 15 minutes of time to give input with regards to the Capital Budget and the Current Budget coming up and that was an extensive consultation process, which was very impressive. And I would like to ask the chairman what efforts has he made to consult with the rest of Council before bringing forward this Current and Capital Budget?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: On specific items that I know are perhaps a little questionable, I've brought items up with Councillors who have more knowledge than I have in those certain areas. In general none.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: I guess my question would be, in light of the fact that we would want to work together as an entire Council what efforts that you intend to do in the near future to consult with the rest of Council prior to bringing down a Capital Budget and a Current Budget?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'd like to preface it by saying that these Budgets are tabled at Executive Policy Committee not at Fiscal Issues so the timing is not totally up to me.

The status of the Budgets, as I am deeply involved in them, is that the Capital Budget will be ready to go to the printer if all goes as scheduled this week; will be tabled the first week in February to all members of Council which would then follow the usual period of debate; the normal methodology for the Capital Budget.

The Current Budget will take somewhat longer and would not be tabled until later in February because so many numbers are still influx and if EPC is still debating exactly how to handle the increasing demands for expenditures with the public's seeming unwillingness to jump ahead with higher taxes.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary for Fiscal Issues.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that the Capital Budget by the sounds of it has been set and without any sort of formal consultation with the rest of Council, my question would be to the chairman, what assurances can he give Council that the $11.64 million earmarked from gas tax in 2005 and $11.64 million earmarked from gas tax in 2006, will be on and above the $61 million that was allocated in the past to infrastructure and roads, not taking into account the $5 million that was cut last year, on and above, and be directed towards existing infrastructure. What assurances can he give this Council chamber?

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Give you assurances that the rules will be followed and that a document will be put before all members of Council within the next two weeks.

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions?

Report of the Standing Committee on Downtown Development. Councillor Magnifico.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED JANUARY 10, 2006**

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the report of January 10th, 2006 and move adoption of the Consent agenda item 1.

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

We move to By-laws, Councillor Magnifico.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Magnifico: I would like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 206/2005, By-law No. 18/2006.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 206/2005 and 18/2006.

Councillor Magnifico: I'd like to move that By-laws No. 206/2005 and 18/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 206/2005 and 18/2006.

Councillor Magnifico: I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 206/2005 and 18/2006, 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 Downtown Development? None. Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development

the report of January the 10th, Councillor De Smedt.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 10, 2006

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the report. For the notation to members of Council, item 14 has been Laid Over by Executive Policy Committee for 30 days so I would like to move clauses 1 to 13 as Consent.

Councillor Gerbasi: Number 2 please.

Mr. Speaker: Pardon me?

Councillor Gerbasi: Number 2.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 2. Anything else?

And the balance of the report to be adopted by Consent with the exception of clause 2 and 14.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clause 2 Councillor De Smedt.

Item No. 2 – Subdivision and Rezoning – east side of Camp Manitou Road, north of Assiniboine River File DASZ 44/2005

Mr. Speaker: Do you wish to introduce the clause?

Councillor De Smedt: Yes thank you very much Mr. Speaker, I won't take too much time. I would like to hear the observations that Councillor Gerbasi may have on this but I would just like to advise members of Council we had a short history lesson a moment ago from Councillor Lazarenko about Unicity. I'd just like to inform you that this is the first subdivision since the mid '70s that St. James west or the St. Charles area, has been able to put forward in over 30 years.

We've had several subdivisions where schools have closed. I wouldn't call 20 or 30 homes a subdivision, that have been built, but since the mid '70s, nada, nothing has been able to evolve in our area of town.

Simply put, I think we missed opportunities in the past, but it was the rule of this Council and the Provincial government, that we would have additional zones. We would have no growth north of Saskatchewan Avenue. We wouldn't go west of the Perimeter, and on and on it went.

I just wanted to say to you that this very small subdivision of some 120 to 130 homes, plus about 40 condominium bungalows that would go into this subdivision is a very small addition to our stock here in the City of Winnipeg but it's a very welcome one in our area of town. People have been looking for opportunities for new housing, for condominiums to stay within the community.

I don't consider this to be exurban growth because it's beyond the Perimeter. Just to go over the history, you may recall this project has been in the making for seven years. Council approved in 1999 the evolution of a wastewater line to service that area of town, Assiniboia Downs, the auto-mall, plus future opportunities for housing to evolve.

Concomitant with that Council approved forwarding to the Province, *Plan Winnipeg* in September of 2000, which made this a Neighbourhood Area. It's a small area just to the west of the Perimeter, south of the Trans-Canada Highway surrounding an area where I get lots of votes, two cemeteries. There is a private sector evolution there. There is a private sector property and there is City property. City property that has been sitting there for years. That City property hasn't provided one iota of the tax base to this City.

So let me just say that on balance, what we have here is a high-quality development for single-family homes for some multi-family in the context of condominiums, probably condominium bungalows that will have added value to our City. You must remember that we're in competition every day of the week with those people that are in the Capital

Region. This will rival Pritchard Farms, Breezy Bend Estates and other evolutions out in La Salle, Niverville and what not. And it is going to give people a choice to stay within the City. And it's going to add tax base to our City.

This is a high quality development that on balance meets the needs of our community. But I do recall the very first representation that was made here this morning by Councillor Gerbasi about the Winnipeg Homelessness and Housing Initiative in which she thanked EPC and other members of Council about the commitment we're making to be able to provide some funding for a very worthwhile cause obviously, in terms of providing needed housing in our inner city. These things won't happen unless we can continue to grow. And this is a very small part of our growth. There are many others that are happening throughout the City, we know that and there will be others coming forward in the course of the next year or two, that will add value to our City.

But I would just simply like to remind everybody that there has been very little happening, very little happening in terms of this kind of growth for well over 30 years. This is a welcome addition. It meets all the policy context that we have and I recommend to Council that we approve it however I would like to listen to, perhaps what observations may be made by Councillor Gerbasi. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Just before that, if Councillors will indulge me I believe Councillor Swandel would seek permission to introduce some special guests who have arrived in the gallery.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out to the, my Council colleagues and Mr. Mayor, the presence of two members of the Katimavik program, who we have about 10 of them residing in the St. Norbert ward right now working on different projects in the community in places like schools, the nursing home in St. Norbert and some great community projects like our trails projects, so our Katimavik kids from St. Norbert.

Mr. Speaker: Welcome. Welcome to Winnipeg City Council.

Can I just ask Councillors seek some guidance in view of the hour? I think there are some people who want to, others besides Councillor Gerbasi they want to speak to this clause. Do you wish to call at 12:00 o'clock and resume at 1:30 or do you wish to sit through and complete the entire Council agenda? I seek your guidance.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker I will move that Council do adjourn to 1:30 this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Agreement then to call at 12:00 o'clock and we'll resume at 1:30 and Councillor Gerbasi will be next up on the roster. Thank you. Recess until 1:30 this afternoon.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of January 25, 2006 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Resuming the Council meeting. Clause 2 of the Property and Development report, Councillor Gerbasi is next.

Councillor Gerbasi: It's unfortunate, I would like a few more of our colleagues that haven't made it back yet might want to hear this debate but I guess that's unfortunate that they have taken a long lunch. Well, it's important whether the stands are packed or not or whether Councillors are back from lunch.

Anyways, thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to point out that in Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry there have not been any new subdivisions of this size in the last 30 years either. But, not sure that's a reason to do anything. But, it's, and I'd also would like to point out that it's rare that I raise an issue about a rezoning that takes place in another Community Committee, in another part of the City. I very rarely would rise to raise concerns about something like that but in this case there are some serious concerns and that's why I'm raising this issue today.

First of all there is the issue of the lack of adequate access for emergency vehicles.

There is a lack of public transit service, a lack of true costing, and other urban sprawl related issues. In terms of the issue of access for emergency vehicles, the administration has made it quite clear in their report that their best advice is that there needs to be two permanent access points. The amendments made by the Councillors at the public hearing do not satisfy the administrative concerns.

It is also important to note that the City has no agreement with the Rural Municipality of Headingley regarding paving, servicing and maintenance of Camp Manitou Road, currently gravel, which will be if this goes ahead, the only permanent access and this road is owned by the Rural Municipality not the City of Winnipeg.

It is also disturbing to note that although members of the Fire Paramedic Service were on hand to answer questions at the Community Committee hearing, and for part of the Property and Development Committee hearing, no one asked them a single question about this issue or these changes that were made to the recommendations.

I would also point out that the political amendments, changing the access to the site were brought forward at the Community Committee after public representation was concluded. While this is allowed under the rules and I'm not accusing anybody of breaking any procedure, the result is that the public does not have a chance, did not have a chance to respond to these changes. Once representations are closed at Community Committee the public does not have another opportunity to speak to the amendments at Property or at Council. It seems to me that Councillors at Community Committee must have known what amendments they intended to bring forward and they could have chosen to give the public a chance at least to be heard on it.

Furthermore, the rest of Council and the public will now have no chance to directly hear from the administration about the concerns about adequate emergency access in a public forum. The Community Committee and those opportunities have gone. Even if every rule has been technically followed in this process, which I am not saying it hasn't, the result is the same. The voice of the public has been silenced. The proper information has not been available to the public because they can't ask those questions. The rules of the process have been used to push this project forward without adequate public input.

At Planning and Development Committee, the director of Planning was asked generally about the concern regarding emergency access. He clearly but tactfully stuck by the administration's recommendation in the report which utterly contradict what is being voted on today. The argument that there are other exiting developments that have inadequate access is hardly an excuse to create new problems. Past mistakes are not a good reason to make bad choices today especially when we're talking about public safety. It is down right irresponsible to knowingly approve developments with inadequate fire safety access. Wake up everybody, please!

On the issue of public transit, I was shocked to hear Councillor De Smedt state that there will be no transit service to this development. He said it as if it was a good thing. Perhaps he was trying to give comfort to the concern that we won't have to spread our already thin transit services even thinner. But if you think about it, his comments just highlight why this whole development proposal is seriously flawed.

First of all it is an ethical responsibility to build communities that are accessible by public transit in a City such as Winnipeg. This kind of decision is the kind of politically short-sighted approach that has caused the City many of the problems of lack of adequate services and urban sprawl related problems that we have today.

Furthermore, it isn't fair to the people who will be moving there to deny a fundamental City service such as transit forever. People have to get to work and move around and not everyone will be

able to get there by car. Eventually those residents will demand public transit and we will be obligated to give it to them.

Not only that, it is poor land use planning to encourage development that is not transit friendly. It is poor policy environmentally and it directly contradicts *Plan Winnipeg* 3C-015 of *Plan Winnipeg "*promoting alternative modes of transportation through the inclusion of transit routes and bicycle paths in transportation plans and in the design of new developments." Building totally auto dependent new communities is outrageously backwards in this day and age and is simply wrong. This will also discourage assisted living, multi-family or any higher density development because people who live in those sorts of developments are even more likely to expect transit services.

The report refers to *Plan Winnipeg* and even boasts of how environmental friendly the development is because it preserves some of the sensitive lands that are there. Well it's very nice that the entire forest isn't being mowed down and that's wonderful but the report is silent on other relevant parts of *Plan Winnipeg* such as the one I just mentioned.

Plan Winnipeg also states in 3B-08 "that the re-designation of rural lands to neighbourhood should only happen where the land is needed but also, where a full range of municipal infrastructure can be provided in an environmentally sound, economical and timely manner." It doesn't appear that these requirements have been met and I am aware that the land has already been re-designated in *Plan Winnipeg a*nd that may have been a very short-sighted choice.

As it stands, since we've now designated Waverley West and all that other housing area, as it stands the City service of transit will not exist here, not to mention proper emergency access. And how much will it cost to provide transit service? I would like to know where the full cost benefit analysis is, and full costing to make sure this development is worthwhile to the City's bottom line. That's not available to us.

Issues of access, servicing and true costing should be resolved before a development like this is approved. And I urge Council, I think we are making a very serious mistake if we do not send this back or say no to this at this point in time until these complex issues can be resolved that involve other jurisdictions, the Provincial highways, there's all kinds of safety issues. There was an accident in the paper today that had to do with an emergency vehicle that was in this place today and this thing isn't even built yet and we know the problems haven't been adequately resolved.

The administration is not satisfied. The public is not satisfied. The public has not even had a chance to comment on the political amendments that were changed at the hearing. This process is flawed. This development is flawed. Please do not support this today. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham on the clause.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I certainly agree with everything that Councillor Gerbasi has said and I hope that other Councillors will, actually I disagreed with something earlier, I added something earlier, but it is true often I agree with Councillor Gerbasi and I hope that all Councillors are listening to these arguments with open ears because this is a very serious error we are about to make.

And I must admit that given that we generally do allow zoning to go through the normal process and so on, it's unusual to raise it at Council and I do agree with that as a tradition that certainly when these things are looked at by Committees and we're generally satisfied that we should be willing to let them go through. Not this time, Mr. Speaker. This is too serious Mr. Speaker.

And I'm afraid that the desire by the ward Councillor to see some kind of development in his ward, after so many years has simply blinded him to the negative parts of this development, the very negative parts of this proposal and I

would hope that given that none of us come from that ward by definition, I would hope that all of us would look at this with a more open mind and look at the very serious warnings we have in this report.

Councillor Gerbasi referred to them in broad terms and she is absolutely right but let's listen specifically to what the administration is telling us; what public servants are telling us; what the Fire and Paramedics Service is telling us about what happens if one of these houses burns down. Mr. Speaker, I think it's, or if somebody in one of those houses has a heart attack. Mr. Speaker, these are the lives of Winnipeggers at stake.

Councillor De Smedt is quite right this development will be in Winnipeg but it is pushing new ground. It's outside the Perimeter Highway; it's outside our normal infrastructure. What do our public servants say about that Mr. Speaker? The City of Winnipeg including the Public Works department, the Fire Paramedic Service, Land Development and the Planning and Land Use Division, so bureaucrats across 1, 2, 3, 4 departments are "steadfast in their insistence".

Now Mr. Speaker how often do we have civil servants, public servants stand up and be steadfast in their insistence? They generally recommend. They generally say that one course of action is preferable over another or would increase public safety or decrease public safety. But to be steadfast in their insistence that at least two accesses to the subdivision must be open to the public as full-time, unimpeded, paved entry and egress.

Councillor De Smedt took that recommendation and destroyed it Mr. Speaker. He and the Committee destroyed that recommendation and then, as chair of Property and Development, he gutted it even further so that when we look at the way that these decisions have been made, we see that the department, the ACG recommends in the first place, exactly the same thing, two unimpeded accesses, two paved full-time unimpeded access and egress to provide access and egress, and repeats it in part 10 of the ACG report: "the developer shall ensure that two paved means of vehicular access are available at all times through all stages of development".

Mr. Speaker why would our public servants say that? Or are public servants in the business of creating meaningless requirements for developers to fulfil? Are they trying to thwart legitimate development in Winnipeg? No Mr. Speaker they care about the safety of Winnipeggers. They care about saving lives. And if this Council doesn't care about it, then we better be prepared for what happens the first time there is a fire in one of those houses or the first time someone in one of those houses does have a heart attack or something else requiring immediate medical treatment. Because Mr. Speaker, our public servants have told us they are more likely to die, because of a decision that is being made here simply because of political hubris. Simply to create a subdivision where one doesn't exist now in a ward that hasn't had one for a while so let's throw all the public safety considerations to the winds.

Mr. Speaker that is not acceptable to me and I will be voting against this proposal, solely, solely if that were the only thing wrong with it, that that would still be enough for me Mr. Speaker. Future deaths because of inadequate, because of the inadequate provision for access and egress and to do so deliberately, deliberately, not only ignoring but changing every single recommendation made by our public servants, to ensure that Winnipeggers would be safe in the future. Mr. Speaker, that to me is bordering, well I won't say, okay so let's say what it is. It is negligent Mr. Speaker. It is negligent. We are neglecting our duty to protect people, to listen to our administration.

But Mr. Speaker there is of course several other aspects to this which are also negative and Councillor Gerbasi mentioned transit. And Councillor De Smedt, author of *Direction to the Future,* author of the report that he said in Council two meetings ago or 3 meetings ago, laid the basis for the *Rapid Transit Task Force Report*, and yet Councillor Gerbasi is quite right, Councillor De Smedt was

quoted in the newspaper as saying that the fact that this subdivision won't have any transit, that's a good thing. No, Mr. Speaker, that's a bad thing. It's a very bad thing. It means that once more we are telling Winnipeggers, buy a car.

What's our policy? What's our transportation policy? Mr. Speaker under this Mayor and under this Executive Policy Committee "buy a car" that's as imaginative as we get. Investing in the future, investing in transportation infrastructure so people can have other choices. No Mr. Speaker that is beyond the imagination and vision of the people who lead this Council and Mr. Speaker it is a very, very bad thing for the future of this City.

In addition I would just like to add a point that has not been picked up on completely and that is the matter of public parks. We have the public parks, our plan for the interior of the development, while private homes will line the Assiniboine River. Mr. Speaker have we learned nothing? Have we learned absolutely nothing about the development of riverside property in this City?

At very great expense and very great trouble, we negotiated with the landowners along the Assiniboine River between the Legislature and the Forks to develop a fabulous Riverwalk there, one that is used by thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of Winnipeggers; a great tourism development. It took a long time because there were a lot of landowners who said no I'm not going to give you an easement or they held out for more money or whatever. Well if we want to continue a bicycle path along the Assiniboine River and include our lands west of the Perimeter, we won't be able to because that land will be under private ownership thanks to this report.

So the houses will not be adequately protected by Fire and Paramedic services, no fault of their own. The people who live there will not be able to use Winnipeg Transit, through no fault of their own. And, Mr. Speaker, the river, the wonderful Assiniboine River, the wonderful river bottom forest that we are trying to protect, will in fact be protected for individual wealthy landowners, not for the common good.

Mr. Speaker I will be happy to vote against this. I hope all Councillors have been paying attention and I hope they join Councillor Gerbasi and I in defeating what is a very bad proposal for the future of this City. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Thomas on the clause.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll try not to reiterate the previous arguments. But I would like to point out that this is so inconsistent with *Plan Winnipeg* in so many ways.

First the size of the lots themselves. We're supposed to be looking at smart development. The size of the lots are 60 feet to 90 feet in width. That's huge amounts. It's, it's incumbent upon us to encourage people for smaller lots. I've had a new development in my area where we have upper middle class homes and they are happy on 40-foot lots that we do not need to go back to the area where people are on 60 to 90 foot lots. It's a waste of our resources to be doing that. It's also difficult on our infrastructure. That this development is the furthest from the inner city and it's going to be spread out the widest which makes it more and more difficult to deliver services, and less and less economic to deliver those services. So, the size of the lots itself should be a reason for not supporting this development.

The second issue that I wanted to point out is that I believe it is against our policy to have all those "R1.9"'s, the biggest lots there, that that should be reserved as parkland. I believe we have a policy with regard to maintaining the riverbank as parkland. We are in some areas, trying to buy it back. In the number of years that I have been on Council, to try and buy this back, I've succeeded in buying back only three lots in my area, and turning them back into parkland because it's very difficult and very expensive to take something back once it has been occupied. Raw land is cheaper to get

than land that has been serviced and has had a house on. So it's been very difficult to get those lands back into the public domain.

But, in my area, that some of these houses are over a hundred years old, it's well before those policies are established. So you know, you make, you understand that kind of thing. That was done before policies but to fly in the face of this policy and keep all those "R-1.9" lots down there is against policy and shouldn't be proceeded with.

I'm not going to talk about access. That's been talked about for, sufficiently. I would say if the access is inadequate to say the least.

And last but not least it's not the time for it. We have lands that could be and should be developed that are closer to the centre of the City, whether it's, whether it's close to potential rapid transit corridors; whether it's lands that have been abandoned by the military, that we could turn and utilize into housing and for what, for how many lots? It's baffling that, I think it's 120 lots or something like that. It's a very small development. We would have more potential along, I think there were 595 lots along the rapid transit, potential rapid transit corridor. There is another 600 lots if we choose to do smart development, sensibly in the old military forces area that that could be developed.

To go to the very edge of the City and develop these huge lots for very little, for very little economic gain, is puzzling to say the least. Why we would abandon *Plan Winnipeg* and abandon our park, riverbank parkland policy in order to put a tiny development on the edge of town is to say the least puzzling.

So I'm disappointed in this development as it is been configured. I think there is potential for this development if it's done right. But what's being presented here today does not in any way meet my criteria for smart development and I won't be supporting it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement on the clause.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I seldom speak to rezonings in other Councillor's wards too except I happen to have been one of the Councillors at the Community Committee meeting and I heard some comments and I heard the word negligent Mr. Speaker. That's not a word that I think that I've ever used to, on one of my colleagues and I, I think it's frankly right on the edge.

When we have a Community Committee meeting, first of all when we're elected we are charged with going to those meetings and adjudicating those meetings based on the information that we have in front of us Mr. Speaker. That's the first thing.

The first thing that happens Mr. Speaker when somebody makes an application for rezoning is that that application is sent to all of the departments in the City of Winnipeg and under the development parameters they get a timeframe to report back and it's somewhere in the four to six week range for them, as far as I remember.

When they report back the Associated Coordinating Group then takes those relevant requests and they create a report which is called the ACG report. We all know what that is and usually it comes to us in fashion, in a numbered fashion and it could be anywhere from eight to 80 different types of clauses associated with any number of municipal works that might be required or deemed necessary by our very capable planning people.

The process is, is that those departments work through the Planning department. And when we have a meeting like that, the person who comes would either be a Chris Torpey or an Ernie Carriere, somebody of that nature; those are the people that work in that department. The individual departments don't come Mr. Speaker unless they are asked to be there. If you had a very specific problem with Public Works and you requested somebody from Streets and Transportation, they'll send somebody. If you had a very specific initiative associated with Police or Fire or Paramedics and you requested somebody to be there, then they would be

there. And if you didn't, then they wouldn't be there because they've already made their requests through the ACG Mr. Speaker. That's the process. So what happened here?

When the applicant made his first attempt at this, and put his application in, he had one access, down Manitou Road. That's all he thought, I guess, that he needed or their conglomerate of decision-making people.

The fact of the matter is however, is when the ACG report is created they get a copy of it. Which is only right because they have to come in and they have to make their points because they might not think that they should put a sidewalk somewhere or plant a tree somewhere. And sometimes we go along with them on those things and sometimes we don't based on what type of a subdivision that it is because that's the way that the process works.

When they came into that meeting they brought a different drawing than the one that we originally had had, that showed the change with the second access. And it was an access for emergency vehicles, which was the important access component of this.

And I might point out to you, I represent Whyte Ridge. When I started representing Whyte Ridge there were about a thousand homes there. There was one access off of Kenaston Boulevard and there was over a thousand homes. One access. About that time we had about 1,600 homes we finally paved Brady Road, way on the outskirts, which gave a few people over west of the tracks another way out. But frankly, it was a long way around. And finally, this summer, over 20 years after the subdivision started, we put an access out to McGillivray Boulevard. How did all that happen? How did all that happen?

Anybody been to Royalwood? Where is the second access? There is only one it's called Shorehill. It comes out on to Bishop Grandin. I don't know of another access into Royalwood. I think there is two into Island Lakes, there might be another one but I'm not aware of frankly that connects back over to Island Lakes somehow now but it didn't, it's coming. Yeah it's coming but it's not there. But my point is, is that the subdivision is huge in comparison to this, that's all.

Bottom line is, is that we had a new drawing in front of us. That's what we had. And so we made changes to the ACG report which is our job Mr. Speaker. Not negligent. You have to change it to reflect what the drawing is. The drawing clearly showed another access out, they explained how it got out towards the Perimeter Highway and it was paved. And that's what we did. We made those changes.

The only change that I'm aware of that happened, I mean there might be another one and Councillor De Smedt can speak to it, the only amendment I'm aware of that was made at the Standing Committee Mr. Speaker, was that when we made our motions, there is another street to the north that runs by a church and comes out near the water stand and out near Chapel Lawn, that had been requested to be paved. Well, there was no need to pave it. It's external to the subdivision. It's got nothing to do with the subdivision whatsoever. It's got nothing to do with access for emergency vehicles. They come down the Perimeter and are right in and they are right into the subdivision and same thing on their way out.

And we suggested that that wasn't necessary in the Community Committee meeting, which is where we make our recommendations. And for whatever reason, when we made that recommendation it didn't get changed. And it got picked up at the Property Committee which is why they review things there, for that very purpose.

As far as transit goes, I don't know what the future will be for that type of thing, and it may very well be that some day in the future somebody in there may request transit. It may be that there is other things that happen. God knows what's going to happen with Headingley, as far as that goes with those types of things in

the future. They're developing all around out there.

But I will say this, and I'm going to go right back to areas that I represented. When I started representing Linden Woods there was no transit. There was none in Whyte Ridge either. And I think in south St. Vital we had a dart service. That's what we had over there. So this is not a new thing where we don't have initial transit service into a subdivision. It's just the way that it is with some of them.

And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and there is all kinds of areas to the south of me where we don't have any transit service either. I mean it must be nice to represent a ward where you've got it running around every regional street on all four sides of you and I guess that's really great and that type of thing. But the reality is if there are people who live on McCreary Road; of course they knew when they bought on McCreary Road that there wasn't any transit service, but of course that would be information. Do you think these people aren't going to figure that out before they buy a house there? I mean that's just majoring in the minors, talking about that stuff.

This issue about Fire and Paramedics not being allowed to speak, I've heard that. Nobody wasn't allowed to speak. They weren't registered to speak Mr. Chairman and we didn't have any questions of them. As a matter of fact there were four people in favour that were there. One of them lives there.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor (In Audible) moves extension. Carried.

Councillor Clement: There were four people in favour. One of them lived there, the other three were there in support of that particular gentlemen. The people that were in opposition; there were two from the Council of Women of Winnipeg and there is two others that are listed on here that must have sent letters because I know they weren't there, because they are both constituents of mine and I know who they both are and they weren't in that room.

There is one lady that I know and I know her personally and she does live there. And she was there. She didn't speak. She was called out but she didn't come up to speak. And there were three gentlemen there that are listed in here as in opposition and they weren't in opposition, they were clearly there for information. They were all from the church and they were wondering about future accesses and it was explained to them and they understood all of that type of thing. They were not in opposition to the subdivision. I was sitting there. So, I would like at least everything to be straightforward here.

This is an infill development if there ever was one and if you've got a problem with this one, then I can't wait till next month when the one from east of 59, south of the Mint comes here from Councillor Magnifico's ward and I'll watch to see how you vote on that one. Because if there was ever urban sprawl that's it on the east side of Highway 59 where there isn't any bus service by the way. Sorry Franco. Sorry, Franco. You know you want to talk about urban sprawl. You know urban sprawl if you read what urban sprawl is Mr. Chairman, is in the rural area. It's not inside Winnipeg. And it was the current government, well not the current one that sits today but it was the NDP government that created the urban limit line years ago.

In any case Mr. Speaker there is absolutely nothing wrong with this subdivision. There was nothing wrong with the way that the public hearing was conducted and everybody conducted themselves appropriately and all of the people who were there administratively clearly understood what was going on and it was done and dealt with exactly the way that every public hearing has been dealt with in the 22 years that I've sat adjudicating them Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I agree with many of the previous speakers Mr. Speaker, that this piece of property, the fact of the matter is, it was placed in *Plan Winnipeg* as a Neighbourhood Policy Area. Whether it

should have been put in *Plan Winnipeg* in the last review of *Plan Winnipeg* as a Neighbourhood Policy Area or not, I would agree with many of the previous speakers that it probably was not wise to place it in *Plan Winnipeg* as a Neighbourhood Policy Area. It should have stayed as a Rural Policy area.

This land is, it could be argued from the point of view it's infill from the historic point of view that Headingley at one time was once part of the City of Winnipeg and therefore the community of Headingley was a community that did constitute the City. But that's iffy. I think by and large it's questionable under *Plan Winnipeg* and why this was included.

But that, unfortunately now Mr. Speaker is history. It is now been made Neighbourhood Policy Area, which means under the rules of *Plan Winnipeg*, that if it is serviceable it can be developed and that's exactly the issue here. Water and Waste has indicated it can be serviceable. Streets and Transportation has indicated it can be serviceable. Mr. Speaker, the Property and Development department, though again probably if it was left to them they would have not have recommended that it would have went as a Neighbourhood Policy Area, the administration after the *Plan Winnipeg* amendment and I agree that it shouldn't have but the fact of the matter is it is now. So as long as to constitutes and meets the service requirements then it can be done. Then it can be developed.

The Fire department issue is an issue. I had talked to the Chief regarding this issue. And it was indicated to me that the response time for this development is probably about eight minutes. The ideal response time to a development or to homes in the City is four minutes. That's the ideal but if you ever look at a map of the City and you see the City or you look at any other cities I would challenge members of the Council, and you see exactly how much properties are actually subject to four minute response times or more, you'd find in a lot of cities including Winnipeg we do not have four minute or less response times to many neighbourhoods. It's just impossible to build that many fire halls and maintain a fire service where you have four minute response times everywhere, based on as a city grows and struggles.

Indeed maybe, I don't know Mr. Speaker, maybe there is in this upcoming Capital Budget money for a fire hall in the area. I don't know but the Capital Budget has been so tight around here that this process you know is starting to make Glen Murray look like Mahatma Gandhi when it comes to openness and the level of openness versus what we have now, but maybe there is a fire hall coming.

But nonetheless the Fire department's concerns are noted and what was interesting in the conversation with the Chief Mr. Speaker, is that there could be steps taken to address this such as the issue of access out onto the Perimeter. That is something that is still left up to negotiation with the Province. Frankly I'm not a big fan of having more accesses out on to the Perimeter. It drives me nuts when you drive the Perimeter Highway and you hit all these damn traffic lights everywhere. Only in Manitoba would we do something like this. But anyways maybe if there is a right in and right out allowed onto the Perimeter that would definitely address the concerns of the Fire department.

As well, the other option that was mentioned by the Chief to me, which I thought was very interesting and I think it's worth exploring, and that is the requirement for sprinkler systems. Sprinkler systems in homes and condominiums that are being developed, based on the code to date would make a huge difference if constructed in the houses and that was the comment given to me by the Chief. So I think there is room to address these. The fact of the matter is there is an emergency access out onto the Perimeter Highway and that's incorporated as part of the project.

The issue of the large lots Mr. Speaker. I think we should be building large lots to a certain degree in Winnipeg. There is definitely a market for homeowners who want to live in large lots and the fact of the matter is we're not building large lots

in Winnipeg and people are voting with their feet and they are going to other municipalities like East St. Paul or West St. Paul or what have you and we're losing a lot of those homeowners that would have normally, possibly lived in Winnipeg, if they had the option to purchase large lots. Is a majority of the market going to buy large lots? Absolutely not. The vast majority cannot afford large lots but there is a minority of the population that can afford large lots and that would take that option if they had it and this is supplying it.

And talking about *Plan Winnipeg* Mr. Speaker, *Plan Winnipeg* also talks about the importance of the sustainability of neighbourhoods and the sustainability of communities. And so therefore I'm somewhat sympathetic to the Councillor of the area who is attempting to make something happen in his community because he also sees it as an issue of sustainability in his community and an issue of regeneration of his community. And *Plan Winnipeg* speaks to that and the regeneration that needs to happen in communities and so I think he is trying to achieve that.

I note with interest that the development, 95 acres, has approximately, well according to this, 16% of the lands are set aside for parks and open spaces but based on the calculation of the acreages that I see before us here, that are set aside as open space and park, it works out to more like 33 or 34 acres which is like a third of park space. I think that's extremely generous. I know I've brought subdivisions from in my ward forward and they've been shot down by the Committee because they've had too much park space and it's interesting this one has quite a bit more park space than anything I've seen lately. So this seems to be very generous on the park space side of things than I've ever seen, a third of it being set aside in park.

And the fact of the matter, if you look at the aerial photograph, the forest area is what's largely being preserved in the big chunk of park space and that's why it's on the interior because that's where the forest is and you know that's what you want to preserve. As well as access to the river is still guaranteed based on the parklands being allocated here and a trail system to connect to the river and also to the forested area.

So I think based on that, Mr. Speaker one of the things that I'm glad to say that the Committee adopted the recommendation I made at the Standing Committee of Property and Development, was I saw there was a need with regards to the intersection being improved at the intersection of Camp Manitou Road and Portage Avenue. There was a requirement in the agreement for us to come to terms with Headingley with regards to maintenance agreement of upgrading Camp Manitou Road but the agreement was silent on the intersection.

And to me that was a real, if you want to talk about safety and a threat to public health or well-being, I could tell you trying to turn off a road like the Number 1 Highway in that area without any storage lanes, without any traffic lights, you know all you need is a family of four in a minivan to be making a left-hand turn to be clocked by a truck coming the other way. And, so it's crucial that there was proper intersection access and intersection improvements and upgrades.

The Standing Committee adopted that, that recommendation that I made. The Legal department took it back during the meeting. We actually set the issue aside, came back with a recommendation for wording that that has to be adopted as part of this agreement. So I think that's a major step forward in ensuring this, the services that need to be supplied to this community.

So Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Extension is moved.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. So Mr. Speaker based on what I've, what we've seen here, you know there's, it's often a challenge when you're dealing with awkward pieces of land and I know what a lot of the previous speakers on the Council floor argued, that this is suburban sprawl and whatnot. But based on the

history of the City it's questionable whether it is suburban sprawl in light of the fact that it is now a Neighbourhood Policy Area.

It is an awkward piece of land to develop there is no doubt about that, based on its configuration, based on its location. It is very difficult to develop. I don't think you could have worked out anything that could have been done differently. The economics still have to work for the private sector to make this developable and that's the challenge all the time Mr. Speaker.

And I know I've had that difficulty with infill properties in my ward. I know other Councillors have had it with regards to developing infill properties. You have to be somewhat practical when it comes to the ACG process and the Community Committee process. Our administration yes, is hired to give us their best advice and the best recommendations and that's what they have done. And I think we've lived up to the vast majority of it and we're working towards meeting the rest of it.

So, at the end of the day we also have to try to make opportunity happen in the City and I think this is a way to do it. It's a way to ensure an existing community such as St. Charles, as the Councillor has pointed out there has been no subdivision come forward in St. Charles for 30 years. This is a chance for that community to have an opportunity for some regeneration and growth and enhancement.

So I'll be supporting the clause Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. And I've done my usual trip to www.quoteland.com. Looking, I was a bit conflicted. I didn't know whether I was looking for something from George Orwell or something from Chicken Little. I'm pleased to report that "the sky is not falling" and "big brother" will not be having us all living in 25 foot lots in the middle of the inner city.

You know I have a great deal of respect for our Community Committee process and I think this particular Community Committee has the wisdom of not only the chair of Property, Planning, Property and Development, it also has the wisdom of the chair of Public Works and the wisdom of yourself Mr. Speaker. Probably some of the, well, probably the greatest seniority of Council for any Community Committee. In the world! As my good friend Councillor Steeves would say.

There are things that you know that I may not agree with in this particular development but I do you know, look at the process that has been had here. You know I listened to some of the arguments about *Plan Winnipeg.* I think Councillor Wyatt alluded to some of the other things that *Plan Winnipeg* said. It also talks about the creation of protection of unique character neighbourhoods and there are many other examples in *Plan Winnipeg* that you can use to justify a development of this nature.

I wanted to speak particularly and this may have been touched on a bit already, on the dual or in this case triple access argument; access and egress argument into communities. The purpose of this is for emergency access. It's not to have paved access for residents to come and go on. It really is to address the need for emergency vehicles to get into a community; if one access is blocked the secondary access is available.

And I sat through the Property and Development listening to the comments that were brought forward and I'm very comfortable in saying that you know, a great deal of diligence has been done by the area Councillor in this particular case. And indeed, that you know, the burden has been met here. This development meets the need for access and egress and addresses the concern for emergency vehicles.

I'd like to ask Councillor De Smedt in his summation or response to address the riverbank issue. Though I know in *Plan Winnipeg* we speak about the need to acquire riverbanks as they become available. And I've seen on a couple of occasions in the Riel Community Committee where we started to drift away

from that a little bit because of liability issues or the assumption of the stabilization issues that come with the riverbank. So I'd like to hear some comments from Councillor De Smedt in that regard.

I also want to just make comment that the respect of the Community Committee's and the area Councillor's knowledge, you know. When the Standing Policy Committee, we have in the Riel Community Committee we have coming before us sometime in the near future the Waverley West subdivision. And the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development was very straightforward in its recommendation with Waverley West, that it recommended that the Riel Community schedule a public hearing in accordance with the Development Procedures By-law of the City of *Winnipeg Charter*.

And you know, I can only assume that their wisdom there was ensuring that the local Councillor and the members of the Community Committee have the ability to bring the local knowledge to the table, to further it on to Property and Development and further it on to Executive Policy Committee; because our vision for development in the Riel Community Committee may not be the same as the vision for development at the Assiniboia Community Committee.

So I'll leave you with that and again I won't be supporting the clause as I see it is in keeping with *Plan Winnipeg.* And just in closing I will read another administrative recommendation, and that is: "the development is consistent with *Plan Winnipeg* and its encouragement of low intensity residential uses, mixed residential, environmental stewardship and providing a full range of municipal infrastructure."

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Your time is up Councillor. Thank you Mr. Speaker. Well to touch on some of the things that have been said in the chamber, moments ago, I found the quotes particularly interesting. You won't notice the sky is falling, Mr. Speaker or if anyone including your big brother is watching if your head is stuck in the ground or in some other unflattering place.

There is nothing wrong with the development per se. It looks like an orderly development of houses and who wouldn't want to live along a riverbank? But the fact is Mr. Speaker it's the wrong place and the wrong time. If Chief Peguis Trail as an example was talked about in 1969 prior to Unicity and still hasn't been contemplated in a real tangible sense now over 30 years down the line, then certainly the demand for this development could be put on the backburner.

Now, with all due respect to the previous speakers and the excitement that I would be sharing for them if indeed St. James or St. Charles was in need of more residential development, I for one, based on my analysis of *Plan Winnipeg,* don't believe that there is a significant need for residential development in that area. And to consider this infill development Mr. Speaker is hard to take seriously when this development is occurring nearly halfway between here and Portage La Prairie.

I did read the *Plan Winnipeg* policy that was articulated in the report, and it's here on page 32, it's 3B-01, Promote Vibrant Neighbourhoods, and it does support the intent "the City shall promote vibrant neighbourhoods by encouraging and accommodating within new and existing developments a variety of compatible and mixed uses including:" And as one of the policies, Low-Intensity Residential Uses, it passes a test but it fails on the second one: "Low-intensity ancillary uses such as local commercial, educational, recreational, religious and institutional uses at a scale and density compatible with, and necessary to support, low-intensity residential development, and in recognition of traffic flows related to these uses." And I could go on. That it's in complete contravention to "high-intensity residential development and ancillary uses on sites adjacent to major traffic or transit corridors" and etcetera, etcetera.

In fact going through this document Mr. Speaker, in about half an hour, and this is a very conservative, a very conservative analysis, I found at least 30 contraventions to our very recent *Plan Winnipeg* document within this proposed development. And you only have to read as far as, if reading a long document is tiresome and boring, you only have to read as far as the introduction and consider the principles upon which this document was founded.

And the first principle is "Sustainability - making certain that the choices available for future generations are not impaired by decisions made today." Well it seems to me that emergency services and their inability to access this development might be a very immediate impact if this development was to proceed never mind 10, 20, 50 years down the road.

For example this means committing to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Ah! So public transit may have a role to play in that. Making decisions that do not compromise the environment. I read into that the preservation of the riverbank and also the greenhouse gas reduction and recognizing that long term goals are more important than short term gains. Now the developers might not agree on that final point but certainly we as stewards of the public trust should be putting this principle foremost in any decision that we make.

Then there is "Thoughtful development - evaluating the costs and benefits of development proposals." That hasn't been done in this particular, in this particular report Mr. Speaker. I don't have an analysis of what the property values might be or the value of the houses might be or what the contribution to the tax roll might be, or what the cost of the infrastructure and maintenance of the infrastructure now and out to 30 years from now might be, taking into consideration the change in the net present value of the dollar between now and 2030. None of that analysis has been provided in this report.

And it goes on to say "the intent is to take maximum advantage of existing infrastructure through increased densities and compact form, to commit to inner city revitalization and heritage conservation, and to provide integrated transportation options." And there are six principles Mr. Speaker and I've only touched on two of them because I found that they were the most pertinent to this particular case.

And if I go on Mr. Speaker and I won't bore you beyond the eight minutes that I'm allowed to speak here on this development proposal but the first one that really strikes home is the "Promote Orderly Development". And that's policy 3A-02. This fails on two counts here. It doesn't in particular identify those areas of the City that are governed by secondary plans and this ties into promoting compact urban forum where it fails on all five out of five policies there.

The one that's probably most pertinent is "Approving new residential, commercial, and industrial subdivisions only where there is a reasonable relationship between the supply of land and the projected demand when a full range of municipal infrastructure can be provided in an environmentally sound, economical, and timely manner."

Now, again, development is exciting and I don't think St. James or St. Charles has been void of development, it's just been a different kind of development. If you look at the commercial development, the redevelopment of Unicity, the big box development around Polo Park, the redevelopment of our airport and the industrial development that surrounds the airport, there has been a lot of exciting development around St. Charles and St. James that Winnipeggers and those wards can be very proud of. And they all contribute to the tax base of Winnipeg as does any development whether it's in the inner city or whether it's in Transcona, Elmwood, North Kildonan. That's why we created Unicity in the first place so that St. James and St. Charles wouldn't have to be dependent on their own development plans at the expense of the rest of the City, especially when it comes to trying to maintain our shared infrastructure.

It fails on two counts of "integrating land use, urban design and transportation planning, encouraging mixed use development to minimize travel distances for basic needs and ensuring that all residential development supports the provision of efficient, attractive cost effective transit service through appropriate design considerations." That's pretty obvious.

It fails on three out of five in Policy 3B-02, "Guide the Development of New and Existing Residential Areas". In fact what's interesting about this development Mr. Speaker is that it fails to be guided by a Secondary Plan and although it is zoned neighbourhood if you went out there, it's no more a neighbourhood area than any other farm field surrounding Winnipeg or any other undeveloped land. It's grassland. It's some farming and it's bush along the riverbank.

So to look at a Policy Plate and say well by golly we designated it a neighbourhood we don't really need a *Plan Winnipeg* amendment, we don't really need a secondary plan because all we're doing is rezoning, is a false assumption in this case. And my concern is that without a secondary plan how is this development going to tie into future developments? And we see that problem all the time. What if a hog plant wants to set up next to this development and it's not articulated in the secondary plan. Certainly there is enough room out there. It's on a major transportation route. It's close to Brandon, close to Winnipeg. Why not a hog plant out there Mr. Speaker? Without a secondary plan we don't know what's coming next.

And again, I'm slowly running out of time here and there is an awful lot of ground to cover because just about the entire *Plan Winnipeg* has been, has been ignored in trying to find one or two policies that support this development which are taken completely out of context. Because as we read a policy statement there are sub policy statements that are there to balance the overall over arching policy statement and that's what *Plan Winnipeg* attempts to do.

But to sit here and fool ourselves into believing that this has *Plan Winnipeg's* support because it contributes to vibrant and lively neighbourhoods, is exactly that Mr. Speaker, it's sticking our head in the sand and ignoring the information that's before us. And *Plan Winnipeg* for all intent and purposes receive knowledge, this isn't a new document. We've had this document, all of us, in our offices for some years now and I think it's important that we use *Plan Winnipeg* and the policy decisions that Council has made in order to, in order to weigh the decisions especially decisions like this, and analyze them and determine whether or not this is the best decision at the best time.

And although as far as the developers are concerned it is making the highest and best use of the land, that's not necessarily our goal to achieve their financial or commercial objectives. And you know ultimately what we need to do is put on our City Councillor hats and use the policies that we've worked hard to develop and that we use in order to provide a predictable, orderly kind of development in our City. One that makes sense and one that isn't compromised in the future with developments that have competing interests or at the very worst, developments that are working at cross-purposes to each other, like our residential development beside a hog plant or beside some other industrial or commercial use that ultimately doesn't compliment it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you your time has expired Councillor.

Councillor Lubosch: It has expired. Well, then in a very short close Mr. Speaker, I regret that I will not be able to support what could otherwise be an exciting development proposal for the reasons that I have articulated in *Plan Winnipeg*. It's in could complete contravention to our plan.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor De Smedt closing debate on the clause.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I also am shocked by some of the observations that are raised here

today. So where are we starting and I think it's at the beginning.

First of all let me address Councillor Wyatt's observations on land dedication of park space. I think if you understand the context the reason there is a 16% land dedication park space is because there were sensitive lands. There has been an inventory of sensitive lands and river bottom forest lands and some forest area within City lands that are part of this aggregation. And because I think it's important when we deal with sensitive lands that we have not a policy of regulation where we impose something and cannot expect private sector lands to evolve, we have a policy of collaboration.

And so for some time the City and our parks planning people and the developer with the assistance of a high quality landscape architect have worked diligently to try and find a balance, and that's why there is that large element of contribution. I'm glad you pointed it out that 16% seemed small but in terms of, it's probably more than that, because it was so important that we recognize those valuable lands and that we consider the repair and interest that have to take place there.

And so the developer was quite pleased and quite anxious to make sure we satisfy that. He didn't need a fight on his hands. It wasn't trying to maximize every last foot of property to make profit on this but to make it a high-quality evolution that respects the kind of natural fauna and flora that are in the area.

Councillor Swandel I thank you for your observation. You should know that the private lands that are there on Assiniboine are going to be adjacent to some publicly accessible lands to the river and the private lands are going to have a conservation easement which will be permanently caveated on the property from owner to owner to owner in perpetuity that will protect the trees and what can built on that site and there will be obviously the opportunity for some access. So you really have to understand that there has been a huge movement by the private owner to make sure that we consider all matters related to the public interest here.

You know, it is really sad that we try to look at some of our documentation as a trump card that kills everything else. *Plan Winnipeg* and we discussed this when we approved this at Council meeting in September of 2000. Our central, very strong guidelines. There is no trump card in every policy issue in there about what will or will not happen. The policy plates are a little more instructive. And I think we're intended to use that with some common sense and practicality and with the ability to discern what's important not just to the community but to the City at large.

So it's for this reason I also say that, you know, these prophets of doom and gloom, these mistresses of misery, these mavens of incumbent privilege coming and saying "you cannot ever do this in that area. It's ex-urban growth. It's sprawl." Sprawl has received the most erroneous title that I think that has ever been ever applied because of this academic thought that any time you go a little bit beyond your immediate community it's sprawl. The history of Europe is sprawl. The history of North America is sprawl. There is nothing wrong with sprawl provided one understands that it's a natural evolution.

Now I'm not a proponent that I'm going to say I want everybody else to have five SUV's in the garage and you can live out in Portage and come down and work in Winnipeg, though I did spend part of career traveling from Winnipeg to Portage La Prairie because my family is in one area and my career took me elsewhere. Yeah it was 160 kilometres a day of travel. You have to do what you have to do sometimes.

The fact is, is that you know this attitude that we have that anytime we're going to grow a little bit further is incorrect because it isn't infill development, is such an erroneous one that it leads us down a garden path I think of stagnation. And if there is ever, somehow we can call ourselves to be in a cons debated position for evolving our City that would be it.

You know let's talk about infill development in the area. I find it very instructive that the City Centre Community Committee has rejected an infill development very recently without any instruction.

Councillor Clement: Move extension.

Councillor De Smedt: Without any instruction back to the developer to give them an alternative plan. They just killed it.

I know I don't have any extensions allowed that's a shame. Too bad, too sad. It is too bad and too sad. I've really heard a lot of very negative comments. We are not negligent in our duties here and I thank those who've spoken up in support, sometimes we are not always on the same path. Thank you for that. This is not a negligent development. This is a very prophetic one for our City. We're in competition with others. It gives balance and it gives a high quality evolution that will contribute to this City and to our quality of life.

To answer one last, I do have to answer, Mr. Speaker, I do apologize I have to go on because we can't leave it hanging on the record. The emergency access requirements by Paramedics and Fire. They need to have one major access. They would prefer to have two. This is not a code that trumps development throughout the City. That is their preference in the report. It is not, you can point all you want Mr. Benham, it is not a trump card. It is not a code of compliance. They have one major access that's paved. They'll have a secondary access that allows them to get into the site for emergency vehicles.

Councillor Gerbasi: Can we all have a few more minutes then? Like this is…

Mr. Speaker: Okay, I have to bring it to a close Councillor. So that's…

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much. Yes, I'm sure you would like to have all sorts of time you took 12 minutes. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I encourage you all to support what is a very logical evolution. Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote please.

Mr. Speaker: Okay on clause 2 all in favour of the clause please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Benham, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Smith, Thomas.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 5.

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor De Smedt,
Seconded by Councillor Magnifico,

WHEREAS on December 14, 2005, Council adopted Item 23 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated November 29, 2005, and amended Zoning Agreement Caveat No. 86-133631 under File ZAA 13/2005 (DAZ 276/86) for property commonly known as 15 Jean Louis Road by amending Clause 2 to read "no new dwellings or accessory structures (excluding fences) shall be constructed on the land within fifty (50) feet of the St. Mary's Road right-of-way";

AND WHEREAS the application was advertised not to permit accessory structures within sixty (60) feet of the St. Mary's Road right-of-way;

AND WHEREAS the administrative report contained a typographical error in the recommendation so that it made reference to fifty (50) feet rather than the advertised sixty (60) feet and this error was perpetuated from Community Committee through to Council;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council reconsider Item 23 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated November 29, 2005;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council rescind a portion of its decision with respect to Item 23 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated November 29, 2005, by deleting the words "fifty (50) feet" in line 3 of Recommendation No. 1 and substituting therefore the words "sixty (60) feet so that Recommendation No. 1 reads as follows:

1. That Zoning Agreement Caveat No. 86-133631 under File DAZ 276/86 dated September 24, 1986, (By-law No. 4447/86) be amended by rewording Clause 2 to read "no new dwellings or accessory structures (excluding fences) shall be constructed on the land within sixty (60) feet of the west limit of the existing St. Mary's Road right-of-way."

Mr. Speaker: We have one motion under this Committee, Motion No. 1, which I think we want to deal with today. It's an amendment or a correction to a clause that was passed in November.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Yes it is.

Mr. Speaker: Moved by Councillor De Smedt, seconded by Councillor Magnifico. Taken as read.

All in favour? Opposed? That's carried.

By-laws Councillor De Smedt.

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

Councillor De Smedt: Just allow me a moment Mr. Speaker to get my thing up to date here.

Mr. Speaker I would like to move that By-laws 3/2006 to 9/2006 both inclusive, 11/2006 to 15/2006 both inclusive, 17/2006, 23/2006, 28/2006, 29/2006, 31/2006 and 32/2006, be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Opposed Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 3/2006, 4/2006, 5/2006, 6/2006, 7/2006, 8/2006, 9/2006, 11/2006, 12/2006, 13/2006, 14/2006, 15/2006, 17/2006, 23/2006, 28/2006, 29/2006, 31/2006, and 32/2006.

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker I would move that By-laws No. 3/2006 to 9/2006 both inclusive, 11/2006 to 15/2006 both inclusive, 17/2006, 23/2006, 28/2006 and 29/2006, 31/2006 and 32/2006, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 3/2006 to 9/2006, 11/2006 to 15/2006 inclusive, and 17/2006, 23/2006, 28/2006, 29/2006, 31/2006 and 32/2006.

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker I would move that the rule be suspended and that By-laws numbered 3/2006 to 9/2006 both inclusive, 11/2006 to 15/2006 both inclusive, 17/2006, 23/2006, 28/2006 and 29/2006, 31/2006 and 32/2006, 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 Property and Development? None. Standing Committee on Protection and Community Services, Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JANUARY 9, 2006

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, regarding the report of January 9th, 2006, I'll introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent agenda, item number 1.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES MOTIONS

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

WHEREAS the Winnipeg Police Service (WPS) Operation Clean Sweep began in November 2005 and was announced to be a temporary project that would be evaluated toward the end of a 90 day period;

AND WHEREAS the WPS has recently reported the success of Operation Clean Sweep since its beginning on November 21st, 2005, with statistical data of 257 arrests, the seizure of drugs, and over 1000 spot checks, just to name a few examples;

AND WHEREAS the WPS has reorganized resources such as reassigning officers from other districts in order to make Operation Clean Sweep possible;

AND WHEREAS to have a lasting positive impact, it is crucial to keep the pressure on organized crime, the gangs, and those involved in the drug trade;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that resources be directed to the WPS to establish Operation Clean Sweep as a permanent unit of the Winnipeg Police Service;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these necessary resources directed to the WPS shall be above and beyond the existing police resources and complement, so as to ensure that the WPS is not placed in the position of reassigning officers from existing police districts or units.

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

We have a Motion, Motion No. 5, moved by Councillor Wyatt would be an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee.

By-laws, Councillor Steek. I'm sorry, Councillor Steeves.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Steeves: By your position as chair of the Secretariat Committee, that concerns me. (laughter)

I'll move that By-law No. 30/2006 be read the first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 30/2006.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-law No. 30/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 30/2006.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 30/2006 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 the Protection Committee? Councillor Wyatt.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the chair. In light of the fact that it has now become clear that there is a serious cost overrun with regards to the four district Police model that was adopted by Council two years ago, with regards to the construction of the new mega-stations. And the fact that the, all the assumptions made in the original report that Council voted on and adopted have been thrown out the window because of the fact that these costs now do not justify any longer even if there still are which is debatable, any savings due to retirement or attrition through the merger of the districts. Is it being contemplated or is it at least being considered or being reviewed on whether or not we should at this point proceed with the four district model or whether or not we should be looking at other options which are more cost effective and community based?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Definitely components of the four district model are being considered ongoing and there is always discussion of it. I think by in large there still is the idea of the four district model moving forward with the first station.

I'll tell you what Mr. Speaker if it pleases Councillor Wyatt I'd be prepared to provide an update from the service as to the four district model in a reasonable amount of detail and if that doesn't suffice I can try to get more.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the chair for getting back to me on my other previous questions as well.

The follow-up question Mr. Speaker is based on the recent decision by Council to allocate more funds there is a sign sitting out on the road saying "Coming in 2006 the Four District Model New Mega Police Station." Could you, maybe if you can't supply us today take it under advisement and get back to the Council Mr. Chairman, with regards to what exactly the new, the cost overruns are as of now and when would we foresee construction beginning?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I can get you the costing information and the type of…

Mr. Speaker: Will you take it as notice?

Councillor Steeves: Sure.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Final supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. And on that, is there any review or consideration being given to the option in light of the cost overruns to continuing with the six district model and looking at renovations of existing buildings such as the district office on Provencher and the one on Plessis or on Pandora I should say, that would be far more cost effective in light of these new cost overruns. Is that something that's being considered?

Councillor Steeves: Well Mr. Speaker actually if I recall correctly I think those type of calculations were kind of the calculations that lead us to the four district model in the first place. The idea of the renovations of existing Police infrastructure wouldn't be cost efficient so a four district model might make more sense in the longer term. This all fortuitously I think that information is probably fairly readily available and is part and parcel of what I am going to provide to Councillor Wyatt. I'm certain that a lot of that information will be available.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Any other questions?

Infrastructure and Public Works, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED JANUARY 12, 2006

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker I'm pleased to move the minutes of the Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated January the 12th and move items 1 and 2 as Consent items.

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

We have no By-laws. Is there any questions of Public Works? Councillor Wyatt. Don't you have a home to go to?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: The question I have is pertaining to the fact that we have almost $12 million dollars of Capital dollars coming, that have already flowed from we heard earlier today, flowed to the City with regards to the gas tax.

It is the understanding of myself and other Councillors that the money has to be spent of course on wastewater and transit but the understanding is that with the Federal government that then we can move money from wastewater investment over then to the account with regards to infrastructure improvement.

When will we know, since it's out of 2005 item, when will Council find out and know what options, what recommendations the administration has made with regards to regional streets or residential streets to be contemplated for improvement under that $12 million dollars? When will we find out that information and exactly what the administration has recommended?

Councillor Clement: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Wyatt, we will find that out when Executive Policy Committee presents this draft Capital Budget.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: So if I'm understanding correctly that the 2005 amount will be rolled into the 2006 Capital Budget based on the fact that we are getting $11, $12 million this year and roughly $12 million, or $12 million last year. So it's actually now a total of $24 million, correct?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: The actual number Mr. Speaker is $23, 238,000 and yes it would be rolled in.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you and that will be Mr. Speaker, will that be on and above the $5 million that was cut out of the Capital Budget as part of the need to balance the Budget last year? Will that $5 million be coming forward or will that be $23 million minus $5 million?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: That's not actually the bailiwick of Public Works, that's the part of the Budget and the Budget comes from Executive Policy Committee and will be addressed when the draft Budget comes out.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Any thing else?

Councillor Pagtakhan moves adjournment.

Roll Call.

ROLL CALL

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

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 2:45 P.M.