COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday May 24, 2006

The Council met at 9:33 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 Thomas.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to ask the galleries no demonstrations are permitted in the galleries, please. Councillor Thomas would you lead us in the opening prayer. Would all Members of Council and the gallery please rise.

ROLL CALL

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

MINUTES

Councillor Lubosch moves the Minutes of the meeting held on April 26, 2006 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: I'd like to introduce our pages who will be working with us during today's sitting: We have Elaine Manipol who attends Kildonan East Collegiate lives in Transcona and we have Michael Dwilow of Fort Richmond Collegiate who lives in St. Norbert Ward. Welcome and thank you for being with us today.

On guests and announcements, Mayor Katz, you have some special guests to introduce.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to recognize Kevin Peacock, President, Municipal Information Systems Association Canada together with Chris Fisher, Vice President of Municipal Information Systems Association Prairie Chapter who will be presenting the Peter Bennett Award, an award for the volunteer who has made an outstanding contribution to the municipal information technology environment in Canada, and I'll turn it over and welcome you, thank you.

Kevin Peacock: Thank you Mayor Katz, Members of City Council and guests, I would really like to thank you for giving us the opportunity to make this presentation at the council meeting. Peter Bennett was a dear friend of ours and we definitely do miss him.

I'll have to give a little bit of background on MISA Canada just to put it in context. We have a number of MISA chapters in Canada and Ontario and B.C., fairly large, fairly powerful and tended to do things their own way. There's no single voice for municipalities across Canada. A number of years ago, probably about six, I met Peter at a Lac Carling Conference in Saint-Sauveur, Quebec and we started talking about the need to have a single voice for municipalities across Canada so we could start getting our rightful place and because sort of equal with the other levels of government from I think a perspective and a service read perspective. Now, Peter had this dream of MISA Canada and a number of other like minded fellows got together and we formed an interim committee a couple years back to develop MISA Canada.

The organization was formed and launched at the Lac Carling this year, the tenth anniversary and so now we're official. We have representation all over Canada. Peter was instrumental in getting the MISA Prairie Chapter established.

He was the first president of MISA Prairies and also helped us get the MISA Atlantic Canada Chapter going. So, as an organization we decided we wanted to create an award where we could recognize somebody's contributions to municipal IT and based on Peter's untimely death we figured this was a really quick way to honour and recognize somebody whose heart and soul is in municipal IT. He loved the municipal environment and we felt he wanted to promote it and make sure it had its rightful place like I said earlier. So we created the

Peter Bennett Award and at our board meeting we had unanimous approval to make Peter Bennett the first recipient of this award.

I mean, he was on the public sector CIO Council. He was the co-chair of the Lac Carling Conference and as I say dedicated many years to moving the message forward that we wanted. So we tended to feel we were ignored by more senior levels of government. I'm sure the rest of municipalities feel the same way in their lines of business and we believe municipalities need to be taken up to the top and maybe we need to drive some things. So part of what Peter did was help us achieve that and we would like to make a presentation to his wife Renate on his behalf, and which it is, is the Peter Bennett award for 2005.

So I would like Renate to come forward please.

(Applause)

Renate Bennett: Thank you, Kevin, Chris, Mayor Katz, Council members and guests. We recently marked the first anniversary of my husband Peter's sudden passing May 12th. Many of you worked with Peter on different projects of the city. Those of you who knew him well knew that he was someone always willing to jump in to help.

He was committed to providing the best IT services available surrounding himself with good people who shared his vision. The work he did with MISA was only one example of his willingness to get involved. He certainly talked about the importance of the organization and bringing together different municipalities. He also often spoke of the dedicated people with whom he worked on various committees stressing that it was the strength of these individuals that made all their meetings so successful.

This award is a great honour not only for Peter but also for those other individuals who will one day receive it. We are very proud to accept this award on Peter's behalf. Thank you.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Peter Bennett was a good friend and colleague to many of us, and he's still missed here so very much appreciate that.

Councillor Lubosch will move the minutes of the last meeting, taken as read and confirmed. All in favour, Opposed? Carried and Councillor Magnifico will move that the communications that were received too late to be placed on the agenda be received as information, all in favour. Opposed? Carried.

Just before we proceed, our rules do not permit signage of any sort in the Council Chamber during meetings, but although they're silent on articles of clothing, I would ask that in respect to the rules that all of those wearing aprons please respect our rules and remove them immediately please and at the same time those signs at the back, if they could be removed it would be appreciated. Thank you very much for that. Please remove it. Thank you.

DELEGATIONS

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, I have four delegations with regards to the delegations this morning.

Mr. Speaker: I believe we had reached some general agreement to have five speakers per side, Councillor, on the subject of Council's decision obviously. But, can I just finish please.

Councillor Wyatt: Sure.

Mr. Speaker: I was under the understanding yesterday that there was some general agreement to have five speakers in favour and five in opposition with the first two, of course who are registered under the rules and the other three to have five minutes each with no questions and I had the understanding that's what had been arranged but is there something different?

Councillor Wyatt: Well Mr. Speaker, I have moved suspension of the rules to consider the individual Jon Gerrard, Madeline Downie, Ed Schinewald and

Fred Horbaty, talking about four individuals.

Mr. Speaker: Four, Is there agreement to hear four on the other side, on both sides? Alright we'll do it that way. I'm sorry, no, not for the final four. What was the last name?

Councillor Wyatt: Fred Horbaty.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Okay, appearing first in support of the motion that was tabled at the last meeting we have Mr. Craig Sangster and Mr. Jim Stevenson who have been registered with the clerk. Mr. Sangster you will be allowed ten minutes and Mr. Stevenson five minutes and then any questions for those two. Thank you, Mr. Sangster.

Craig Sangster: Good morning, Your Worship, Councillors, administrators and guests. My name is Craig Sangster and I'm here to address the motion to rescind approval for the OlyWest financial package as chairperson for the St. Boniface Industrial Park OlyWest Opposition Group.

Let me start by saying that after many months of being immersed in this very divisive issue it has become abundantly clear that you have been misled. You were told this hog slaughtering and rendering plant would add 1,100 jobs to the City of Winnipeg. The fact is you will not be adding 1,100 jobs. You will be trading for them.

The fact is 1,100 jobs in trade for at least as many clean, less hazardous, higher skilled and in many cases higher paying jobs. VITA Health is an example, a pharmaceutical company that has been a part of Winnipeg for 77 years. Started as a small family run company that has grown quietly over the years to a point where we now employ almost 400 people with plans to grow fourfold over the next five years.

A good neighbour, a good corporate citizen and a good employer, all those many years, now on the brink of being forced to leave should this hog slaughtering and rendering plant be built in this location. And many local suppliers like Quintex, Richard's Packaging and dozens more will lose our business as a result. One of our strategic suppliers from Ontario had been making plans to set up shop in the park with the knowledge that this plant was being built, they have said they will not come.

The new job the Province appeared at our news conference to tell how the construction of this plant will severely put at risk the opportunity for a large pharmaceutical company from India to locate in Winnipeg.

A local realtor has told us recently he had a prospective buyer walk away from a deal for purchase of property in the park because of this issue. The St. Boniface Industrial Park largest proper manager Sunex has already lost business over this proposed plant and has told us no less than 50% of their tenants are strongly opposed to this plant with many considering their options including moving from the area and Sunex, as you may have seen in the paper this morning, has just provided a 1 million dollar retainer to legal council to launch proceedings against all those responsible for present and future lost business.

You are misled. The construction of this hog slaughtering plant in this location will hurt existing business and employment and severely diminish future business and employment opportunities.

Last time we appeared before Council we were asked for the science. I stated at that time that the very fact you were asking for it was of grave concern to us. We have since provided you with it recognizing it represents only a small portion of what's available, but the point is that on this issue as well you were misled.

We know this because you had to ask for it. We know this because city officials have told us on several occasions our research was way ahead of theirs. We know this because city officials confirmed that the vast majority of the information that they gave to you to make your decision last November was provided by OlyWest and the Manitoba Pork Council and with all due respect that's a lot like

going to the tobacco industry and depending on them as your only source of information to determine if smoking is bad for your health.

You were misled into believing you had all of the information needed to make your decision when at best you have half, and then shortly after your November vote you and the rest of City Council were misled by what has now become known as the infamous Franco Magnifico smell test.

Shortly you will hear the truth behind that trip and realize beyond any doubt, you and the rest of us and Mr. Magnifico were misled.

Finally and perhaps most importantly you were misled to believe that this was a deal that was best kept completely quiet until it was all done. No need for public consultation, no need for business consultation, no research beyond that provided to you by the very group that wants to locate that plant in that location and when a spokesman for the Manitoba Pork Council was asked on this very floor why all the secrecy, his response was when these things are made public ahead of time they tend not to go through. Go figure. And now it gets even worse.

Now we're informed by the city that the city is racing to begin finalizing contracts with OlyWest starting on the 29th of this month. Again in secrecy, again behind closed doors, but this time there's a difference because it's with full knowledge of the concerns and opposition voiced by an ever growing number of citizens and businesses in this city and how can you be signing contracts when Mr. Gord Steeves wrote to a constituent just last Friday and I quote, "we have no power to authorize the building of this plant in Winnipeg or anywhere else. Only the Province has that power." How then could you possibly enter legally binding agreements if you have no power.

How could even one contract be signed until that decision is made by the province? How could you be sued if you bear no responsibility? And how could you in good conscience sign these contracts in light of all that you now know.

Some Councillors have accused us of spreading misinformation. On the contrary, this has been a campaign of misinformation led by the city since the very beginning and it's clearly getting worse.

But Mr. Mayor, you have the opportunity here today to show the people of Winnipeg that you truly do have a vision for economic development in this city and a true vision for our future. Show us that you're not willing to let one business locate here by sacrificing others to achieve it. Show us that you're willing to work hard with all of the stakeholders to find a location that works for OlyWest, the city, the province and for all who live and work here both today and in the future.

As an example we propose Winnipeg Two, an agri-industrial park within the capital region where industries like OlyWest can locate and still draw upon the city's resources without putting incompatible industries at risk or harming the quality of life for Winnipeg residents, a park to attract other appropriate development for the Winnipeg region such as bio-mass bio-energy, waste management, agri-business and agri-research.

If the will is there this could happen very quickly and form a critical piece of the Winnipeg economic strategy. We could become a showpiece for the rest of the country rather than the laughing stock we are so quickly becoming over this issue now, a model for all to imitate rather than a place where incompatible industries are forced to lock horns.

Being open for business, Mr. Mayor does not mean at all costs. We support the city's efforts to attract new business development to the area. We support the city's commitment to provide economic incentives to help make it so. In fact, Vita Health, ourselves, received an economic incentive from the City of Winnipeg years ago to create new jobs.

What we are opposed to is where such incentive packages are given knowing full well they come at the expense of businesses already here. The city can

lead the way for us all and avoid dragging this on through similar future motions.

I understand there's a motion being put forward by Mr. Lazarenko this morning to hold this over and as long as sincere discussion is prepared to take place about looking for a new locations, we would agree with that.

There's a fall civic election coming up, they're CEC hearings coming up, the Provincial elections, legal challenges as you've read today in the paper, demonstrations, blockades and an increasing anger and ill will that will surely accompany this every step of the way.

Rescind this package and negotiate a new one. One that takes all sides into consideration, one that offers a true win for us all. These people will not go away. Businesses like ours fighting for our lives will not go away. Now is the time to say you are ill informed, that you have listened to the people of Winnipeg, you understand and are responsive. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Sangster. Mr. Jim Stevenson, you'll have a five minute slot.

Jim Stevenson: Hi, my name is Jim Stevenson and my home is located near the proposed OlyWest site. I just want to start off by saying that we have from the start as a concerned citizens coalition been in favour of the plant in another location. We haven't been out here saying that we're against the industry. We have always stood by that and said that you've got to put in a location where it's wanted and where it's not going to affect the lives of so many people.

I'll start by saying that in last November when I stood here I was clearly naive. I've never been a political person outside my own social group and actually believed we lived in a truly democratic country.

First of all, I have to address the perception that some people are putting out there that there is a possibility of these plants smelling. In the past six months I've been to Saint-Simeon, Quebec once and Red Deer three times and the perception is that these plants stink I'm here to tell you perception is truly reality and Guy Vaudry thank you for finally coming forward and admitting that there is a smell that will be generated throughout our neighbourhood.

I should point out both these plants are run by Olymel and they are doing everything possible to lessen the effects on the surrounding communities but slaughter houses and the surroundings stink plain and simple. There's no further trips required Franco.

Also I should point out that this industry plant is much smaller and neither of these plants have rendering. Residents of the City of Winnipeg are aware that Rothesay's rendering stinks.

We should assume that a slaughterhouse bigger than anything we've seen before in the pork industry with rendering will also stink or is that also just perception. With the facts that the plants will stink being a given and they will I would like to point out a couple of things and a few statements that have been given to me over the past six months and question whether this was a democratic decision.

Of the six elected officials in St. Boniface and Transcona, four have spoken out adamantly against this plant, one is planted firmly on the fence and even Franco has suggested that he's concerned for his constituents.

While canvassing the area concerned we found a minimum of 95% of the surrounding residents are against the location of this plant. That's not a fictitious number. There's 4,000 signatures here on, people don't ask the question should we sign, they just sign they are against this.

The majority of existing businesses within the industrial park are also against this plant. The majority of politicians, people, and businesses are against the plant. It makes you think, you know, where is this push coming from, and some people wonder why we don't trust the process?

We've told to trust the C.E.C. We trust the CEC; we just don't trust that the politicians will act on their recommendations. The past has shown us they don't and we fear the E.P.C. will deem noxious order, that's acceptable within our area.

We've been told by Councillor Swandel who voted for the plant that the preferred site was in another location and if that location would have gone ahead he would have voted against it due to the fact it's too close to some of the people that voted for him lived. I can't believe that, it blows the mind. Draw a map of the E.P.C. Councillor's locations and the areas that voted for this plant and do the math. You'll see E.P.C. is not surrounding this plant. The people that voted for this plant are not living by the plant. Why Franco's the exception to that I have no idea.

There's a few statements that may have been made directly to me that I have to repeat at this juncture. Mr. Katz, you told me I shouldn't be concerned after visiting me in my home because my home is far enough away and I already have the molting plant.

You know, does that make it okay. I'm dumbfounded by that comment, and what about the people from Mission Gardens, Southland Park and Windsor Park that live closer than I do to this plant. One of the high tech officials when questioned why they were on my street replied "we're looking for other locations and oh by the way, Jim, one's closer to your house." This was something to make me decide I don't want to fight this anymore; the City of Winnipeg is secondary to my own concerns. I don't understand that comment.

When I asked Mr. Doer if the plant goes ahead that he would think my home would devalue, his response was probably. Keep in mind they're hundreds of homes closer to this plant than mine. To the Councillor who voted against it the last time and maybe changing his vote to protect himself from legal repercussions you were elected to represent your electorate with your honest opinion and to do otherwise is disgraceful, Mr. Lazarenko. Mr. Magnifico told me and this one really caught me off guard, told me I remind him of Mayor Murray.

I couldn't figure that one out and I said how is that and he replied "you think Winnipeg something that isn't as well. We're not Toronto. We're not Montréal. We're not Vancouver. We're just an Edmonton wannabe" implying that the slaughterhouse is the best we can do and we should keep quiet about. This is a vision we're talking about in Winnipeg. These are the people that are making the decisions for us.

Finally I have to speak to Mr. Katz statement that he would not want to have to live in a city that makes decisions like this and rescinds them. I believe in a time of supposedly transparent politics and accountability. I would think it's a good thing to acknowledge your mistakes and correct them.

Vision has been a catch phrase for the proponents of this plant and my vision of this city is not another hog town and remember hindsight is 20/20. Listen to one of the strongest advocates of this plant, the Mayor of Saint-Simeon, Quebec when she was asked what she wanted to tell the City of Winnipeg. She said do not build this plant where it's windy. There's a tendency for wind to blow in our city.

The original decision to proceed with this plan in this location was wrong and it's time to acknowledge and correct it. Mr. Katz you told me that Councillors don't respond well to having a gun to their heads. You've got a stinking gun pointed at the heads and noses of thousands of the citizens of the City of Winnipeg.

Do the right thing and democratic thing and vote this down. This plant should be located in an appropriate site and turned into a win/win situation for both the people that are locked out of here and the ones that are in here. Thank you for your time and attention.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, Mr. Stevenson. Are there any questions for this group? Councillor Wyatt. Craig is right here, proceed.

Councillor Wyatt: Gentlemen, thank you for your presentations. I know you spent thousands of hours on this whole issue, probably have better things to do than this. Would you say that it is highly symbolic if not ironic that today you have a gallery packed full of the proponents of OlyWest and yet and including the Mayor of Steinbach who's here, yet the very taxpayers and citizens of our city have been pushed out, out of the Council Chamber thanks to a very strategic public relations ploy that has clearly backfired on OlyWest.

Would you agree that that's highly symbolic if not highly unfortunate.

Mr. Sangster: It's unfortunate that the process has been handled that way from the start with complete separation, because I don't think there needs to be a separation. This is something that Winnipeg has been an agriculture city for years and there's no reason that the city should have separated the people the way they did today and the way they did in the process deciding on this plant and its location.

Mr. Stevenson: It appears to be a deliberate attempt to drive the wedge deeper, and that's the tragic mistake in this. We have a model right in this province that we can all look at and that's the Brandon model with Maple Leaf, a plant that's built four kilometres outside of town, where they say it's working so well they're inviting the OlyWest venture to come out there. We're saying why can't we do that here? Why can't we find a location that meets their needs and brings that kind of economic development to this city instead of deliberately manipulating and dividing us apart further and further.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have supplementary, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, during the presentation I couldn't help but overhear a Councillor complain that a statement made I think by yourself Mr. Sangster or Mr. Stevenson that Councillor Swandel had said something to the effect that had this been built in his or proposed in his ward he could not vote and support it. Is that correct, is that a statement that was made by Councillor Swandel?

Mr. Sangster: That was at a meeting that Stephanie Haverstick and I had with Mr. Swandel at Vita Health and I would say that to some extent,

Councillor Swandel: It's not true

Mr. Sangster: I'm sorry.

Councillor Swandel: That's not true.

Mr. Speaker: Just answer the question.

Mr. Sangster: It is true.

Councillor Swandel: No, it's not. It's an outright lie.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary, Councillor Wyatt, short and to the point.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, a very interesting matter. The other question I have, I know the businesses and citizens, businesses specifically, have been trying to get a meeting with the Mayor to discuss this issue. Have you been able to get a meeting with his Worship to discuss this matter?

Mr. Stevenson: We haven't as a group. I will say one thing in Mr. Katz defence that he has been open to conversations. He's been completely unwavering on it, but he has been open to conversation privately and not as a group, no.

Mr. Sangster: For the representing the group though, the business opposition group, we had tried for several weeks working through the Mayor's Chief of Staff, Mr. Ryan Craig who initially told us that the Mayor would love to meet with us. At the end of the day we were told that the Mayor has indicated and communicated to us that if we wanted to discuss relocation there was no point in meeting because it was a done deal.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith, Councillor Smith. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: You know I would like to ask you for a comment on the Property,

Planning and Development report. It states compatibility with surrounding land use. The proposed land use is compatibility with the adjacent and surrounding land uses. Can you comment on that?

Mr. Stevenson: We're not sure we understand the question, Harvey. If it's to do with business locations surrounding the,

Councillor Smith: It's saying it's compatible with the businesses there.

Mr. Sangster: Well we can tell you that the St. Boniface Industrial Park actually and this has been kind of confused in the media and by a number of people involved in this issue is actually zoned M-2 which is for light industry, higher developed, higher technology type industries, pharmaceutical companies like Vita Health. The piece of property that sat dormant and virtually unknown to everyone until this deal came along is zoned M-3, and its right beside another area that's completely zoned differently for a different purpose. So we see that as a significant consequence for us, significant incompatibility factor in this whole issue.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have supplementary? No. Councillor Thomas. Question?

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I had the opportunity a couple of weeks ago to tour a plant that immediately to the north of the proposed location and it was a high end technological plant where I think starting salaries were something like 23 dollars an hour and it went up from there, and at the end of the tour I went out into the parking lot and was just blasted by a very strong wind coming from the south which would be directly where this plant is located. Can you tell me how often that strong wind which seemed to be in excess of 30k comes from that direction.

Mr. Stevenson: This is Winnipeg; it's windy and in the summer months especially when it's hot like this it comes right up from the south and sometimes from the southeast and sometimes from the east and then it will turn to the north and from the northwest, it moves around everybody is going to share in this.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary, Councillor Thomas?

Councillor Thomas: Yes, in your comments you said that there was a possibility of losing some jobs because they would be threatened by this plant. Can you give me an estimate of how many jobs you feel are in jeopardy at this point?

Mr. Sangster: Well, I can speak for Vita Health specifically. We had a plan to expand our existing facility. We have a five year plan to grow the business four fold. That's a fact. We have now put the plans for expansion on hold and we're looking in different parts of the country for possible acquisitions or relocation opportunities because unlike some we cannot wait for a year or two or three to make our decisions.

Business people know that are sitting here today, we can't afford that, to stay in business. So there's 400 jobs and potentially three or four times that many just from our company.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a final supplementary, Councillor Thomas?

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Finally I would like you to comment on the zoning regulations. We have very few regulations in the M-3 zoning area and could you comment on the fact that we have very few cases in which we have conditional uses or variants and just about anything is allowed in an M-3 and the impact that it has on your M-2 zoning having this there without any public inputs or regulations because it's not just something that occurs on this site. It actually impacts the surrounding community, could you comment on that?

Mr. Sangster: Well, I want to say one thing about that, and I read this in the city's own material somewhere, one of the administrators made the statement that because it's M-3 and the nature of this plant and Mr. Vaudry is always calling it a food processing plant and that's the last

step, for sure, but they have to slaughter at full capacity four and a half million hogs to get there, one of the city administrators made a comment that the St. Boniface Industrial Park M-2 zoned will make a great natural buffer to the residents of Transcona. How we became the buffer with no one giving us any prior warning is just amazing to me.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lubosch, you had a question.

Councillor Lubosch: Yes thank you Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Sangster, you had come here with a fairly reasonable proposal to look at relocating the hog plant to a location where it's not only less offensive but complimentary. Could you elaborate on that position, it seems pretty reasonable to me.

Mr. Sangster: We believe there's an opportunity here and we have been meeting with a number of individuals in the province, business leaders and politicians that have shown great interest in this. We believe there's an opportunity here as I said in my presentation.

We call it Winnipeg 2, because we're proud of Winnipeg and we think within the capital region it fits with the provincial capital region economic development strategy. There's huge tracts of land all around this city that the city could go into partnership with companies like OlyWest and the province and those municipalities and the federal government and work together to create an agri-industrial park, a large tract, where suitable or compatible industries like this one would be welcomed, where monitoring of the facilities would be enclosed in an area instead of haphazard all over the countryside.

That there's opportunities for cost and revenue sharing with the stakeholders throughout this region that could create an opportunity, you know, it may not exist anywhere. We want to be pioneers. We want to be visionaries. We hold summits to that effect. We believe there's an opportunity to do just that with this particular project. We don't want to drive OlyWest away. We do not. We're on the record from the beginning as saying that. All we want is for them to be in the right location. Winnipeg 2 provides that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, gentlemen. Time for questions has expired. Thank you very much.

We'll now hear from the additional four individuals who will be speaking in support of this motion. Each will be allowed up to five minutes. There's no questions in this section beginning with Dr. Jon Gerrard, followed by Madeline Downie, Ed Schinewald and Fred Horbaty. Dr. Gerrard you have five minutes.

Dr. Jon Gerrard: Your Worship, Members of Council, I speak today in opposition to the current location proposed for the OlyWest hog processing plant. I'm not opposed to the plant itself. I believe it should be located outside of the City of Winnipeg as has been suggested in an aggregate industrial park rather than inside the City of Winnipeg.

I believe a good location outside the city can be a win/win for all, while the location proposed in the St. Boniface Industrial Park I fear may turn out to be a lose/lose for everyone. In my role as M.L.A. for River Heights and leader of the Manitoba Liberal Party I've listened to hundreds of Winnipeggers who oppose this project.

I've personally received over a thousand names in the form of petitions in my office opposing the location of the plant within Winnipeg. I believe that Manitobans have a right to live in areas that are clear of pollutions, clear of smell, clear of environmental hazards and then not to have the conditions arbitrarily changed by governments after people have already bought homes, started families and have roots firmly planted in the community.

People living in Winnipeg should have the opportunity to enjoy bike paths, parks and neighbourhood barbecues. These are some of the best selling features of our city and our province, our quality of life.

Whether a person lives in River Heights, Fort Garry, Transcona, Southdale or Windsor Park, we all should enjoy a clean and a green Winnipeg.

Let me stress that my decision to oppose the location of the OlyWest plant is not a knee jerk response. It's one that's made with careful consideration and discussion with people on both sides of this issue. I just feel that there's not sufficient basis at this point to believe that there will not be an odour problem. This area of Winnipeg already suffers to some degree from odour problems with the existing rendering plant in the mushroom factory and I would suggest to you that the current odour problem should have been cleaned up before people even started thinking about this sort of thing.

The bottom line is that people living in Winnipeg should be able to go outside in their back yard, enjoy a barbecue, play with their children and enjoy our great city. At this point I don't believe that hog processing plant should be located directly within urban areas of Manitoba.

I've been to both Brandon and Neepawa, both of which have hog plants that are located outside the major urban area. Residents of Winnipeg should be treated no less well than residents of Brandon and Neepawa.

And I would add that while the hog plant in Neepawa itself is largely not a problem because of the distance from the town, there's a definite problem there with sewage treatment. There have been problems right from the beginning, I understand, in about 1988 and the problems haven't been addressed to this day. Residents tell me that it's the improper treatment of the sewage that creates some of these air quality problems that do exist.

It's a classic example, sadly, of the Doer N.D.P. record, and frankly my observations in the last several years suggest that Gary Doer and his N.D.P. are just not to be trusted when it comes to projects of this nature dealing and needing strong environmental stewardship.

I would like to emphasize that a key point remains that the local residents as we've seen, those most greatly impacted were not properly consulted. The businesses in the area were not properly consulted and Manitobans in general were not properly consulted before this deal was brokered, and I should add by the Provincial N.D.P. because I know they came to the city much of that behind closed doors. Winnipeg should not become synonymous with living in with, by, a hog plant.

The public outcry against the location for this site is undeniable. I urge Council to remember the citizens that you all represent, the citizens that are here today in force. Let's keep our city so that no matter where you live you can go outside into your yard or to a nearby park with your family, your children, your friends, your neighbours and enjoy what living in Winnipeg and Manitoba is all about, and that's my comments, your Worship and Members of Council.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Dr. Gerrard. Madeline Downie.

Madeline Downie: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Madeline Downie. My elected City Councillor is Franco Magnifico and I want to be sure you understand he does not speak for me.

There's a lot to say but a lot has already been said. I think what I need to talk about now is fairy tales and respect.

Mr. Magnifico has not raised his head once since the people have come to this podium to speak. What are you reading? Mr. Swandel, Mr. Gord Steeves, your body language, not respectful. We've come, we've taken off work, and we would really, really appreciate your respect and to listen to us.

My fairy tales, once upon a time, Mr. Katz, you told Jim Stevenson you had done nothing you could not undo. Now we're saying you could be sued.

Once upon a time, Mr. Magnifico questioned why we didn't understand that

this situation would come back for final approval, not so.

Once upon a time a hog slaughter and rendering plant was not called a food plant. Today it's called a food processing plant. Once upon a time there was not corporate welfare. Once upon a time the city was run for the citizens, not the companies. I ask you to go back to that. I don't know what we can do, what more we can say, to try and to get through to you. This is not a good thing for the St. Boniface Industrial Park.

This is not a good thing for citizens and children, for water, for lakes, for rivers. It doesn't seem that hard to want to move this. We're not asking you to not have it at all. We're just asking you to move it.

I want to introduce you, Mrs. Riddleman and the reason I want to introduce her to you, Mr. Franco she lives in your riding. She bicycles everywhere she goes and she bicycled to the University of Manitoba to get signatures for her petition. She also cut down some flowers for her tree and she would like to give those to you now, Mr. Katz. Can you do that?

So she's bicycled a long way to bicycle here this morning, too. So that's all I've got to say. It's already been said. There's no point in resaying and resaying. Please vote to move this plant. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, Ms. Downie and Mrs. Riddleman. Mr. Ed Schinewald. You have five minutes.

Ed Schinewald: Good morning. My name is Ed Schinewald and I am the President of Melet Plastics, a locally owned and operated high tech company in the St. Boniface Industrial Park. We manufacture complicated products, plastic products, mystery products, auto parts, grain valves, etc., things that disappear into other people's products. We also manufacture canes for the visually impaired which we export all over the world.

We're a company employing 106 highly skilled people and we're a proud corporate citizen extensively supporting the Arts and University of Manitoba. Our symbiotic relationship with the City of Winnipeg has been central to our success.

So, where to begin, well I could start by saying what my kids used to say. This deal isn't fair, dad. This isn't fair. The truth is we paid 55,000.00 dollars per acre for our land on which we built our business. OlyWest I think is paying $2 for 100 acres if they exercise their options. We paid 78,000.00 dollars last year in property taxes and as far as I can tell OlyWest is going to be getting the equivalent of a five year tax holiday. Two years ago we built a small addition, three walls and a roof, 5,500 square feet. Obviously no live animals to deal with and it took your planning department three months to give us approval, but it took the City Council nine days to do due diligence on this massive OlyWest project with its huge environmental concerns.

Why was this product expedited, process expedited. Why was there no consultation. Isn't it the job of the City Council to protect Winnipeggers rather than side step them and now with the vague threat of OlyWest launching litigation, the city is prepared to precede with a bad deal rather than to fight the prospect of a lawsuit. Will future generations be saddled with this huge hog slaughter plant because today's Councillors would stand up to OlyWest.

You know, the Mayor of Brandon was on CBC a few weeks ago and he said don't build this plant within the city and I've spoken to the folks at OlyWest myself and they've told me their plant in Red Deer with this high tech odour scrubbers doesn't smell yet there are lots of people in Red Deer who say there's always some odour and several days a year you can't walk outside unless you're prepared to gag.

Why would the people of Red Deer say that unless it wasn't true. There are a lot of St. Boniface and Transcona residents here today who live near the site. They're watching the value of their homes plummet before their eyes. These people work hard, they pay their mortgages and they pay their taxes, and they deserve better than to be broadsided by the city.

Now I'm going to do what I really don't like to do. I'm going to talk about me. You know Melet just didn't happen. It took a huge effort on the parts of many people to get us where we are, exporting Manitoba built technology and products around the world. Ladies and gentlemen, I can't begin to enumerate the number of weekends that I worked or the number of late nights or the years that our family of six lived on my wife's salary as a schoolteacher because I was working without pay.

I could have tried this anywhere but I wanted to be in Winnipeg, it's where my family comes from and where I chose to give back by building my business from the ground up and now that that it is the time of my life when I'm thinking about selling the business there's going to be a huge abattoir less than a kilometre away. I suppose I will have to take a much lower price when I sell, perhaps that doesn't mean that much to the people here but it means an awful lot to me.

Well also, what would this mean for the dozens of other small business people like me who have worked so hard for the years, but there's more. More than the smell and the stream of trucks and the live hogs and the rendering, our largest customer which has operations in the southern U.S. and Mexico is constantly pressuring us to move near to them.

We're pretty well at capacity in our building and will not invest another penny with OlyWest as a neighbour. We could, however, move some of our operation to Texas or Mexico, wouldn't you? Who will come to Winnipeg to invest in the future. A few months ago the premier led a delegation to India to encourage businesses to set up in Manitoba.

Bidhu Jha our M.L.A. thought he had an excellent chance of getting a large Indian pharmaceutical company to set up in the St. Boniface Industrial Park. I ask you, who would build a pharmaceutical facility with a hog slaughtering plant as a neighbour. More importantly who would invest anywhere in our city knowing that any time Council could approve another unreasonable deal, right beside them.

We keep hearing that Council can't reverse this disastrous decision because it would send the wrong message to future investors in Winnipeg so as a business person let me make this as clear as possible. Approving the OlyWest proposal sends one and only one message to the business community and the message is, invest in Winnipeg at your peril. Still, as everyone else has said, we are not anti OlyWest. We support the creation of hog slaughtering jobs in rural Manitoba.

We love and support the city. We want it to thrive so that we can all thrive, not just some of us. Council, therefore, has a choice. It can stifle investment and damage our community with a gigantic hog slaughtering plant and rendering plant or it can make Winnipeg the kind of place in which people like my neighbours, my staff and I choose to live and to work and to invest. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, Mr. Schinewald. Finally Mr. Fred Horbaty, You have five minutes.

Fred Horbaty: Good morning Councillors, good morning Your Worship, good morning. Good morning OlyWest. Good morning everyone out there. I'm here today as a private citizen of the City of Winnipeg. I was born and raised on a farm in rural Manitoba and moved to the city to obtain my Bachelor of Commerce and my Charted Accountant designation so I have the benefit of a pretty well rounded education and upbringing.

My wife and I have two young children, age three and 14 months, and we made the biggest investment of our lives last spring when we purchased our home on Foch Avenue in south Transcona. Our home is where we're raising our children, teaching them the lessons that will hopefully make them into good and honest people. Until six months ago we thought we lived in paradise within the city.

We've got lots of land, big property; deer ran through our yard last summer, we had ducks swimming in our ditches. Now we're worried we won't be able to leave

our windows open on a warm summer's evening for fear that our home will stink like the back side of a hog and that's the same smell that's been stinking up city hall for the past six months.

The thing that surprised me the most is the lack of integrity showed by your Worship and one of the Councillors in particular, Mr. Franco Magnifico. You've been less than honest to the citizens of Winnipeg and your constituents in St. Boniface. Many discussions we've had and many times I've caught you in mistruth and not telling all of the truth. The manure that the Mayor and Councillor Magnifico have been spreading regarding the City of Winnipeg funded trips to similar plants quote unquote in Montréal and in Kansas City. Well I'm here to tell you that this is embarrassing that they're spreading these lies about where they went.

The plant they visited in Quebec is not in Montréal but in St. Esprit and it's located in a little village of about 2,000 people located nearly an hour away from Montréal. The plant is only a fraction of the size of the plant proposed for Winnipeg, and it doesn't have on site rendering so it's not a fair comparison.

The plant visited in Missouri is not in Kansas City like they said. It's in St. Joseph which is located an hour away from Kansas City. The plant that they visited has been open for less than a month when they visited. It's located in an area of the city known for being the stock yards area of the city, and at the time of their visit was processing less than 10% of the volume proposed for the Winnipeg site.

I spoke to Councillor Magnifico on the Friday before their big trip. At first I didn't tell him that I knew that the plant they were going to visit in St. Joseph had only been open for two weeks so he explained to me how the trip was going to put everyone's mind at ease and their nose at ease. Nothing was going to be, you know this is going to tell everyone whether these plants really smell or not. You know, and the two citizens of the company were completely independent. You'll get an unfiltered version of the truth coming back so not to worry, you can trust us. Then I shared with him the information I had about the plant in St. Joseph.

I don't think I've ever heard someone back pedal so quickly. He changed the story, the focus was, of the visit was now to see whether, you know, the technology of the plant was sound and let's just check out the layout of it and let's talk to a couple of the neighbours and find out what they think about this hog plant.

Last time I checked Councillor Magnifico is not an industrial engineer so I'm not sure that he's really qualified to inspect the technology of a slaughterhouse. To be clear on this matter Councillor Magnifico, you misled the public prior to taking this trip by withholding important facts about the sites being visited. You told them it was going to put them at ease and it didn't.

You lied and Mr. Mayor, you knew this information before the trip left the ground. I sent you an email about it. You decided not to do anything about it. Thank you.

What I've learned from these experiences in my many years in business is to listen and look for details that are not being presented. Business people and politicians only present the information that will support their position, to find the complete truth relies due diligence to uncover the information that's not being said and this is what worries me about this project. There are so few details available from OlyWest on how they plan to build this state of the art slaughterhouse, in the absence of information you have to fill the void with information you find on your own.

The problem is that there's no comparable slaughterhouse facilities like this in Canada. We'll be the beta project for Olymel to test out this state of the art slaughterhouse technology and they do not have a plant that's comparable in technology.

Just ask OlyWest about their experience in building plants like this. I'm sure you'll find that Big Sky and High Tech have no experience in this area because they only

supply hogs for slaughter. Olymel hasn't built a hog slaughtering plant like this anywhere in the world. This combined with the complete lack of environmental due diligence by the city is very troubling.

What is also surprising is the Mayor and many of the Councillors are not concerned about the impact this plant will have on the community and the environment and surrounding area and in the city in general. The city cannot wash its hands of the responsibility of ensuring that this hog slaughterhouse is environmentally sustainable.

The slaughterhouse will use city land, city resources; eventually leave a site within the City of Winnipeg that will need to be cleaned up. It's not long ago that we spent millions cleaning up the old stock yards in St. Boniface after many, many years of being an eyesore in the community.

I hope we don't have to end up having the same situation in the St. Boniface Industrial Park 25 years from now. The city simply cannot rely on the city C.E.C. to do the environmental due diligence that the city should be doing on behalf of its citizens.

These are just a few of many, many concerns that you should have regarding the slaughterhouse. It's not a food processing facility, it's a slaughterhouse, call a spade a spade. I hope you'll all come to your senses and support the motion to revoke the funding for the OlyWest slaughterhouse and perform the due diligence necessary to make an informed decision about the slaughterhouse. Have the courage to do what's right. Thank you for your time this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, Mr. Horbaty. Now we'll hear from delegations in opposition to the motion under consideration beginning with Mr. Rejean Nadeau on behalf of Olymel who will have a ten minute spot and Karl Kynoch a five-minute spot, Mr. Nadeau you have ten minutes.

Rejean Nadeau: Good morning, Your Worship, Councillors and citizens in the gallery, my name is Rejean Nadeau, I'm C.E.O. of Olymel. I am pleased to be here today to speak on behalf of the OlyWest proposal, a state of the art food processing facility for the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba.

We appreciate this opportunity to share our proposal with you. As many of you know OlyWest is a partnership initiative of ITech Limited from (In Audible) Manitoba, Big Sky Farms of Saskatchewan and Olymel from Quebec together creating a new venture for Winnipeg, Manitoba known as OlyWest.

This is an important council meeting and the council members present here today are faced with an important decision. So I will honour this assembly by being brief and will limit my comments to three essential elements related to the OlyWest proposal.

Firstly, I would like to speak briefly on the economic impact of our proposal. Secondly, the environmental assessment related to our proposal and finally I would like to close on a note about the leadership and vision necessary for our proposal.

Starting with the economic impact, I would like the council to consider that the combined partners of OlyWest are committed to make an initial investment of 200 million in Winnipeg to construct our facility and get it up and running. This investment will generate over 1,000 jobs of all capacities and countless indirect employment within the greater community of Winnipeg and across Manitoba.

This investment will generate a new tax contribution of over 20 million. I would like the Council to keep in mind that OlyWest represent the single largest private investment in Winnipeg in over 15 years.

Now moving to the issue of the environment. OlyWest is currently, has been associated with the proposed facility. At the conclusion of this assessment in mid summer of this year OlyWest will be filling an application before the C.E.C. commission which will review our assessment and file a report to

the Government of Manitoba associated with our proposal. This is OlyWest's part to demonstrate our environmental due diligence.

Now let me reassure each member of this Council and citizens of Winnipeg that OlyWest will not build any facility in Winnipeg until it fulfills the spirits and intent of this environmental due diligence and meets the regulatory requirements of the Government of Manitoba.

Now I would like to conclude on the topic of leadership and vision. As I've just outlined that the proposal of OlyWest facility is a significant undertaking requiring a significant commitment of resource, over 200 million initially, generating over 1,000 jobs direct and generating over 20 million in annual tax contribution.

This project also entails significant effort in terms of demonstrating responsible corporate citizenships by meeting the environmental due diligence requirements establishments by the Province of Manitoba. But this issue, economy impact and environmental counsel would not matter if we were not for the vision and leadership of our partnership group.

OlyWest has a vision of creating an economical, sound and environmentally responsible facility in Winnipeg that creates good safe jobs and sustainable economic growth for both Winnipeg and Manitoba.

This is an initiative that can help Winnipeg grow and help keep Manitoba out from leaving for competing economic advantages such as Alberta and British Columbia. This is an industry that helps a city define its future by ensuring a strong financial base for both its citizens and communities.

Representing the partners of OlyWest we are asking each member of the Council here today to share our vision of a prosperous City of Winnipeg and Province of Manitoba and moderately we ask that we demonstrate your leadership with your vote of affirmation that the city support for the OlyWest proposal.

Thank you for this opportunity to present the strengths and benefits of our proposal. We look forward to your positive affirmation of support and a prosperous future for the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Nadeau. The five-minute slot is for Karl Kynoch.

Karl Kynoch: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor and fellow Councillors, my name is Karl Kynoch. I am Chairman of Manitoba Pork Council. I want to thank City Council for the opportunity to speak to you on this important matter. Manitoba Pork Council represents the interests of all hog producers in Manitoba and I would like to start our presentation here today by reinforcing again that the hog producers of Manitoba, large and small, fully endorse the OlyWest project.

Today's vote to ratify or reverse Council's previous November 23rd, 2005 approval of OlyWest project incentive package is at a critical milestone, not only for this project but for the future of Winnipeg and Manitoba's economy.

This proposed facility will not only provide much needed packing capacity for our producers, it will provide 1,100 jobs for Winnipeggers and it will contribute an estimated 20 million in taxes annually to the city, the province and federal government. It will also reduce the vulnerability of Manitoba's pork industry and provincial economy to U.S. trade actions and thus secure many Winnipeg based jobs already tied to the success of our pork industry.

Mr. Mayor and Council, OlyWest has followed due process in its deliberations with the city and provincial governments. The contention by opponents to the project that government has not done its due diligence in the review of OlyWest is simply not true. The OlyWest project has taken over two years of joint business planning by Olymel, High Tech and Big Sky Farms and over six months of good faith negotiations and a thorough analysis and review with civic and provincial leaders and your respective administrations. The project was reviewed

by city officials involved with water and waste, public works, legal services, property assessment, corporate finance, real estate and planning and land use.

We strongly believe that Council made a wise and rational decision on November 23rd, 2005, to approve the OlyWest incentive package. This important decision provided certainty to OlyWest to proceed with its plans for a 200 million investment and embark on a necessary engineering and environmental impact analysis.

And we are confident that all environmental issues will be fully examined and addressed by the independent Clean Environment Commission in their rigorous environmental review and licensing process. This will include extensive formal public notice, information and consultation. Regrettably some area businesses and residents do not wish to wait for the environmental assessment hearing to voice their concerns.

Instead they have chosen to brew up a wind storm of emotion and speculation that's placing a rational review and decision making process in jeopardy. This is wrong, to allow a normal civic and provincial review and approval process to be derailed under these circumstances and to allow a few nay sayers to override ration decision making would set a dangerous precedent.

This would send out a very negative message to businesses that Winnipeg is not open for business despite having found a site that meets all planning and M-3 heavy industrial zoning requirements, after fully vetted the proposal through interdepartmental review and having negotiated in good faith and having already had the project approved by Council.

We ask that Council send a clear message that Winnipeg is in fact open for business by voting no to rescind the incentive package. This will allow the Clean Environment Commission to hear all environmental issues based on facts, engineering analysis and good science and to complete its due diligence review and recommendations to the Minister of Conservation. Rest assured the OlyWest project cannot proceed until a thorough environmental review process is complete.

In closing I want to mention with the construction of OlyWest plant and its 1,100 new jobs in Winnipeg the pork industry in Manitoba will employ more than 16,000 men and women. This is more than twice as many people as employed by Boeing, Bristol, Standard Arrow, New Flyer and Motorcoach industries combined, and it isn't just the new jobs at the OlyWest facility.

There will also be spin off jobs. These men and women will buy groceries, buy houses, send their children to school, shop in Winnipeg's stores and eat in Winnipeg restaurants. The pork producers of this province are confident that this is the right time and that OlyWest is the right project for Manitoba.

The partners in OlyWest are good corporate citizens in the communities in which they already operate. High Tech for instance was recognized in 2004 as one of Canada's top 50 best managed companies and we know that they and the other OlyWest partners will be good corporate citizens right here in Winnipeg.

This is a golden opportunity for Winnipeg, for Manitoba and for our industry. We firmly believe that we will lose it to others outside Manitoba if it is not located in Winnipeg. There is no other site in Manitoba that meets this project's requirements. We therefore urge you to vote no to the motion to rescind the OlyWest incentive package. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, Mr. Kynoch. Okay. All right folks, let's try to keep it down, okay, it makes it go faster. There may be some questions here. I believe Councillor Lubosch has a question. Order, please. It's all right Councillor Lubosch you just speak to the chair please.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Nadeau,

welcome to Winnipeg, I can appreciate that in your province, same as here, we take our politics very seriously, and this is indeed a very serious issue for us.

My question is with respect to the conceptual idea that was brought forward by the speakers before you to create an agri-business industrial park within the vicinity of Winnipeg that would provide for improved access to the services that your industry requires, sewage and effluent treatment, water services, a larger landmass for future expansion and for the location of other complimentary industries to the hog processing industry and improved transportation logistics.

In principle, if we rolled the clock back and you didn't have this tentative agreement with our two levels of government for the establishment of a plant in the current location that we're discussing, would your company and the group that you represent be open to discussing at least on a conceptual level the options that may be available for a secondary location, another alternative to locating your industry?

Rejean Nadeau: Thank you. You know from the beginning of this project we state that this plant will, you know, if it has to be built, it has to be built within the rules of the city and within the rules of the province, and we still feel that this site we can make within those rules, and as I said before we're going to go before the C.E.C. and from there from in front of the province, and we'll get the answer, but as of now we still think that we can make this project within the rules of this province.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: My second supplementary question Mr. Speaker and I thank you for your very candid and open and honest answer. I understand as everybody here does that within the rules that are applied to these types of industries that indeed that location could be made to fit your industry and conversely your industry could be made to fit the prescribed conditions under our environmental legislation.

My question to you, again, very directly is, I understand there are business leaders meeting in the coming weeks to discuss the concept of developing an agri-business park which would have a far greater benefit to your business, future businesses and indeed to the city and this province and that,

Mr. Speaker: Direct question please Councillor. You've already had a very long preamble which isn't allowed.

Councillor Lubosch: Then very directly I'm requesting you to give consideration to meeting with business leaders and politicians in this province and in this city to discuss conceptually the development of an agri-business park in another location, would you be amenable to that, sir?

Rejean Nadeau: First of all, you know, this is (in audible) and secondly as one speaker said before, business is time so we spend a lot of time on this site and to start another project is time and I'm not sure that we have enough time.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a final supplementary Councillor, direct question.

Councillor Lubosch: If time were not a factor and if it took the same amount of time, would you be amenable to meeting with a group of politicians and business leaders to discuss the development of an alternative site? No strings attached.

Rejean Nadeau: OlyWest and (in audible) I think from the beginning we were still, we are always open to meet with the people and talk.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham, you have a question.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to Mr. Nadeau, Mr. Nadeau if today's resolution were successful and the city did rescind the economic development incentive package, would Olymel or OlyWest or any of its member companies sue the city of Winnipeg?

Rejean Nadeau: We have, you know, for me it's a new question. I heard about that this morning. I have no time to talk with my partner so I cannot give an appropriate answer to this one.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the candour of that answer as Councillor Lubosch appreciated the other candour. Mr. Speaker perhaps I could ask Mr. Nadeau, he talked about the time that's been spent so far. What has the company actually invested in hard costs so far on this site and on this process?

Rejean Nadeau: I would say a lot of money, a lot of effort, and those numbers will be public at the right time.

Councillor Benham: I'm sorry I didn't quite hear the answer Mr. Speaker.

Rejean Nadeau: No, those numbers will be available when it is going to be decided by the board.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Councillor Benham: Yes, Mr. Speaker and given what we know about the Clean Environment Commission hearings and I gather that they will be in the spring of 2007, perhaps Mr. Nadeau can confirm that in his answer, what is the timeline for this plant? That is, what does Mr. Nadeau anticipate being done before Clean Environment Commission approval and what can proceed in the time line after Clean Environment Commission approval?

Rejean Nadeau: Still, feel and hope that the Clean Environment Commission will take place this fall so from there we could start construction at least the, how do you say the, the appeals are filed and start the construction next spring.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nadeau, I have three questions. I have a motion that's coming on the floor of Council of laying this matter over for 60 days for number one is that the E.P.C. direct the administration to review the proposed OlyWest project and report back on all implications, alternatives from the point of view of the various city departments. Would you be objective to that happening that we be able to proceed, hold table talks, to look for alternative sites?

Rejean Nadeau: As I said, you know time is precious for us, so we'll see and you know we'll have to consider it with the board and make the decision from there. But as I said we still feel that this site is complying with all the resolutions and we feel we can demonstrate it to the citizens.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have supplementary Councillor? Direct Question.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker, my second question is, and this deals with, did the city consult with the province and conduct public consultations in the affected communities in east Winnipeg and report back the results of these consultations to us and then finally to Council. Would you be willing to participate if these table talks are held with the provincial government, with the City of Winnipeg?

Rejean Nadeau: From the beginning, we have been always open to discuss and participate in any discussion at every level of politics.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My final question is the, also it's asked that OlyWest project business plan be made to Council with the administered analysis of its contents. Would you be willing to do that, sir?

Rejean Nadeau: I didn't catch it.

Councillor Lazarenko: That the OlyWest business plan, your business plan would be made available to Council, to all Members of Council. Would you do that?

Rejean Nadeau: Yes.

Councillor Lazarenko: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. Do you have a question?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. speaker, my question is directed, first question, Mr. kynoch, back on November 23rd Mr. Maa on behalf of OlyWest at the time indicated to this Council and I quote "that this information will be made available widely to the community in coming days as factual information and there will be further public comments by OlyWest to hold public open houses early in January of 2006."

Well, those have not happened and you and I had an opportunity to chat at the Association of Manitoba Municipalities convention a day after it was publicly announced and at that time I requested and encouraged you to show good faith to rescind your proposal and go to the public and public consultations prior to pushing this through Council and that failing that there would be a huge political battle and that's what I predicted and that's true enough,

Mr. Speaker: Your question is.

Councillor Wyatt: My question is would you be willing to show good faith today and end this battle that's going on in the city by pulling your proposal voluntarily from the city and going directly to the public in public consultation? You believe this is a good deal for the city; you believe this is a good deal for the province. You make that clear. If you believe in that,

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor, you've asked the question.

Councillor Wyatt: Then stand by your promise.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, you're out of order now. The question has been asked. Quick answer.

Karl Kynoch: No, I would not recommend pulling that proposal today. I have the utmost, lots of confidence in OlyWest, that they are going to be good corporate citizens here in Winnipeg and that they will do everything they can in the public to virtually have no odour there. I have seen some of the reputations of these companies that are putting this together in the past and I have every confidence in them to do the same type of business in Winnipeg as they have done out of the country.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. The time has expired for questions. Thank you very much, gentlemen for your presentations and we'll now hear from the four additional speakers from the list that I have here, John McDonald, Ron Friesen, Mike Jones and Guy Vaudry. In that order, Mr. MacDonald, you have five minutes each.

John McDonald: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Mayor Katz, Councillors, public on both sides of the issue and of course the media. I wish to thank you for the opportunity to speak on the issue of the location of OlyWest and the benefits I see arising from it and Mr. Wyatt I am a taxpayer of Transcona.

I see jobs attached to the city, province and also to our federal government. I'm not going to reinvent the wheel by repeating a lot of the information that has just been said, that you've heard, but prior to this issue being raised I had never heard of OlyWest.

I decided to support them when I saw them being economically lynched by misinformation. Some of the comments I've heard is I don't want a hog barn down the street from me. That's someone talking and not really knowing what the plant was all about. And I've actually heard some of the speakers today give the same information.

As a resident of Transcona I feel that I can speak on the issue unlike some of the opponents who do not live in the area but are still making a big stink about it. I sat in on the hearings in Brandon when Maple Leaf processing plant location was being discussed; listening to the opponents against OlyWest something has surfaced. The same concerns brought on by misinformation and rumours. At the hearings in Brandon a lot of the speakers

that were against the progress were from where, they were from Winnipeg. They didn't even live in Brandon.

There were experts brought in from southern U.S.A. talking about floods, hurricanes, when was the last time we had a hurricane in Manitoba. What would a flood do, pollution of the Assiniboine, houses would fall in value, try to rent a place in Brandon right now. Houses have gone up. There's a shortage of houses in Brandon. People in Brandon would have to move because of the smell. How could a company dare set up a hog processing plant creating thousands of jobs.

Well, the strange part and the issues here have come forward now; there's been an expert from the southern U.S. warning us about hurricane problems and the dangers of a flood. Well if it's a fear of a flood, I think that's already been addressed, and if we experience a flood that gets inside the new proposed floodway I don't think we'll be discussing the hog processing plant.

These chambers will be probably be under 20 feet of water and will certainly get more attention. I think those opposed to the plant should go back a little bit of history and see the opposition to it and I believe there's a Seven Oaks Hospital, the sirens from the emergency vehicles would keep everybody awake. Don't build it in my back yard.

Opposition to the MTS Center, ball stadium and others seems you can't move ahead in this city or do anything without a loud minority objecting because they don't have all the facts and base their decisions on misinformation, but they do have the right to object.

As what happened in Brandon I feel house prices will go up as the need for housing close to the site will become in demand. New people will have to move into the area to create this demand. The misinformation being tossed around is what will cause house prices to drop.

I've been near the Brandon location many times over the past few years and I have never smelled a detectable odour outside that operation. I have been to Brandon. The spin off from this industry will be much more than the initial jobs. There's maintenance, floor workers, accounting, computers, management. The truck traffic issue was raised but the trucks don't even enter a residential area. I would say that much of the opposition comes from individuals that have never been out to the site and are only making their information based on misinformation again. To me this plant is a welcome sign to other businesses that Winnipeg wants to move forward.

Currently these animals are shipped to the U.S. and processed there, making a final product and their economy is being rewarded for this. Why can't we be in the forefront and have a piece of the action in Winnipeg.

Just take a look at what happens to the cattle industry when the BSE crisis arose. Now we're scrambling to find processing plants to handle our beef. If this venture gets turned down it will send a clear message to other private investors go elsewhere as Winnipeg does not want to move forward into the future but wants to remain isolated on to itself.

Yes there has been indications move it somewhere else. I think Brandon has said they will take it. Steinbach will take it and I'm quite sure Dauphin will want it. Yes, there are other locations but this location was first choice which means there are other ones down the road. In closing I just want to thank everyone for the opportunity to be able to express our viewpoint whether different but also in the open and without fear. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. McDonald, Ron Friesen.

Ron Friesen: Good morning Mayor Katz, the Honourable Mayor Katz and City Council, my name is Ron Friesen. I'm the Vice President and General Manager of Eastman Feeds. We're located in St. Boniface on Marion Street. We've been there for over 30 years. We have 13 branches across Western Canada and in the states, and we employ about 200 people, and we think that OlyWest coming into this area is going to be a

substantial boost to our business and it will probably add between 30 and 40 more jobs to our current location.

Everyone has seen St. Boniface and the decay of the packing industry. You've seen a lot of the packing houses closed. There have been four major packing houses closed in St. Boniface. Those properties have been cleaned up and we see that the addition of OlyWest to agriculture in Manitoba is a rebirth of this industry.

This industry is a vibrant industry. They employ thousands of people in the agricultural sector across Manitoba and let's not forget that the other half of the people that live in this province live in rural Manitoba. This isn't just an opportunity for Winnipeg. It's an opportunity for all of Manitoba and Manitoba should open their arms and welcome OlyWest to this location.

Our plant is located 100 feet from a major kill floor on Marion Street with no smell. If anyone would take the time and go to Panet Road to a new facility that has been built in the past years and stand ten feet from the wall you would find that there was no smell at that location.

Let's not confuse dead animal rendering, animals that are collected around the province and brought in to Winnipeg to be rendered in St. Boniface. Let's not confuse dead animal rendering with food processing. Let's not confuse dead animal rendering with food processing, and as far as the process of vitamins I'm not sure what the difference between a vitamin pill and a pork chop is. They are both very healthy for our citizens of Manitoba.

High Tech partners with OlyWest, High Tech are farmers, they are family farmers, they've grown up in the Steinbach area, in the La Broquerie area. They are responsible citizens, they are stewards of the land, they are farmers. They are looking after some of the participants in agriculture, the agriculture sector which is the hog sector and they are corporate citizens of Manitoba and are truly entrepreneurs in their own right.

They are young men that wish Winnipeg to be a center for a hog kill plant and they have gone the extra mile which a lot of people in this industry hasn't done and partnered with a corporate citizen such as OlyWest or Olymel.

OlyWest must be built in Winnipeg because transportation is a major factor in livestock production, especially with the current prices in oil. We see that transportation is becoming more and more important. This is a center which is in the middle of a very large hog producing area, and there's a lot of people here today that have their own agendas. People here today not only in the galleries but outside have different agendas and they include PETA, animal rights activists, environmentalists, people that are friendly and people that are opposed. Everybody has a right to their own opinion and my opinion is that this plant has to come to Winnipeg.

It's the center and we truly believe this is the location, and I stood out in the field and it's hard to see a city from there. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Friesen. Mike Jones, Mr. Mike Jones, you have five minutes.

Mike Jones: Thank you. Your Worship, Council, guests, first of all I would like to say thank you for letting me say a few words about the OlyWest proposal. I'm here today, my name is Mike Jones, and I'm here today representing the TransX group of companies.

TransX is a Manitoba based transportation and logistics company with our head office on Inkster Boulevard. We provide Manitobans and Canadians over 2,000 jobs as a result of customers like Olymel. We have been a Manitoba based company for over 40 years, and currently have over 600 jobs in the Manitoba market.

These jobs include driving, mechanics, dispatch, administration, sales and management. TransX has been a supplier to Olymel since 1989 at which time we

were hauling from Neepawa to Quebec for them.

At that time the business at Olymel was involved in, created over 40 jobs in Manitoba at just our company. As I mentioned we've been working with Olymel for over 17 years and have always found Olymel to be very fair and partnership oriented customer. We currently provide services to Olymel in various locations. We view them not only as a strategic customer but also a partner in business and we're excited about them choosing Manitoba as a place to invest in.

TransX is excited about the future of Manitoba. We have world class people here, and this investment will help ensure that our city and our industry will continue to grow and develop.

We estimate that the spin off affects of the project we're discussing today will create over 300 jobs in the capital region and that's just in our industry. We welcome Olymel to our province. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Finally Mr. Guy Vaudry for five minutes.

Guy Vaudry: Your Worship, Councillors, my name is Guy Vaudry and I'm speaking on behalf of OlyWest. We appreciate the opportunity to present some of the facts about our proposed food processing facility particularly in light of any of the apparent misunderstandings that some of the members of our community are sharing.

Let me make it very clear what OlyWest is and is not. OlyWest is proposing to develop a food processing facility, not a hog barn as stated by Mr. Sangster.

The food that is produced, pork products, from this facility is the same pork that we buy here in Manitoba and across North America, the same pork products that we buy for our families. Now keeping in mind that we're talking about a food processing facility, I want to provide you with the rationale for the choice that we have made for this facility's location, a location we are committed to.

As you know, OlyWest has chosen a large site, over 60 acres in the St. Boniface Industrial Park after carefully considering approximately ten other locations. We selected the St. Boniface Industrial Park for the following reasons.

This location in the St. Boniface Industrial Park is zoned M-3. It is not zoned M-2 as stated by Mr. Sangster. This is a heavy industrial zone which is compatible with the facilities that we are proposing.

Our facility is located beside CN Symington Yards. We were able to obtain a large track of land, approximately 60 acres, allowing us to have an optimal building location; the relatively remote location together with our unusually large property gives OlyWest maximum separation from residential developments. This industrial park has existing designated truck routes to enter and exit the plant without traveling through major residential areas, incorrectly stated by Mr. Sangster.

The industrial park is close to a large labour pool, a large labour pool which we need to draw from in order to fill more than the 1,000 jobs that we will create, jobs including a range of jobs with respect to processing work, with respect to quality control jobs, with respect to sanitation jobs, with respect to shipping and receiving jobs, with respect to information technology jobs, with respect to accounting jobs, finance jobs, human resource jobs, this is a modern facility, and we have an opportunity for everyone.

The industrial park best positions OlyWest to develop the necessary on site infrastructure, the necessary off site infrastructure which OlyWest will need to pay an estimated 9 million dollars for this off site infrastructure, again, incorrectly stated by Mr. Sangster.

This best positions OlyWest to utilize the new city wastewater infrastructure that this city has already committed to develop. I've been told there's more than a billion dollars being spent for water and wastewater treatment. That will best position OlyWest to be environmentally sound.

Overall, the decision to pursue the site provides a reasonable balance of considerations such as access to workers, access to an environmentally sustainable infrastructure and a relatively remote location to put a food processing facility.

At a media conference last weekend and again yesterday at a visit to our site several industry and business leaders attended. We had an opportunity to share with a site with approximately 100 people. This is a field and everybody was very, once they were at the site understood why we're committed to this location.

I have one minute left. I've shared the rationale with yourself for this site; I also want to make comments on odour. This is all about odour. We are not incorporating ten or twenty or thirty year old technologies in this plant. We will be use modern applied technologies in this facility. This is a 370,000 square foot facility. There will be less than 5% of that footprint associated with the receiving barn in that facility which will be continuously cleaned and will have sprinklers in it. We will have specific odour measure controls in this facility. We will have air scrubbers. We will have scrubbers for emission control. We are going to maintain excellent air quality. What I can assure you with respect to odour, there will be odour directly around this facility, okay.

When you move into the parking lot there will still be some odour, but once you get to the perimeters of our grounds there will be less odour, and we're committed to Winnipeggers, to the City of Winnipeg, to the Province of Manitoba, that we will do everything we can not to create any disturbances, and we've got an excellent location at this site. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, Mr. Vaudry. That concludes the delegations on this matter. We will now hear from an additional delegation with regard to Item 6 of the E.P.C. report of May 17, Mr. Vaughan Baird.

Vaughan Baird: Mr. Speaker, Your Worship, Members of Council, I'm Vaughan Baird. I've been 39 years a volunteer for the City of Winnipeg. It started before the 1967 Pan Am games. I was on the facility committee and it was my duty to see that the Pan Am pool was built. The budgets came in a million and a half over so they decided it would be an open air pool.

I started a campaign and it took a year and finally the federal government came up with a million and a half and also paved the parking lot. Steve Juba who had vision, he promoted this city which hasn't been done for years and he said, Baird, I want you to go for the Hall of Fame of Canada. I said all right, because I was on the national committee, and I went for the Hall of Fame of Canada and got it. And he made the comment make it work.

Well I can say this. Everybody should donate a certain part of their time to the community, give back something, and this has become my project for 39 years.

Well, we've come to a second Pan Am games and we have the front entrance condemned so the city has not the monies for the front entrance on, so Doctor Thorgreson, Robert Thorgreson my campaign chairman and raised the necessary funds to put the new front ends on for the 1999 Pan Am games, and the money was gained out of the process that it would be for the Aquatic Hall of Fame and for receptions and gatherings, and I've given you some information and section "A" and "B" are the most important.

"A" deals with the question of the news release, tri-party release by the government of Canada, government of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg whereby the Hall of Fame would benefit from this area.

The "B" one is the Executive Policy Committee dated June 17, 1998 and the fourth paragraph, the fourth and fifth are the most important dealing, for the Hall of Fame and for receptions. And then on the second page of that, number three, the proper offices of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to affect the intent of the foregoing.

In fact, the officers were supposed to promote it. Instead, we have a bureaucracy, all right sorry. We have a bureaucracy which the National Post rates as the 21st worst bureaucratic city in Canada.

Let me tell you this. When you have a committee, a Property Development Committee which takes let's say this, a month, a month and a half, a year and five months and the latest was they gave us their submission on a modified agreement. They gave it on January 4, I gave a reply on January the 9th and we still haven't gotten a reply, notwithstanding that we've requested them to reply. There are only eight sections in dispute and we've been through this.

The city has numerous facility use agreements. Why waste the public's time. Let me, I have 19 volumes of letters and documents trying to get a simple facility use agreement.

Gentlemen, there have been fifteen top bureaucrats involved in this. The wasted time, business wouldn't put up with this. I'm amazed that the City of Winnipeg will put up with it. Gentlemen, you have, I'm limited in my time but I received the report yesterday afternoon or suppose to receive it Friday but I had it come and I got it yesterday afternoon.

There's a litany of errors in the report by planning, and I can go through it section by section, but you've had a lengthy tough morning and I'm going to try and be brief because we've lost I suggest one of the things where we got national and international publicity. A lot of you people don't realize that the Aquatic Hall of Fame of Canada and the Pan Am pool gets international and national press in the aquatic world. We are one of the leaders in the world in it.

Now the Executive Policy Committee submits the following, "A", confirmation by the Aquatic Hall of Fame of ownership and responsibility of the artefacts and memorabilia. We do not, as established by Mayor Juba back in the '70s we were to give the, everything we got to the City of Winnipeg and it would be self-insured. We followed this. Part of the reason he put that in because there were other cities were furious that we got the hall of fame and they didn't think we deserved it, and he said if the city owns the property then they can't get it.

And so this was done, and six to eight claims have been made over 30 years as to damage and vandalism, the total under 1,000 dollars. Werner Matysiak, the supervisor of the pool, I have wrote him and requested that he confirm that the (In Audible) from the City of Winnipeg on the question of these items. He never responded so I called him and asked him you haven't responded. He said he's been ordered by his superior that he couldn't reply to me. Where's the credibility of our city. It certainly lacks it.

Now let's go to "B," A.H.F. to provide proof of insurance for the swimming artefacts and memorabilia. If you read their report of planning they're saying well 28,000, 30,000 insurance. We don't have those funds, and we cannot insure the items. It's self insured by the city we would hold and I think any court would uphold on the evidence we have that the city owns the artefacts, but to say we have to insure, even the city won't insure it and if its lost, its lost, but minor things they have covered in the past.

"C", A.H.F. to provide a written commitment to approve the show cases for safety and security purposes in a manner satisfactory to the city. Those showcases, there's hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of showcases lying in the north and south walls on both sides. Now those showcases were built to the standards the city required.

Only one minute, holy hell, sorry, I hope there's some questions, but the showcases, let me put it this way, belong to the city. When the case is attached to the wall it becomes the property of the owner of that building, and we cannot afford to, this is just a way to discourage us because what is behind the whole thing, they want the front entrance, planning wants the front entrance for themselves.

They have bowling, numerous items in the thing and they just served our, now I just want to jump, I'll ask Donald Benham to maybe organize a visit to the Pan Am pool of those who have not seen what's been done there and we will give you a tour of it. I'll be away until the 8th of June. I'm out of the country. I'm sorry but I didn't know this was coming up.

But, gentlemen, I can't tell you how important this is for our city, but believe me, and I say this, and they say that the Chief Executive Officer will be soliciting the arbitration of this matter.

She has shown a negative attitude. She has not responded to our letter, two letters, one a nine page letter and the third letter, the Mayor asked her to respond regarding the Thomas Sill Foundation to save that grant of 25,000. She didn't respond, and in a month and a half so I sent her a letter requesting her to respond and she says I won't respond until you have a facility use agreement. Now...

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Baird

Vaughan Baird: To me when you have somebody who is paid higher than the salary of the Premier of the province and higher of the salary than the President of the United States who doesn't act on communications from a public and volunteers, I'm most disappointed.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you; your time is up, Mr. Baird. Thank you very much. Are there any questions of Mr. Baird? Thank you very much, Mr. Baird for your presentation. We'll dealing with this very shortly.

Okay, the report of Executive Policy Committee, May 10th, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 10, 2006**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of May 10, 2006 and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour. Opposed? Carried. The report of May 17, 2006.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 17, 2006**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'd like to introduce the Report of May 17, 2006 and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 6.

Mr. Speaker: Number 6, any others? Okay, Mayor Katz moves that clauses 1 through 5 be adopted by consent. All in favour, opposed? Carried. Clause six.

**Item 6 - Pan Am Pool Building, West End Addition - Aquatic Hall of Fame And Museum of Canada Inc. - Resolution of Outstanding Matters
File PR-2.2**

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

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker at this point in time I would love to hear from Councillor Benham. I know we have discussed this before. I'll just listen and then I'll respond.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Benham on the clause.

Councillor Benham: Great thanks Mr. Speaker and I do appreciate we've got many people here regarding the notice of motion that is going to go ahead so I will keep my comments very brief.

I'm glad that we had an opportunity to hear from Mr. Baird on behalf of the Aquatic Hall of Fame. I will note just a couple of things, first of all Mr. Speaker, I will rise my, I told the Mayor this and it's nobody's fault, it's our long standing procedure but the procedure of having people come before committees that are meeting In Camera to discuss In Camera reports that affect them but they aren't allowed to read the report because it's In Camera I think obviously leads a member of the public and somebody who is representing an outside organization like Mr. Baird at a tremendous disadvantage.

Mr. Baird, not everyone is aware of the history, but Mr. Baird was a prominent lawyer for many years in this community. He served the volunteer community that he's talked about but he's far too modest to note that he was in fact the lawyer in one of the two ground breaking Supreme Court of Canada decisions about bilingualism in Manitoba, about the position of the French as the official language of Manitoba.

So he has fought many important court cases, he's capable of reading briefs and commenting on them obviously and in fact this was, to my mind a bit of a denial of natural justice in terms of the procedure that goes on before committee. Again, I'm not referring to specifically what goes on behind closed doors because we can't do that and that leaves all of us at a disadvantage as well. So I think we need to look at our roles.

The question that is before us today as Councillors is the question of the empty ownership of the memorabilia. The case that Mr. Baird has made is that right from the beginning, right from the conception of this notion of an Aquatic Hall of Fame associated with the 1967 Pan Am games and taking advantage of the 1999 Pan Am games to strengthen that presence and get the Aquatic Fall of Fame a permanent home.

Mr. Baird has traced that lineage back, some of it is before you, as he says there are volumes and volumes of correspondence and I have seen much of it and I've become convinced that there was at least a moral commitment from the Mayor, the Chief Executive of the City of the day, was it passed by council motion, perhaps not and that's one of the problems that our staff has had, but it is to me a clear commitment that was made at the time and to Mr. Baird in good faith and Dr. Thorlikson in good faith and that other committee members and members of the community had took on and I know that again without referring to specific things that went on behind closed doors, Mr. Speaker, I think that there was a reasonable view at Executive Policy Committee of this except that when it came to ownership Executive Policy Committee and I guess I can refer to this because it's in the report, Executive Policy Committee said no on the ownership question, on the central question that is before us.

I argue, Mr. speaker, that particularly given that we have just passed by consent, I believe it was item 1, item 1 of the same report of the Executive Policy Committee considered and voted on the same day at that E.P.C. meeting in which we announced some or decide that we are going to very strongly support the city owned museums, why are we doing that, because they have so much of our physical history, because there are so many artefacts connected with them and because the business arrangements, quite frankly, were so spotty and so ad hoc.

Well here we have on the same day before Executive Policy Committee a chance to straighten out in a really good fashion, a fashion that would really solve all of the major questions before the Aquatic Hall of Fame.

We can straighten out the question of the collections. We can take ownership. What is the risk Mr. Speaker, our administration advises us that it is quite low or that's my interpretation of the report, they don't use those words, but they report that for 25,000 dollars in appraisal, which is not much for a collection that may be worth as much as 4 million dollars, that for a 25,000 dollar investment and for an agreement to self insurance, we've heard from Mr. Baird that this is not a collection that has been vandalized or subject to theft over the years, that we could in fact self insure, we could own this memorabilia, this collection on display at the Pan Am pool, happens to be located in River Heights - Fort Garry but it is a citywide recreational facility, it serves constituents of all members before Council and I would suggest Mr. speaker, that it's worth doing.

It's unfortunate that we would have to to defeat this report to do that because in other respects I think that the staff have worked very hard with the Aquatic Hall of Fame and I would not associate myself

with the comments that Mr. Baird made about bureaucracy. I know he feels very strongly about that and I'm not going to convince him but I do believe that our civil servants have worked hard certainly in the time since I've become Councillor to reach some agreement with Mr. Baird on the matters of substance.

This was the sticking point. The staff came to the politicians and looked to the politicians for guidance, the politicians said no, hands off. We don't want to do that. It is that political decision that I'm challenging today, Mr. Speaker, and I thus will be voting against the report.

I will ask for a recorded vote and I would urge all Councillors to join me in doing that. That would send the process back to E.P.C. essentially and give an opportunity to reconsider this central question of the collections. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi on the clause.

Councillor Gerbasi: I haven't had time to prepare for this but I'm thinking perhaps a referral back on a motion of referral that might be a better way to deal with it than defeating it. So, I would move referral back.

Mr. Speaker: Your referral motion is in order; you have participated in the debate. Mayor Katz, did you wish to speak against that?

Mayor Katz: Mr. speaker, first of all, I do want to thank Vaughan Baird for his dedication and passion towards this, and there certainly has been a problem trying to deal with this, and the realities are, is when people allege that someone said something and committed to something, maybe they did, maybe they did not but I think we all know that Council is supreme and if something goes through Council it's something has been committed through.

I can tell you that the administration spent many hours trying to deal with this in a very fair and objective manner as well as trying to maintain the collection of the memorabilia and I think one of the things that they asked for Mr. Speaker, was that the city at least be given the opportunity to see some verification of who controls the memorabilia, who may own it.

We don't have those answers right now. I don't see how we could do anything until that possibly took place. The realities are is that we do want to support it. By the same token, and we made other recommendations to support it, but the memorabilia is certainly an obstacle which I think was given a great deal of consideration and not, you know there were a lot of unknown facts which we still can't get answers to and Mr. Speaker, I certainly stand by the recommendation at this particular point in time and I will not support that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, on the motion to refer. All in favour. Opposed? That's close. Let's have a recorded vote on the motion to referral. In favour of referral, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 8.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is lost due to a tie. Councillor Gerbasi, did you wish to speak to the clause? No, any other debate. Mayor Katz, closing debate on the clause.

Mayor Katz: Mr. speaker, as I said earlier, a lot of hard work from the administration went into this to try and come to a conclusion so that the Aquatic Hall of Fame could continue and actually so that people would have the opportunity to see all these artefacts in a proper environment, and some very difficult

decisions were made. In reference to the heritage preservation policy by Councillor Benham, I think we're comparing apples with oranges.

The whole purpose of that, Mr. Speaker, was to adopt a policy so that we have a long term policy for preservation and that's what we are concerned about, the preservation and we addressed issues of how the preservation should be taking place.

We also have put an offer on the table for an agreement with the Aquatic Hall of Fame. I think everything is there so that we can proceed in the right direction and I don't want to give the impression to anybody that this was an easy decision.

You could certainly see the passion and devotion from Vaughan Baird and as he said he's been there a very long time, but we want to make something happen there and I think we've come up with a viable plan that can help the Aquatic Hall of Fame gain the exposure and the notoriety it should expect considering it's a national facility, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The debate is closed on the clause. All in favour of clause six will please rise. All in favour of the clause please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried. We proceed now to notices of motion which there are three. We will deal now with motion number one moved by Councillor Gerbasi, seconded by Councillor Thomas which is the OlyWest motion.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi
Seconded by Councillor Thomas

WHEREAS the City Council resolution enabling the building of a hog slaughterhouse in St. Boniface Industrial Park was introduced only seven calendar days before Councillors were asked to vote on it;

AND WHEREAS the haste with which the decision was made prevented Councillors from hearing from affected members of the public, both residents and nearby businesses;

AND WHEREAS many residents and nearby businesses have made it clear through meetings with Councillors and media interviews that they are opposed to the building of the hog slaughterhouse in that location;

AND WHEREAS City Councillors want to be fully informed about the wishes of the people they serve;

AND WHEREAS Bernie Wolfe, the former deputy mayor of Winnipeg, has stated that the building of the hog slaughterhouse is incompatible with the original intent of City Council in establishing St. Boniface Industrial Park;

AND WHEREAS some businesses currently located in St. Boniface Industrial Park have stated they will move out of the area and possibly out of Winnipeg if the hog slaughterhouse is built in that location;

AND WHEREAS there are extensive environmental impacts and potential additional fiscal consequences that have not yet been determined;

AND WHEREAS the Clean Environment Commission process is not yet complete and should be completed before council approves any incentive package;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:
1. City Council hereby rescinds its approval for the OlyWest Project: Economic Development Incentive Package approved at the November 23rd, 2005 meeting of Council. Council Minutes - May 24, 2006

2. The administration provide appropriate wording to amend Zoning By-Law 6400/94, that is currently under review to include intense land uses such as hog plants, emission factories and chemical waste storage facilities as conditional uses, so that public hearings will be required.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, opening debate on your motion, please.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The motion before us today gives Council an opportunity to reconsider its previous decision to provide a 4 million dollar incentive package to lure this new hog slaughterhouse plant to Winnipeg.

Last November there was not a lot of time, there was a mere nine days for all Members of Council to consider whether or not this was a good choice for Winnipeg. Since November the whole situation has shifted dramatically.

First of all, there's been a huge public outcry from residents and businesses that go far beyond anything the city has seen in recent memory.

Why is there such huge opposition to this proposal. When the decision to expand Schneider's was made back in 2000 when I was a new Councillor, we didn't see this level of public concern and what has changed since then?

For one thing this isn't the expansion of an existing facility. It's a new facility in a new location, a location that currently contains a number of high tech established businesses who do not want this plant opening up beside them. What has also changed is awareness. There is much more experience and knowledge out there about the mega hog plant industry. That information tells us that this is an industry that brings with it a myriad of environmental problems. It brings with it the problems that people don't want to have to live beside or be affected by.

Back in 2000 we were assured that the jobs this industry would bring were high paying and safe jobs, but today we have learned from the Maple Leaf experience in Brandon that these jobs are lower paying, high injury jobs with a turnover rate of 100%. Some people have argued that a job is a job, but it seems to me that if we're going to subsidize a business with taxpayers' money those jobs should be jobs that are stable and help build our community.

Now I recognize there's a history of the meat packing industry in Manitoba providing good decent jobs. Unfortunately, some things have changed and the wages have been lowered.

We also want to see opportunities for new immigrants, but a migrant or temporary work force that doesn't settle here or truly immigrate here does not make our community more safer, more stable, and that's what's happened in Brandon. Immigrants who want to stay and make their life here in Winnipeg need safe jobs with good transit access and affordable housing nearby and yet that's not what this plant will offer.

We've also learned that other high tech desirable jobs in other industries in the St. Boniface Industrial Park are threatened by this proposal, that skilled jobs will not happen that would have happened because current businesses are reconsidering expansions and are considering leaving, and these potential jobs could equal or overshadow the jobs, potential jobs from the OlyWest plant and these jobs are better jobs and safer and cleaner jobs.

One reason that there's such public frustration and anger over this issue is the perception of a lack of transparency and poor process.

At the November 2005 Council meeting, Councillor Magnifico stated that Olymel told me in January they are going to have

open houses in St. Boniface and Transcona.

For whatever reason this didn't happen, but from the public's point of view the process has been abysmal, not to mention what happened today with a plan to stack the Council meeting so that the residents who live in Winnipeg and who live in the community are not allowed into the meeting. I've never seen anything like that.

We've dealt with other controversial issues, for example, since I've been on Council, for example, the MTS Center, and when we dealt with that City Centre Community Committee held public hearings so people could at least be heard and then there were approvals that were required for conditional uses and variances and there were public meetings held.

The city doesn't have the mechanisms or safeguards in our bylaws right now to require a decent public process, and if you'll note the other part of the notice of motion calls on Council to amend the zoning bylaw to make intense land uses such as this a conditional use so that a public hearing would have to be held before something like this could be approved.

Even though several Councillors have suggested that we do this, I learned last week that this has not been included in the proposed zoning bylaw redraft so I hope this will be reconsidered.

I don't happen to agree with Mayor Sam Katz when he said in the November 2005 debate, and I quote, "on the economic package it's one of the best things that ever happened." Many Members of Council and a growing number of citizens are not convinced of that. In fact, many people, particularly those who live in that quadrant of the city, think that it's one of the worst things that could happen in our city.

We have been told that it is not the city's jurisdiction to worry about the environment in these types of situations and that the Clean Environment Commission will deal with it.

Well, just as often as it is said there is only one taxpayer to pay for things. There is only one planet that we live on. We are all responsible for this kind of decision and I do not buy the argument that Council need not consider the many legitimate concerns about the environmental impact that this kind of industry brings coming to the inside of our city.

Furthermore, it is the city that has to pay the vast majority of the costs to clean up our rivers and to purify our water. Regarding this issue of sewer and water costs, I would like to remind Council of an important comment that was included in the original report on the OlyWest incentive package back in November.

The report states that Council should consider a revision to the sewer bylaw that would see all heavy producers and high level of nutrients pay a surcharge for their wastewater treatment. The report says that this is a sound policy revision as all ratepayers should not be required to subsidize high nutrient discharge industries. This makes all the sense in the world and it is only fair that heavy polluters pay some of the costs that other taxpayers are left with.

I am still waiting to hear one word uttered from this Mayor or E.P.C. showing that they are all open to this idea. I look forward to hearing that.

The Mayor and his staff keep pointing back in the media or their staff, pointing back to a decision made six years ago about myself and Councillor Thomas supporting the expansion of the existing Schneider's plant.

It's clearly a sign of absolute desperation, and I guess they're really having trouble defending their position that they are taking in 2006. I would point out that it's a good thing to have an open mind. It's a good thing to be willing to learn, and there's no shame in admitting you're wrong and there's no shame in taking a

different course and listening to the citizens of Winnipeg.

I have happened to spend my six years on,

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, out there.

Councillor Gerbasi: Can you stop the clock.

Mr. Speaker: Everybody can be heard with respect, please. Thank you, continue Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: I've learned a lot in my six years on Council and in the last six months a lot, all Members of Council have had a lot of time to learn and think and there's nothing shameful about reconsidering and changing their mind when they get new information and that's nothing to criticize anybody for.

Today this Council has an opportunity to listen, to the public, to the residents, to the business people who have spoken loud and clear despite the attempt to shut them out of the building.

They don't want this plant and the problems that it brings, whether it be environmental, social or quality of life issues and we heard very, very reasonable, thoughtful, responsible options from the business group and the residents group in terms of looking at other alternatives and other options.

There's other choices that this Council can make and I urge you today to make another choice. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Lazarenko
Seconded by Councillor Smith

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that OlyWest Project: Economic Development Incentive Package, Executive Policy Committee - Notice of Motions, be laid over for 60 days;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the matter be referred to the Executive Policy Committee and with the following instructions:

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

2) That the City consult with the Province and conduct public consultation in the affected communities in east Winnipeg and report back the results of those consultations to EPC and Council prior to said Motion returning to Council; and

3) That the OlyWest Project business plan be made available to Council with an administrative analysis of its contents

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko, you have a motion of referral with instructions, number five. I'm going to ask, folks out there, to refrain from pounding on that glass. It's unnecessary. If it breaks, there's going to be, you know, it's going to be very harmful, I'm sure. So please refrain from doing that, so thank you very much for your respect. Refrain from doing that, please. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's unfortunate that we've gone through something like this. If this Council would have listened to some of us last November on a motion that was presented to Council, was to lay the matter over for one month, seek public consultation, get a report from the various departments on the proposal so that citizens and residents in the area would have been made aware of and able to ask questions.

Instead it was pushed through and I was one that I did not support the proposal because of the process. Now here we are

here again. This is why I prepared the motion yesterday that's before us here today asking this matter be laid over for 60 days and also that EPC direct the administration to review the proposed OlyWest project and report back on all implications and alternatives from the point of view of various city departments.

Now Mr. Speaker, I know some of us would say that this is wrong. We're still not too late, Mr. Speaker. Some Councillors are in a hot seat over this, and I mean really in a hot seat and also when we have the province of Manitoba goes along and says, hey, this is a good deal, they came before the Mayor and Members of Council and Council hastily dealt with this and said it's a good deal.

This motion also, to direct the city consult with the province and conduct public consultation and the affected communities in east Winnipeg and report back the results of these consultations to E.P.C. and then onto the floor of Council, and, finally, that the OlyWest project business plan be made available to Council with administrative analysis of its content.

This did not happen on the last clause we dealt with in November. Confusion, Mr. Speaker, I know the Clean Environment Commission by legislation has the authority to deal with all issues whether it may be a smell or not a smell, that's their responsibility. But when the Province approaches the City of Winnipeg on a proposal we act hastily and where the hell is the province.

Where's the Premier of Manitoba, where's some of those that rant and rave at the demonstration this morning. This says we got this, rescind, rescind. Is this what a parliamentarian will tell us, rescind on something that was legal and binding that was voted on last November.

We had a meeting, a briefing, but our legal services last Friday that I have called for and they gave us a clear indication there will be concerns that will, things will be happening that if we decide to go with that motion that Councillor Gerbasi has.

I've always stated. The motion has not much substance in it except to rescind. That's not good enough, Mr. Speaker. If this would go to a court of law and this is what we were told, no doubt the courts will not even consider it because there's no substance. Now here's an opportunity to lay this over, take it back, the province might be able to say we agree with the City of Winnipeg, find an alternative location.

What happens is that when you have someone like the Chamber of Commerce each and every time they come and they give us directions, here's what you should do, term limitations for Councillors, where are they today.

Where's a spokesperson for the Chamber of Commerce to come here and voice their opinion and tell us is this a good deal or not a good deal, can we do this, can we not do that. I'll tell you right now. I'm not prepared to go into the direction of the unknown, to find out that the city can get sued, you don't know for what amount. The Chief Executive Officer has stated today when the question was asked by Councillor Benham, he said we'll take it when the time comes.

We dealt with the True North in the same direction with the former Mayor Glen Murray, was walked onto the floor of Council with him within five or seven days, was challenged by individual people. It was held back for a year and a half, made us look like a bunch of amateurs.

What I'm asking for here today, Mr. Speaker, nothing can happen because the Clean Environment Commission has made it very, very clear whether it's politically, has been motivated to go in that direction, not to hold the hearings until the year of 2007. Now it's ample time, Councillors. Those of you have voted in that direction, here's an opportunity.

Nothing will happen. There will be no threat to OlyWest, no threat to anybody else but it will give the option, the people that are here today, they are here for a reason, and I congratulate them. It's part

of democracy at work. They should not be going in this direction. They should have had those answers from last November yet. They don't know. That's the whole bloody problem. They don't know. They don't have the faintest idea what effect this is going to have on the traffic.

My motion tells you right here, to get all the various departments such as Water & Waste, Public Works, Streets and Transportation, Community Services, Fire Paramedic Services, Winnipeg Transit, Property Planning and Development, all that to come in as a report to get the input, and we can do that Mr. Speaker with no problem. This at least is going to give us the opportunity to cool down, get the things back in order.

Members of Council who voted for this last November made a final decision. Those of us who were opposed to it we have no choice but to go along with the decision made by Council.

This is the policy. This is the rules, and we take an Oath of Office, Mr. Speaker, that's very touchy on issues such as this, that we know for a fact that we're doing something that is wrong that we may have to pay the price.

Legal services on the advice that they had given us Mr. Speaker, I thank them for it because it had given me an idea what direction, what direction we have to go. When we're dealing with the Schneider extension back in the year 2000 not one member of the present Council voted in opposition because then Mayor Murray had said this is a great deal because the province said it's a great deal. We have to go along with the province and what do we get in return.

We have only two sources of revenue that is property taxes and business tax, majority. We don't have no P.S.T. We don't have no other form of taxes. The province gets, reaps in the profits, big time. Premier Doer said at one time in five years we get our money back. We will not get our money back. Why do we have to be the leaders to take the lumps, to take the flack. We're just dealing with the issue of land. There was no reason for all the people to be here today. But they are here because they have a concern. They're not getting any answers.

Where is the province? They have a bigger stake in this than we have. What they have proposed in the past, Mr. Speaker, is that each and every time that we have to make a decision and the decision that is made by us no input from the federal government. Where are some of the businesses in the City of Winnipeg to come here to Council.

Where are they to say just a minute, this is wrong what you're doing because your going to set a precedent that you'll be able to, any clause that's before Council and then finally something at the whim of some person will say we're going to rescind, to rescind. This is a concern that I have, Mr. Speaker; the credibility of every individual member of Council is at stake in here.

To me it really doesn't matter that much because I did not support the deal last November. The deal was made. We made that decision on the clause in November with the OlyWest proposal. It's done.

To rescind you have to have some grounds, but of those who want to proceed in that direction and maybe possibly be faced with a court challenge, that might drag on, might even go to the Supreme Court of Canada, what kind of a message are we going to be sending and some of the businesses not here.

Some of those when dealing with some other issue, they are here. Today just a few that are involved with the St. Boniface Industrial Park were here, but outside, outside, they're not here. There is not one member, people that spoke out at the rally today such as a member of parliament, why wasn't he here today to speak to be recorded in Hansard of the comments being made. Because no doubt they would be challenged.

An oath of office, Mr. speaker, that is taken by every level of government politicians stands, it's legal, and there is a responsibility, and I sympathize with the

people that may be faced with a plant that they don't know anything about, and I hope OlyWest would see to it, hold public consultation, get all the answers that are required, but we should vote on this motion that's before here now Mr. Speaker, lay it over for 60 days which is not that long and then it comes back to us for a final decision. Olywest were not opposed when I asked that question. The delegation was here, and they said, yes, they would welcome this. There's nothing, nothing wrong with this. Let's get, I want to know myself as an individual Member of Council I'd like to know to get additional information from all of our departments, what adverse effect is it going to have within the next 5, 10, or 20 years.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Councillors, I ask for your guidance. Do you wish to sit beyond 12:00 to complete the debate on this motion or call it 12:00? At 12:00. No agreement. It's 12:00. Then I'm going to call it 12:00 then and we'll come back at 1:30. Great.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of May 24, 2006 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Clerk, do we have a quorum?

Clerk: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have quorum.

Mr. Speaker: Resuming debate on the notice of motion and the referral with instructions, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Actually Mr. Speaker, if you could let the next speaker go, I appreciate it I'll go second. Thanks

Mr. Speaker: Well, the next speaker isn't here, so Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you, can I have a ruling from the Speaker on this. Is this just for the referral, and are we debating the motion?

Mr. Speaker: We're debating both.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. That would be helpful. Thank you, I wanted to focus on four issues with regard to the motion that's here which is the location of the plant, the questions around odour, our inadequate zoning regulations and the questionable financial incentives.

Now Councillor Gerbasi quite adequately explained our queries around location. I guess my concerns are that St. Boniface Industrial Park is being used as a buffer and with the prevailing wind that comes from the south, I am very concerned about how that'll impact on the odour, and it's very difficult to accommodate waste, and I think what I'll do is to explain this.

I'll give Council a personal vignette which I shared with Executive Policy Committee while I was a member of Executive Policy Committee so they're well aware of my hesitations with regard to that.

I said to them that my grandfather was a dairy farmer and a market gardener. He used the manure from his dairy farm to fertilize his root crops and it was a very good combination between the two of them.

At one point in his career he decided that he wanted to expand into hog farming. He started small with only 20 hogs and he quickly learned that the manure from the hog waste had to be separated from the rest of the manure that was being kept to fertilize the fields. It was very high in ammonia. It burned the manure and could not be put in with the rest of the manure for fertilization. He learned very quickly that he was burning the carrots and potatoes and other root crops that he was involved in, so he separated it.

The odour from it was so strong and our family lived with the odour of cow manure for the longest time when we knew where the manure pile was and it was there, and no one in the family was having a problem with it, but he had three quarter sections so he decided to take it as far away from the house as he could in the part of the lot that was treed and put it back there. He found he couldn't even keep it there because it was burning the trees and so his stint in pig farming was very short.

After two years he decided to get out of it. He decided it wasn't worth his while. The kids couldn't breathe when they went near the barns. We often went to play in the hay lofts and we had difficulty breathing because of the smell of the pig manure. When he moved it from one area to another, first separating it and then moving it right out to the edge of the property, it still could not be accommodated and I'm concerned about that.

We haven't got anything with what happened before and has happened since to explain to us how that additional stress on our sewage system will be accommodated. I know that we are upgrading our sewer system right now to take care of nitrogen and phosphates. I don't know what we're doing about ammonia and I think that we should have that kind of information before we go forward.

The Mayor was quite aware of that. I expressed his concerns, my concerns to him and the rest of the Executive Policy Committee at the time, and so they know how I feel about that issue, but I thought that it was important that I let everybody know that I don't feel due diligence has been done around those issues, and I think people need some closure on that instead of debating in ignorance and I don't like to do that and that's unfortunate that I've been put in this position.

The third issue is around the city's inadequate zoning regulation. We have more controls on x-rated videos and pool halls than we do on this kind of development within our city and that's a serious problem and our zoning regulations have to be looked at with regard to that, and I guess given one of the delegations who's been a very good employer in the community, has a lot of high end technological jobs, how can the city take three months to approve a small addition to an existing business but nine days to improve a large series of complex structures that may compromise the livelihood of many of the surrounding existing businesses.

Finally I'm questioning the financial incentives. I don't think we need to encourage what's not part of our priorities within Plan Winnipeg. We have been told in our economic development portfolio that we were going to focus on high tech jobs, pharmaceuticals, transportation, including bus and air transportation, and two of those businesses that have been targeted by the city as the type of business that we want to focus on and welcome to the community are saying that they're concerned that their integrity in this community is being compromised by the location of this business, and I think we have to seriously question why we would put at risk jobs 23, 25 dollars an hour and up for jobs that are going to be between 9 and 14 dollars which are not part of the five key businesses that we targeted in Plan Winnipeg as priority businesses that we wanted to encourage into the community and it's not only compromised existing businesses, it may compromise the future businesses that are considering settling in our community if we go in this direction, and I think it's sad that this information isn't here for us.

I think the financial incentives were taken into account too quickly without the proper due diligence on the assessment. I think having a one size fly and sniff trip was inappropriate particularly after the vote, and there are too many questions to consider putting forth the economic development package as approved and this is why I have been a seconder on Councillor Gerbasi's motion that we rescind its approval of the economic development package. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt on the motion and the referral, please.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I'll start with; I have a petition to give to the Clerk pertaining to this item. I'll read the petition out to you. This is to the City Council, City of Winnipeg; these are the reasons for this petition.

On November 14, 2005, the Manitoba government, the City of Winnipeg, the OlyWest consortium and the Manitoba Pork Council announced plans to support

and construct a new mega hog plant and rendering factory in the City of Winnipeg and near the large concentrations of urban residential developments.

Due to the primary concern for the potential of noxious odours as well as other concerns such as traffic and road impact, water supply, waste water treatment, decline in property values, cost to taxpayers due to disclosed government subsidies and proximity to a main branch of the city clean drinking water aqueduct, many Winnipeggers believe this represents poor judgment and must be reconsidered by the City of Winnipeg.

We petition the City of Winnipeg as follows: the Council of the City of Winnipeg as follows, be it resolved that the City of Winnipeg immediately cancel its plans to support the construction of the OlyWest hog plant and rendering factory near any urban residential area. There's over 4,000 names on this petition from citizens across the city. This doesn't happen every day here Councillors so I would like to leave this with the Clerk.

Thank you. This, to answer Councillor Lazarenko's question we might be trouble if we cancel, we are already in trouble Councillor Lazarenko, one only has to pick up and look at the front page of the Winnipeg Free Press today to see what kind of trouble the city has gotten itself in because of a failure of leadership and there's many parts of this which I think Councillors we have to look at and break it down and it comes down to one big failure at the end of the day.

I would like to talk about the failure of this Council to act like a Council. I've talked about this many times in this room, but I'm talking now for the first time in front of other constituents who may have not seen a Council debate or heard about it, but we do not operate as a Council. We operate as a body with one little Council inside a Council that has all the information, all the power, all the resources, and can do with it as it's wished when it comes to development of public policy. That is exactly how this mess has occurred.

E.P.C. behind closed doors decided how this was going to come about put together the package and then brought it forward to the public.

Councillor Magnifico knew about it way back when because he was on E.P.C.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, to the chair, please.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm speaking to the chair Mr. Speaker. Councillor Magnifico knew because he was on E.P.C.

Councillor Magnifico: I was not on E.P.C.

Councillor Wyatt: Excuse me, Councillor.

Councillor Magnifico: I was not on E.P.C.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Magnifico, please, you'll have your chance. Councillor Wyatt please on the clause.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Magnifico: I accept your apology.

Councillor Wyatt: I have not apologized to you Councillor. This Council,

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Magnifico, Councillor Magnifico, please, you know, we've been doing pretty well this morning let's not degrade it this afternoon.

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: You're out of order Councillor.

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Speaker, stick to the truth, is all I'm saying. Stick to the truth.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor! Sit down or face the consequences. Councillor Wyatt resuming debate.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. There's a failure of public involvement Mr. Speaker

and this is what happens when there's a failure of public involvement. There was no consultation of the residents; there was no consultation of the businesses and the community. There was no due diligence done by our own administration. There was a failure of due diligence.

Our own administration, if there was due diligence, it has not been supplied to this Council. We do not know the impacts, the whole impacts to our water and waste systems, we do not know all the impacts to our road system, we do not have detailed planning reports with regards to impacts on the surrounding communities. We have more detailed reporting when it comes to a 20 housing subdivision than it does to a massive hog plant, and we have more due diligence and more public consultations than something like this is dropped into the middle of a community.

There is the failure of honesty. I realize Councillor Swandel disagrees and I'm sure he'll address it in his comments but clearly Councillor Swandel if the comments are true is the only Councillor that showed the courage to say what he really thinks and that if it was being built in his community he wouldn't be able to support it and bravo for him and I believe that this speaks to the direct hypocrisy that's on this Council today and that if it was built in anybody else's community they would be standing up here fighting this all the way. The fact it's shoved right beside Transcona, ladies and gentlemen, that's what brings us here today.

I want to talk to you about the failure of the political system and politics, the failure of a Mayor who refuses to meet with businesses who have tried behind the scenes to do the diplomatic route before having to go public, a simple door shut in their face. Any other time they want to meet with the Mayor of the city of Winnipeg, a company representing hundreds of employees, long time company built up in this city would get a meeting like that, but now the doors are shut. Not able to have a meeting with the Mayor.

I want to talk about the failure of our political system in the Manitoba Legislature. And the fact that the Doer government is putting 28 million dollars basically towards this hog plant and the that fact that we have some N.D.P. M.L.A's who are running scared out in Transcona and Radisson, they probably should be because the N.D.P. government is pushing this down a community which has loyally support it over and over and over again in elections. I have to ask. I was a member of the New Democratic Party for ten years and I remember the New Democratic Party.

This is not the New Democratic Party I remember. I don't know who Gary Doer is. Is he a conservative or is he a New Democrat? Because these are the policies that have been pushed by Gary Filmon and he seems to have grabbed the entire file and run with it.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that there will be consequences in my mind with regards to this in our community and with regard to what this government is doing. They cannot hide.

I appreciate the fact that Mr. Blaikie was here today speaking on the matter, the two M.L.A.s were not. The fact of the matter is the government of Manitoba brought this to the city, called the city, there was a meeting down in the legislature, the bowels of the legislature, in the basement in the legislative dining room back last spring chaired by Eugene Kostyra where it was put to us that we need to build a hog plant in Winnipeg, let's get on and do it And this is what we have before us today.

There's an environmental failure in my view of the stewardship of our province and you know the pork industry is actually quite amazing because the longer they go on with this issue they remind me actually of the tobacco industry, you know, with regards to how they actually manage to discredit themselves.

The longer they keep pushing this issues the more issue are going to come to the fore about the environmental nature and the impact on rural Manitoba and I cite the commission, the C.E.C. commission which made a report to the province when

Brandon was thinking of expanding or planning to expand Maple Leaf, their treatment facility, and it recommended that a full detailed study be done because the commission, based on the information presented to them, is not convinced by information presented by the proponents, the public or the government of Manitoba that hog production in Manitoba is sustainable. Adequate scientific measurements to verify the sustainability of such operation was not presented at the hearing.

It went on to make a serious recommendation that an all party task force involving farmers, involving the industry, involving universities look at the sustainability of hog production. At that time it was the Assiniboine River basin. This has not been done in Manitoba and hasn't even been done in the Assiniboine River basin and yet we're proceeding with this knowing full well that if this plant is built they will have to increase hog production in Manitoba because we don't have enough hogs and what does that mean.

It means more barns and more finishing barns in rural Manitoba. You think this has been a fight. You've seen nothing yet of the kind of wars that are going to break out around rural Manitoba 100 miles circling the city. You wait and see what happens and I say that to Gary Doer who might be watching this on TV and some of his provincial Colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, Lake Winnipeg is dying. It's literally dying before our eyes and it's been dying the last 15 years. I'm not a scientist. The studies have not been done, but one can start drawing conclusions that the growth of this industry in the last 15 years exactly corresponds with the growth and the death of Lake Winnipeg.

There's a failure of vision, Mr. Speaker, a vision in the City so that we can only get agri-jobs, that we can't do any better. That this is what we have to put up with, this is our lot. We don't seem to have; I don't know what the economic strategy of this city is for economic development to attract industries. This is the only industry that we attracted in the last two to the city that I can see the City's been involved with. Where is the economic strategy, what kind of businesses do we want to attract.

What is our future. I believe we can keep young people in this city but it means having a vision, Mr. Speaker, it means having a vision that involves high tech industries and not having to pick up in the newspapers and reading their MacLean's magazine that came out this week and talked about low wage Winnipeg, dead end jobs and the decline of our city, have to read about that in a national magazine is an embarrassment and then now to hear articles by different economists and business individual, business people. Steve Demings, President of Site Selection Canada involved in finding companies for high tech firms to find locations across the country who is on the record as saying that Manitoba government does not have any idea of how to attract high tech jobs. The same can be said for the City of Winnipeg. So this is our lot, a vision based on 19th century industries. That is not a vision.

Mr. Speaker, finally, and I know my time is short, there's a failure of compassion. Compassion to me is the most important thing that we can have as an elected representative because we day in and day out receive the calls from constituents on various issues.

I see zero compassion. I see zero understanding around this table. I want to thank the Councillors who are standing with the constituents and with the citizens of Winnipeg, Councillor Smith, Councillor Thomas, Councillor Lubosch, Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Benham.

I don't know yet where Councillor Lazarenko is going on the motion but I want to thank those Councillors for their support and ongoing support. But there is a lack of compassion and I can tell you that there's more than one constituent, numerous and business people who have come up to me and said, Russ, We'll going to fight this with everything we got but if we don't win that's it.

We are leaving. We don't want to have to see our property values depreciate which

we know we will probably take a hit on. We are going to leave and that is the worst thing that you could be hearing from citizens of the city and they are serious. Do not guess that they are not. They are serious and they will leave.

Councillors, this was a complete, you want to call this a circus. Well this was a boondoggle. This is a mess. It's time to take a step back, cancel the decision made in November. There's nothing wrong with saying that you made a wrong decision and go forward with something that's more reasonable and workable along with the Provincial government which should be showing some leadership. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, Councillor. Any other debate on the clause? Councillor Lubosch, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Lubosch: I'll refer to Councillor Smith.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: I'm not afraid to get up and speak.

Mr. Speaker: Well, when I call your name, please do so then.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker you know I want to tell everybody here, I gave out these little pigs for all those people who voted for the slaughterhouse. Let me tell you this. This is good, keep these, you'll be under a lot of stress with this slaughterhouse, with a lot of questions not answered that are going to come to hurt you, so just squeeze this and it will ease your tension.

You know, seven, nine days after it was announced the slaughterhouse is to be built, we dealt with it on Council, nine days, and you heard one of the speakers say they've been working on this for two years and six months they've been negotiating and we had nine days. It's incredibly bad.

Now Planning Property & Development reports that the nearest residential dwellings are 1.5 kilometres to the northeast with 1.5 kilometres to the southwest.

That's all it says. It doesn't talk about wind, you know. I'm from Vancouver, you know. Vancouver has very little wind. When you come to Winnipeg, you realize how windy it gets, and you don't have to have the operation right next to you. The wind will carry the odours, very clear cut.

Now we had, we did go ahead and have the smell test. We had Councillor Franco Magnifico, take two I gather, two of his supporters, you know, I asked the two people from OlyWest who actually decided on the people going to the plants to view, to see what they were like, and they couldn't tell me, and then they phoned me a day later and said, well, talk to the Councillor so it was Councillor Magnifico who chose the two people and he already was, had his mind set on okaying this project.

You know, it seems to me he didn't use his nose too well and he didn't find out the fact that one of the operations was a fairly new operation and wasn't working at full capacity. You know the report from Property Planning and Development talks about this as a compatible project with the other firms in the neighbourhood.

The fact is, since we've passed this you've seen the firms come out and say they are going to leave. Some of them are going to leave and these are high tech jobs and what are we going to do. We're going to take in effect low paying jobs in place of them. Not good, not good.

Now I want to tell you something, too, by the way. All the members of the Executive Policy Committee will all vote the same way here. They have been told how to vote. They've got it clear in their heads how to vote, but they have a problem, a big problem. They don't know how to go through the agenda and list the documents, facts that support their position. They can't do that, and so they get the Mayor's office I gather to prepare quotes from various people in the past, arguments, one sheet says there's key messages, facts worth repeating often. I

mean, why don't we just have the Mayor here. We don't need his sidekicks that just follow him blindly.

It is important to respect the people, the residents and the business community that are opposed to this project. You know, why can't it be outside the city. Why can't it be in another location in the city. We haven't even looked at alternative locations. We haven't even assessed the different ones. We're just given this, that's it, rush it through Council, fait accompli, and I like to thank Councillor Gerbasi for the motion because, you know, I think it was important to do it at this stage. I think it was important to have all the people out to hear the debate because let me tell you this. This project is going to harm us.

It's going to create a lot of problems in the future and the only way we can change it is to admit our mistake and say let's reverse our decision. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I want to comment a little bit about the process because ultimately it's the failure of our political decision making process at city hall that has really resulted in this kind of outcome, the fact that there are so many citizens here today representing their communities, their homes, their small, medium and large sized businesses for what should ultimately be a good news story for Winnipeg, the opportunity to develop the agri-business sector which certainly is no stranger to our city or to our province.

What ultimately should be a good news story is becoming a very hotly contested and ugly debate, and this should really surprise nobody here today, certainly not the members that sit around this chamber or the media that have been following this story closely and have had the opportunity to see other outcomes at city hall.

The fact is that when this decision was taken it was taken in private meetings and discussions and a vast majority of citizens because their Councillors were not represented in these meetings were left out, and had we had a more open process, had we had an opportunity to discuss and debate this matter and to be objective about it, then very likely we would have had the educational opportunity and participation in a much more democratic, much more effective and reasoned way, but we didn't do that, and so here we are today.

And ultimately whatever the outcome is of today's vote it isn't going to change the process and ultimately the process is what needs to be changed so that we don't come to these kinds of predicaments.

The fact that as Councillor Wyatt pointed out we spend more time debating side yard variances, determining how people position their garages and tool sheds, we spend hours debating those kinds of issues in public and we spend zero time debating the types of issues that really shape and form our city.

There are many questions that need to be answered, and for this reason I didn't support the initial deal, if you will. We don't know what kind of impact this kind of development will have, and I'm prepared to call it rendering and food manufacturing on existing and established businesses and residents.

We don't know what the risk mitigation measures are going to be for dealing with the environmental products of this kind of industry, effluence, air quality issues, we don't know what kind of infrastructure is going to be required in terms of sewage treatment, water use, we offer discounts to high water and high sewage users in the city and we don't know what the cost of that is going to be because ultimately the subsidy has to be borne by the other rate payers. We don't know what land drainage issues are going to be and what kind of risk mitigation measures are going to be required in order to contain that, this is a large site, 60 acres.

Transportation logistics need to be looked at and we don't know what the impact is going to be on other existing transportation infrastructure. There's going to be more trucks on the road in that area which may require larger

pavement widths and intersections. There may be an additional rail line, a spur line developed in order to expedite rail cartage into the area.
We don't know what the impacts of that is going to be, especially if these are going to be done at level crossings. We don't know what the social impacts are going to be, and I find it curious that we are hung up on the issue of job creation. For those of us who have taken the time to review the latest Stats Canada press release, brand new this month you'll note that unemployment in Manitoba is 4.7% which is in the lower quarter than unemployment any where else in the country.

We don't have an unemployment problem in this province. What we do have is a challenge attracting the kinds of employment that is going to bring people here from other provinces which brings me to a whole other set of issues and circumstances.

The Maple Leaf facility may be in its own right and own vain successful, but it hasn't been able to achieve any kind of operating success without the import of immigrant workers, and if you look at the rules and regulations that have been put in place by our federal government on immigrant labour, for the most part people can only come here for about one year to work unless there are some special arrangements made and I question the economic impact.

I've heard numbers quoted that there's a 400% multiplier on these kinds of industries in terms of the economic impact that a dollar invested generates. Well, I'm not sure that somebody coming here for one year from Mexico is going to settle down and buy a house for 150,000 dollars and buy a car and a microwave and a TV and I'm not sure that they're going to bring their children here either and enrol them in our schools and in our community centers.

I would suggest to you that unless we study this issue we don't know whether or not that money is going to be returned to the country of origin in the form of a mail order, pardon me, a money order, and that we may see very little of that, that economic development translated into economic investment and prosperity here.

I will not be supporting the package as it's been approved by Council. I'll be supporting both motions that have been presented here today because I'm committed, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier during question period, I'm committed to working to develop a new alternative, and I'm prepared to do it concurrent to the evolution of this one, whatever the outcome may be.

I believe that an agri-business industrial park could be located, preferably east of the city, to take advantage of the prevailing westly winds that we experience over 90% of the time if you check with the Environment Canada weather history. I believe that locating in that region would provide the opportunity to develop a park much larger than 60 acres, something that could be even more beneficial to the businesses and industries that want to locate there based on the economies of scale that are created when you build one large sewage and effluent treatment plan for ten businesses versus building one such plant for one or two businesses.

I also believe that land can be specifically zoned and we can differentiate our city and our province by doing so for businesses of this nature. I believe that the logistics with respect to the Trans Canada highway running east and west in that location and highway 59 becoming the I-29 in the United States is a superior location to the one that's currently being considered because of the close proximity of the intersection of those two highways.

I also believe that the main rail lines are closer in that particular location and that they could be integrated with safer crossings and ultimately a more efficient and effective way to transport both manufactured goods, manufactured goods and products that are going to be going there for manufacturing. Large labour pools are also located. Certainly people in Transcona may be interested in working as people in North Kildonan maybe or any other part of the city at businesses in this type of a location. That

doesn't mean that the business has to be located in their back yard or in their front yard for that matter.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a better alternative out there, and I'm making a public commitment here today and putting my commitment on the record to work to try and find that alternative, and if we have to work doubly fast in order to make it a concurrent process then we'll do so.

That's what we're here to do and that's what we get paid to do, Mr. Speaker, and I invite any member of Council or any citizen member or any business leader to join me in the development of a better alternative.

We have all the opportunities to do so. The site selection criteria was looking for a large tract of land zoned M-3 beside a rail line, maximum separation from residential areas, trucking and other compatible businesses should also be located. They were looking for on site and off site infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure, et cetera.

These are all attainable in another location, Mr. Speaker. There's nothing unique about this location. Otherwise it would have been developed years ago. In fact, that land was not considered for development or new infrastructure for at least 20 years under our current Plan Winnipeg planning guidelines and to try and make a silk purse out of a sow's ear at this point doesn't make a lot of sense to me when there are better opportunities and bigger opportunities.

And ultimately I would like to see ten companies like Olymel, I would like to see complementary businesses on the environment side that deal with effluent, and sewage and water treatment, air quality and ultimately these can all work together syntactically to provide a stronger agri-business sector in our city rather than trying to deal with this one off proposal. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to start off my comments by saying welcome to everybody.

It is nice to see everybody even though I don't think everybody in this room agrees 100% on everything. It always is I think a better day for citizen participation. I should also say it's nice to see everybody inside. After lunch here it was beginning to remind me of my junior hockey days with people banging on the glass there behind me.

Listening to the, I guess the resident and local business concerns this morning, what I heard was, and I mean there has been some exceptions, Mr. speaker, but I think generally speaking what I heard from folks is that although, again, there's some exceptions, by and large people aren't opposed to new economic development in the City of Winnipeg.

I don't think people are opposed to this company. I don't think generally speaking, although some people are, generally speaking most people aren't opposed to the idea of hog processing. I think most people understand that this type of economic input to our community is a good thing and I think most people support it and I think that there are some issues that we're going to discuss in a moment, but I think by and large those are things that everybody agrees on, new economic initiatives for the city of Winnipeg are positive and people agree on that.

So I think, what should be remembered is we're all members of the same community who I think are fighting to try and get to some type of resolution to some type of problem that we feel we have. There's been a lot of emotion and a lot of things that are said which I think are unfortunate and I hope we can kind of leave those aside and as a community keep sort of working through this and who knows, maybe at the end of the day there might be some resolution that gives the majority of people some comfort.

Because I think at its essence what's happened here is we have concerned

members of our community who for whatever reason that they have are genuinely concerned about things that may affect their lives, may affect their homes, may affect their communities and may affect their families and regardless of whether you agree or disagree that is always fair ball at City Council.

No one can ever dispute that and I think subsequently those folks are looking to us to help them solve what they perceive as a real problem in the community and it's our obligation to try and do that.

For people who are gathered here and for the Speaker's benefit I would say that we are all City Councillors charged with the same responsibility trying to do what we can for our community. Because we're trying to foster economic development does not mean that we are evil people.

We certainly don't pretend to know every single thing about everything, but everybody here understands I hope that when a business comes and they're interested in a 200 million dollar investment in the community that has a significant ongoing multiplier, that it behoves us to at least listen to them, and that's what we're going to talk about I think.

In terms of process which I think there appears to be the greatest disagreement, I want to say a few things. First of all, the land in question has been zoned for this purpose, and in and of itself that might not give people any great comfort but it is important in some ways. We as a City Council, obviously Councillors that came before all of us, I believe, had to zone this land for this particular use.

That's significant in that at some point our City Council, again, not including myself or probably anybody at this table today made the decision this would be good land for this use and the community has developed to a greater or lesser extend and in accordance with that.

Our City of Winnipeg Charter sections 128 to 173 give the City of Winnipeg certain spheres of jurisdiction they're called. We're allowed to preside over certain things. Remember always we are a creature of statute of the provincial government. Our spheres of jurisdictions do not include issues on the environment.

That has been held on to under the Environment Act by the Minister of the Environment of the provincial government. The provincial government in their wisdom or not has made the decision that these types of decisions shall not be under the authority of the City of Winnipeg or any other municipality, and the reason they have done that historically is because often times meat processing plants of any type exist in larger or often smaller municipalities where the administration does not have the capacity to do these types of assessments, so the province has said with regard to all municipalities, regardless of where you are on the province, you do not have the authority to deal with this type of issue.

So a creature has been born, which has been the subject I guess of a lot of discussion today and will probably continue to be and it's called the C.E.C. process, the clean environment process, that's the process that exists and that's the process that for better or for worse this company or this conglomerate of companies has the obligation to go through prior to the permit or licensing being issued.

Some comments made in an email that I sent earlier, fair enough. As a City Councillor I see our decision here today, and I think most people agree, any decision made at this Council is absolutely contingent upon the eventual decision of the C.E.C. I do not see us either morally or legally as having the authority to authorize the construction of this facility without it going through that provincial process, and again, not our decision, not our process, a creature of statute and a creature of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

And that's what has made this so difficult because citizens have come to our City Hall and they've asked for process. Some Councillors on their behalf have asked for

process. Understandable, but from where I stand I see the process as yet to begin.

I see the application as not having even been made yet. The C.E.C. process involves public hearings. It involves intervener application, funded lawyers in certain circumstances and regardless of how you might feel about it, it does appear that that process gave people some satisfaction in Brandon, and I don't know where it started and I don't know where it wound up, but at the end of that process I think generally speaking the community at large felt fulfilled by that process,

And I want to remind people we have yet to even begin it, and when I say we, I mean we as a community, because we at the City don't have the power to make that decision, we just don't.

There's been some comments about this process and about things that have existed and what's happened in the past, and we've heard a lot of talk about the Schneider's plant. The Schneider's plant was done in 2000. That's when the decision was made, and it was a decision with respect to expanding an existing hog processing plant that was closer to the city. It was more close to residential houses and remains so today. The process that existed at that time was the exact same process that is being used today.

I have yet to hear a Councillor who sat on Council at that time to say that that process was somehow wanting. Councillors Gerbasi, Councillor Thomas, there have been some comments made, and they made them themselves, they supported wholeheartedly that process and they stood in this chamber and they said quite clearly they trust in this process, they support this process, and they will stand behind it, and I know Councillors that come behind me will read the quotes from Hansard that were, that have been distributed.

That's not unfair. It's not unfair to hold all of us accountable for decisions that were made in the past because businesses rely on this type of information. It is difficult when Councillors say things like I have to give people a chance to do what they are going to do and what they've laid out. The process they've laid out for environmental review is about as fair as you're going to get from my understanding that I've got until now.

Councillor Thomas, I appreciate the delegations who spoke here today. I heard their cautions. This will undergo a full provincial environmental review before any construction occurs, before any, not in tandem, not a pretend thing while something is already underway but before any occurs. We can ensure that environmental consequences of a negative nature do not happen here.

I wasn't here in 2000. I wasn't part of that decision, but it's difficult as a community to lay down something in 2000 that says we have a process that we trust, we have a process that we all believe in, that we can all work with, and then six years later to do a complete 180 and say this provincial government is not to be trusted this process is not to be trusted, if this happens it will be a negative thing.

We're in the business of trying to balance residential interests with business interests. We need some continuity. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Order, please. All right, demonstrations in the gallery are not permitted. Please respect that rule. Thanks. Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Franco Magnifico sniff test, you know, I've tried to explain the reason that trip was taken before and for Councillor Smith who I thought was aware, I'm gonna do it again here today.

First of all, I did not call it the sniff test. The media did because it makes better headlines and that's their job. I was going on a trip, fact finding trip to find information about these plants. It was to be a preliminary trip to find out what problems existed, if any, at these operations in other areas. I decided to take two Winnipeggers with me with the most to lose.

Both owned 300,000 dollar plus homes closest to the proposed site. One of these people was chosen by the Residents Association of Southland Park and one was chosen off of Plessis Road, I knew neither individual, in fact, the resident from Southland Park, I never met until the airport in Kansas City. And the Plessis Road resident who I had met once in my life was recommended by another Plessis resident.

This was not a trip to come back and tell people good things. This was a trip so people with something to lose came back and emptied themselves out to their neighbours and friends which they had ever, every chance to do.

When they came back from this trip these residents were somewhat appeased by what they saw. Were they totally sold, absolutely not, as I wasn't, but things were going in the right direction.

Now we went to this brand new plant, I understand that, and they also went to a 30 year old plant in Valley Junction, Quebec, just outside Quebec City.

I don't know where the information these gentlemen got was from, but these facts were never hidden. The media called us daily from St. Joseph, Missouri and Valley Junction, Quebec. This was never hidden. It was out in the open all the time and I don't understand the innuendo about these were personal friends of mine.

I never met these people, and both residents are available on calling me, I'll get you their number, and they will tell you exactly how it happened and what they thought of the trip. So please, feel free to call me and I'll let you know who they were.

The important part of this, and I think it's necessary that you see this; I was the only politician other than the Mayor's office that has seen the potential environmental concerns serious enough to actually do something about it.

I'm not finished doing my due diligence, and I expect to watch closely the C.E.C. standards are met and/or exceeded. If those standards cannot be met by OlyWest this plant will not be built.

If this is about process, I agree. Things could have been handled much differently, but if this is about process, let that be addressed for future developments and allow this one to begin those public consultations now. It's not too late to get your input through the C.E.C.

You know Councillors chose to make a decision on an economic package on November 23, 2005 knowing that environmental issues would be heard by the province's Clean Environment Commission during months of hearings. This decision has not been rammed through for the simple reason that it hasn't been finalized until the commission decides on a licence.

For example, Maple Leaf triggered C.E.C. hearings to put a second shift for its plant in Brandon. In March of 2003 Conservation Minister Steve Ashton started the Clean Environment Commission process to review the addition of a second shift for the Brandon Maple Leaf pork plant. Hearings did not take place until June and July of that year even thought the review was only considering the environmental impact of a second shift in a facility that was already built and operating.

The final licence approved the new shift only after several conditions were met. Since those conditions have not yet been met today the licence still has not been issued for that second shift.

The city in itself is being forced to comply with a Clean Environment Commission ruling on its water treatment licence and provincial laws mandate an approval process that can take months. The issues this Clean Environment Commission will consider include odour, air impact, traffic impact, noise, truck traffic, sewer treatment, water and groundwater quality. Contingency planning for accidents, emergencies and de-commissioning the factory if need be some day, environmental monitoring procedures, input and outputs and potential impacts

including, for example the trucking of hogs to the plant.

These will all be considered. In short, the provincial commission will consider every fair concern the opponents are raising, and every concern is outside our expertise at City Hall. Yes, the Clean Environment Commission advises the provincial minister of the environment, but the Minister is required to respond to the Clean Environment Commission's recommendation and an order to deny or issue a licence is binding as our conditions attached to the licence.

The current government has never overturned a Clean Environment Commission recommendation. OlyWest must file its application, provincial technical staff then review the application. The application and the environmental assessment are then placed in a public registry for public review with advertising for public awareness. The proposal is then circulated to a technical advisory committee in the provincial government for study.

The province has already invited citizens and citizens groups to apply for funding to help them prepare technical briefs for this process. Public hearings then begin after a set period of time to allow for opponents and interested parties to prepare submissions, and after open public hearings the panel then has 90 days to report on the process to the Minister of Conservation and a licence is issued or denied by the ministry based on the Clean Environment Commission's recommendations.

You know, I can only be guided by my predecessor here. When he considered approving the incentive for a similar rendering and slaughterhouse facility in the year 2000, then Councillor Dan Vandal said "I'm certain that these are issues that will be addressed, identified and remediate in the long run".

I cannot believe in this day and age where we can split an atom, we can send a man to the moon but we can't deal with manure from hogs and they know better than we do the Provincial Government will host a comprehensive environmental assessment where those issues will be identified. They'll be red flagged and they will be addressed. And that is why I'll be opposing this motion.

Please, let the factual environmental process run its course.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Let me start by thanking all the people that came down here today. I know it's been a difficult process, at times a bit raucous. I wanted to start by clarifying one particular point and I clarified it in the hallway with Councillor Wyatt earlier on but apparently he missed that conversation.

With reference to comments that I made about a pig processing plant in my back yard when somebody had mentioned what I thought about putting something adjacent to the Brady Landfill, I said it would require rezoning and my sense was that it wouldn't be supported and I wouldn't support it, so, for the record that's what I said.

Now, there's also seems to be a great deal of conversation around here regarding due diligence. I don't know what everybody's interpretation of due diligence is here and I hear it battered around in the business community, I hear it battered around the legal community and you know I think we're here talking about due diligence in a political context.

I can tell you what I voted for back in November was for due diligence. I think Councillor Magnifico referred to the process of the environmental hearings with the Clean Environment Commission and forwarding on to the environmental licensing process. Nobody knows better than the City of Winnipeg the strengths of the Clean Environment Commission recommendations.

I believe it was only as short as 2003 when the Clean Environment Commission made recommendations relative to our own environmental licence on sewage

and water treatment that the province of Manitoba took those recommendations and accelerated the process so that we had to conform in a far shorter time period, putting us at, to great expense and our ratepayers and the utilities to great expense and we fought light heartedly and are attempting to meet those requirements which are extremely stringent and difficult to meet.

The Brandon experience did provide a great deal of information and one of the pieces that it provided was through the citizens public hearing process that was held, I believe it was, a man that I have a great deal of respect for (in audible), who chaired a commission and they made a number of recommendations.

They spoke about not just having an environmental licensing process or a Clean Environmental Commission hearings but hearings relative to the sustainable development act of the province of Manitoba, and again, you know the spirit and intent of what they are trying to do I believe is the spirit and intent of what this Council asked for in this due diligence process, and the papers that I read talk about the, any deal that will be finalized being in keeping with the intent of this Council.

I don't see there's anything wrong with presiding down this path of looking at the environmental implications and looking at what is put forward there to mitigate those, any concerns that are brought forward. We do have the ultimate authority in this, our C.A.O. is negotiating this on our behalf, and knows that she is directed by the intent of Council, and I think when you read the documents that were provided to Council and what we approved the intent of Council was to do due diligence.

I also would just like to make comment to the fact, Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Thomas have kind of been treated I won't say unfairly but, you know, we're all entitled to change our minds on this floor. While I don't support the motion, I do support the right to bring it forward and I do support the right to change your mind and I think that as Councillors we need to remember that engaging in that type of we'll call personal, but to go after the two individuals that brought this motion forward isn't serving us any good and the debate seems to be serving as some good.

So, I won't be supporting either of the motions that are in front of us today but I do thank you for the work that you've done.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Benham please.

Councillor Benham: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the speakers who have made their points so far. I think they've made some good points and I appreciate Councillor Swandel's notion of collegiality there and the right of all members to get new information, understand things differently, read and go on from there so I think Councillor Swandel is right that that particular tactic by E.P.C. Councillors today is not going anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support both the motion by Councillor Lazarenko, and it's a referral motion so if it does not succeed I will support the main motion introduced by Councillor Gerbasi and seconded by Councillor Thomas.

In doing so, I first of all want to define what I am not. I am not anti business, and I think that's a slur that is a particularly bad one and doesn't fit. Clearly Mr. Sangster representing a very major business in this city and representing other businesses, neighbouring businesses is not anti business. It's clearly ridiculous to suggest that and sitting beside him in the gallery we have Mr. Ed Martens who's been part of the OlyOp group who's a former president of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce so I think trying to hang an anti business label on those who are opposed to this is so ridiculous. It's not going anywhere and I'm not anti business either.

Mr. Speaker, also I think it's important to note that I'm not anti farmer either, as far as I know the opponents to this aren't. I've discussed with the farmers who are behind us and I happened to have a

discussion with a farmer over the noon hour talking about the need for processing in Manitoba of Manitoba grown product, and I accept that, Mr. Speaker.

So what we are talking about is where should such a plant be located, where should such a hog slaughterhouse and rendering facility be located, and I say very clearly not there. Not in St. Boniface Industrial Park and I will say just as clearly, Mr. Speaker, that if it was proposed for Fort Garry Industrial Park in the Ward of River Heights - Fort Garry, I would also be opposing it strenuously and strongly.

Nor would I want the residents who live in part of Fort Garry that I represent or in Lindenwoods or any other neighbours of Fort Garry Industrial Park to be faced with the trucking in of thousands of hogs each day and all the other things associated with this.

So I'm pro business and I'm pro farmer, I'm just saying we have to find a better solution. I think Councillor Lubosch's suggestion of an industrial park outside of city limits or at least of the city of the residential portions of the city is a good one and one worth proceeding with and discussing. We need to find the right location.

The proponents have put forward that this will mean jobs, 1,100 jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, what kind of jobs are they and at what cost. We are told that these jobs will largely be low paying, low skilled jobs. We know that the Brandon plant, the advent of the Brandon plant drove down wages paid in similar plants in Winnipeg.

The unions regretted that, the union leadership regretted that but they said they had no choice and so in essence there's been a race to the bottom to see who can devalue jobs that were at one time were unionized and paid reasonably well. They were dangerous and unpleasant jobs still but at least they were rewarded and at least the people who had those jobs had an opportunity to build up some capital and perhaps buy a nice house in Winnipeg which is an objective that most people at most income levels can reasonably have in Winnipeg and that would be a good thing, Mr. speaker, because as everyone on this Council floor knows the only way a development like this pays off for City Council and for the City of Winnipeg is if employees buy houses.

If we simply have migrant workers coming in, not true immigrants because we are all children of immigrants or descendants of the first nations people, all Canadian, so clearly if we were to have immigrant workers, true immigrant workers, come in, take these jobs, become part of Canadian society, buy houses, become part of our community we would all accept that part of it.

But that's not what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker, based on the Brandon experience and even the proponents of this plant agree that this is what happened in Brandon.

First, Mexican workers, migrant workers came in, did the work, sent money home, went home themselves. Now there's trouble recruiting from Mexico and its El Salvador that is supplying these workers, Mr. Speaker, and, again, a little bit of a benefit to them and their families, zero benefit, zero benefit to the City of Brandon and zero benefit to the City of Winnipeg from the same thing happening here.

You know Mr. Speaker instead what we're doing is making a terrible choice. We are driving out of St. Boniface Industrial Park the 400 jobs currently held by Winnipeggers, most of whom own homes, most of them are paying property tax, we have the prospect according to Mr. Sangster of an additional several hundred jobs that could have been in St. Boniface Industrial Park in Winnipeg contributing to our tax base and we are told in a very serious way by that business that we may be sacrificing 400 jobs to grow to two or three times that number.

Gee, that would be around 1,200 if I'm doing the math right, Mr. Speaker, so we're going to give up 1200 high paying jobs with a technical aspect to them that could be taken by Winnipeggers and

we're going to send all that money to El Salvador, doesn't sound like much of a deal to me, Mr. Speaker. I don't see how anybody could think that was a good deal and I think the people around here tout their own business expertise, I think they better start doing some basic math.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a very specific reference here about the possibility of a lawsuit. Everyone here heard my question to the President of Olymel, are you going to sue us, his answer was I have no idea, I haven't considered that. So it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of Councillors around here have spent a lot more energy and time thinking about lawsuits and the possibility of a lawsuit than in fact the principle proponent has and Mr. Speaker I would simply point out that in terms of precedent in 1981 the provincial government had gone through a long process with Alcan, a giant company by anybody's measure.

In 1981 there was a change, new government took over, the New N.D.P. government said no we're not going make that deal, Alcan left. There was no lawsuit. There was no lawsuit Mr. Speaker because elected bodies have the right to change their mind collectively, to take new information and to use it and of course, Mr. speaker, as opposed to the possibility of an OlyWest lawsuit we have today the very real news that somebody in St. Boniface Industrial Park is considering suing City Council for going ahead with this decision. So I think we should certainly take that in the ballot.

Mr. Speaker, there are two real issues here that are paramount in my view as to what I will do as an individual City Councillor. First of all there is the issue of listening to the public and Mr. Speaker this may although he is very attentive when people seemingly attentive and perhaps the E.P.C. Councillors are somewhat less so, but I will say, Mr. Speaker that they aren't really paying attention and they aren't really listening to the people.

In fact, the people in charge of this City Council have a real problem with listening to people, and as a result they have tried to kill citizen committees that gave citizen advice. They succeeded, thank you, extension, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and they have succeeded in killing the environmental committee. I wonder what the Civic Environmental Committee would have had to say about this process except that Councillor Steeves of course voted to kill his own committee, gave us advice on the environment.

So the public has not been listened to and Mr. Speaker the public has not been listened to because this was pushed through in seven days. In seven days Mr. Speaker the point has been made about other parts of our process and that was wrong.

In addition, Mr. speaker, so that's the listening to the public, and what Councillor Gerbasi has suggested in this motion in clause two is a very good one which is anytime we have a major project like this, a hog slaughterhouse or a chemical factory or something else that's going to produce very serious emissions then Mr. Speaker, it should be treated as a conditional use and it should result in a full public hearing and we should be hearing from the public and we should be hearing from the businesses that are affected as well as the proponents.
We have had a totally one sided process around here and it's not acceptable to the people of Winnipeg and it's not acceptable to me as a Councillor and going forward I hope we change that process.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, and I have mentioned on the floor before, as an individual Councillor I had no opportunity to question our departmental staff especially in Water and Waste. I had a warning from a scientist at Freshwater Fish Institute who warned that some scientific literature is saying that endocrines in the pig's blood are not necessarily broken down by sewage treatment and can harm the wildlife in the Red River and Lake Winnipeg.

So Mr. Speaker we've spent a lot of time and energy worried about Garrison diversion and Devil's Lake sending all that terrible American stuff north and we in fact Mr. Speaker, might be responsible for

something just as bad. It's not good enough to say it's the province's responsibility to look after the environment Mr. Speaker.

We have a responsibility for water and waste. That's a civic responsibility and we as City Councillors should stand up for that and go for the kind of full public hearing and full disclosure that would give us the information we need to make an intelligent decision, part of that is listening to the people. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Benham. Order please. Thanks. Any further debate on the clause? Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've heard talks about jobs, low paying, high paying, whatever. We're only here to talk about one thing and that's odour. It's the only thing that brought this forward. It wouldn't be here,

Mr. Speaker: Order please, to the gallery. Thank you.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: No, it's the only reason it's here. We as Councillors and those who appear here on both sides know approximately, no know absolutely nothing about whether this proposed plant will or will not emit foul odours.

That is the Clean Environment Commission's expertise and their job, and they're not going to recommend any licence if obnoxious odours will threaten the quality of life for anybody living in the area or any, or will affect, negatively affect the economic well being of any businesses in the area.

My point is simple. Let's allow the Clean Environment Commission, the experts, to do their job in a very public and in a very scientific fashion and let us as Councillors agree to be bound by their findings not by the fear mongers who trade on ignorance and weakness.

Don't want to take up much time but there's a quote that came out yesterday that I would like to put on the record, from Brandon, it says Maple Leaf is currently the largest hog slaughtering facility in the world.

For the past seven years we have had Maple Leaf as an excellent corporate addition to our community. During this time we have never received a single complaint about smell or contamination from this plant, and if one was to stand on their parking lot no smell or odour would come from this state of the art processes used in this plant.

The new state of the art facilities and techniques used today are not at all similar to those older established plants you may be used to. This is from Dave Burgess, Mayor of Brandon yesterday. (In audible) One final thing I can't resist, I'm sorry, Donald, remember, God made the world in seven days.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz on the, order. Order, please. Order, please. Thank you. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's been said by many that Winnipeg has the most diversified economy in Western Canada, and in many senses our biggest risk is that new investment goes elsewhere and it's no wonder.

The motion we're considering today, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to one issue and one issue only. OlyWest was in negotiations with two levels of government to come to Winnipeg and the city of Saskatoon was actively negotiating as the alternative. OlyWest facility if built would be the largest private sector investment in Winnipeg in decades. Our decision was to contribute less than 10% of a combined provincial municipal incentive package of 30 million dollars and that was to defray tax, land and training costs.

Council made a decision knowing full well that environmental hearings would follow, and we were glad to know that provincial environmental experts would be hearing those concerns because, Mr. speaker, we are not the experts.

I've said before that Winnipeg can't seem to take yes for an answer. Now we have Councillors who aren't even willing to take maybe for an answer. All we've done is approve an economic development package conditional on environmental approvals.

So why did some Councillors ask to revisit the answer of maybe. Supposedly there is new information that might affect our decision and Councillor Gerbasi is right.

There is new information that has come forward since November of last year. We've learned that OlyWest will now invest 200 million dollars Mr. Speaker, 65 million dollars more than was first proposed. We've learned that the 45 million dollar payroll for OlyWest includes not only 900 factory jobs but 200 technical and management jobs. We've learned that almost one million hogs enter Winnipeg on an annual basis without generating the wave of complaints our critics tell us we should expect.

We've learned that Councillor Benham attacked this project because he said it would attract migrant workers, a claim that will be a surprise to the union leaders who represent workers in the pork industry facilities here in the city of Winnipeg.

I'm wondering is he implying that migrant workers are a problem. News flash, migrant workers help build the city and continue to make a contribution to this city and this province today, and these comments come from an active member of the Citizen Equity Committee. Shocked and excited.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: What is your point of order?

Councillor Gerbasi: My point of order is that the Mayor is implying an intent that's pretty disgusting and, he's not saying migrant workers are a problem. That's not what Councillor Benham said.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Point or order, Councillor Gerbasi....

Councillor Gerbasi: That's implying racism and that's inappropriate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Proceed Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I want more families like my parents, like Councillor Paktakhan's parents, like Councillor Magnifico's parents to come here and start a new life and take advantage of new opportunities. But Councillors know that one thing has not changed, and that's the process that many of today's critics used to approve Schneider's pork plant expansion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hold, it Mr. Mayor, hold it a second. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: I request that the Chair move on Councillor Gerbasi's point of order under disrespect under 817, it says under Section C, shall not indulge in personalities during the debate nor reflect on the motives of members who have voted for a particular motion and I will say that the Mayor is definitely done both.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I've done neither. May I continue?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Proceed. Proceed.

Mayor Katz: And that's that the process that many of today's critics use to approve the Schneider's pork plant expansion in 2000. In 2000 in cooperation with the province as part of their economic strategy we followed the same process used in 1996 and 2000 to the letter to approve the facility in 2005 and through that process every question raised about environmental issues will be debated at the province's Clean Environment Commission.

Now Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to do what I can to talk to citizens, and ensure them that their concerns are heard there. I'm happy to talk with business owners, too, Mr. Speaker. But I'm not willing to do so while a legitimate clean industry that has employed Winnipeggers for decades is

being slandered and insulted with a so called negative branding campaign in the process, and I'm not willing to talk when the starting point for discussion is kicking a business out of our city before even hearing the facts.

I will not be part of that, Mr. Speaker. After all, if a quarter of the critic's claims are true, then surely we should be expelling Maple Leaf too. Maple leaf and its subsidiaries employ thousands of Winnipeggers, Mr. Speaker, in exactly the same jobs, doing exactly the same things, as OlyWest wants to do. Only they do it in many cases closer to residential areas and closer to businesses which seem to have no problems attracting clients.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that citizens want to be absolutely sure, and I don't blame them for that and that's why I voted to go to the next step, to have those questions heard by a qualified regulator, the Clean Environment Commission.

Since then I've had a great deal of conversation with Councillor Wyatt who must represent and confront the inevitable concerns from citizens in his ward.

Mr. Speaker, I understand his frustrations and I truly sympathize with him. Had this debate been more constructive, Mr. Speaker, we could have spent today considering a motion to ensure that the Clean Environment Commission heard certain issues to reassure those Councillors and their constituents that they would expect tough scrutiny from the provincial commission, but instead we're here today experiencing a political circus and the reason is simple.

Political leaders who are exploiting the debate have backed themselves into a corner with their own rhetoric, an approach which helps no one. I think it was only a few days into OlyOp's campaign Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt moves an extension of time of two minutes, all in Favour. Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Katz: When they announced that and I quote the time for diplomacy has passed and so here we are and now we'll see how effective that approach is. I heard two proponents in favour of this motion talk about a pharmaceutical company coming from India no longer being interested.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I find that hard to believe considering yesterday afternoon I met with Dr. Mishra in my office at approximately 3:30 who is still planning to proceed and is looking for an economic incentive package from the city of Winnipeg.

A vote against this motion, Mr. Speaker, is a vote to continue months of consultation and debate at the Clean Environment Commission. A vote against this motion is a vote to let our strongest industry get a respectful hearing while still holding it to strict environmental standards to protect our citizens.

I think that's fair, and I think it's the right thing to do. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call Premier Gary Doer close and I'll use his words, on the issue that the public is concerned about they will be determined by an independent Clean Environment Commission, and I guarantee you and the public and the city knows this because they made their offer conditional on the license through the Clean Environment Commission that water, odour and traffic has all got to be justified scientifically to the public of Manitoba before this plant will be licensed. That's Gary Doer, this morning, on CJOB radio and that's why, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the motion, and I encourage all Councillors who believe in this city's future to join me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next on the speaking agenda is Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, it would be rather unusual for me to speak after the Mayor, but I didn't get my hand up first because I think he really should have the last word, but I don't think he would mind in this particular case that I would just say a few words.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the first casualty in war is truth, and I think in this particular case since last winter and through the spring we have a distortion of truth. I do not want to say that people are deliberately telling lies, but there's been a distortion and regrettably I think it's been done for political interests. I hate to say that, but it is an election year, and people seem to want to capitalize on that.

And it's regrettable, but you know one of the things that we discussed when we had the delegation here earlier on, was to ask for scientific evidence, so what is the truth. What is the truth of harm, that this particular proposal will have to their business, to their community, and I believe it's important that we're always on this search for the truth because I haven't heard the answers yet.

Of course one of the reasons we haven't heard all the answers is that it's going to have to go through what we continuously heard is the Clean Environment Commission through a very rigorous process to look at all the elements of this particular proposal that will have to meet high level standards, a province that is very well committed to water stewardship and to environmental considerations.

So, we've received information from the only opposition group purporting to have scientific evidence of what the problems are and what indeed we had was a compilation of Google search of various issues that occurred in the United States where standards are different.

They're older locations, and there really wasn't any evidence of how this translates into creating harm against their particular business, against their particular industry. Now I think it's important that we do recognize that residents and businesses in this community have an opportunity to have their say.

We don't object to that. I did appreciate though very much that Councillor Steeves, I think made a very passionate and reasonable dissertation about our mandate, our responsibilities and the responsibilities we have under the Charter and the responsibility that the province has. I would commend him for being one of the clearer statements that we've had on this particular issue.

We have a separation of powers here. You know I've always been quoted as saying life is a balance, and life in Winnipeg and in Manitoba is a very careful balance. Keep checking the statistics and population sense. We haven't grown. We're migrating young people out of the province. We're getting immigrants in, and we welcome them. Here in the city we have a migration from our first nation's people into the city.

We welcome them, but on balance we're not growing. Every job is important. We're a very well diversified economy. Agri-business is the core business of Manitoba and Winnipeg for over 100 years, so is aviation, so is pharmaceuticals and so is education and we can probably talk about six or seven major sectors that we're involved in. Life is a balance.

I guess what I found disappointing in those that are arguing against this plant and this particular location is that they don't take into account this balance, they don't take into account the technology issues that have emerged in the last 10, 15 years and they're changing daily and they don't seem to attribute any sense of confidence in the industry that they could meet high standards of regulations.

I don't know why that is. You know, the people of St. Boniface and in that area of town adjacent to it in Transcona have lived for years in harmony with industries that allowed them to have successful jobs, to raise families and it's been really a success story. Has it been perfect, no, I'm sure there's been cases where perfection is in the eye of the beholder, obviously, but I don't think this Council has received any other information that should change our mind about the economic development package that we entered into in concert with the province and in concert with the industry subject to a major condition they have to prove that they can work in harmony with the residents around them and with the other businesses there.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I almost fell into the trap of accepting Councillor Swandel's view that we ought to work collegiately and perhaps stop sniping at each other. But you know what, on hearing the other Councillors talking about this particular issue and standing up and asking for points of order. You know, I'm really reminded that it is important to understand the record that we've had here amongst these members of Council, people on council floor before waxing eloquent about our responsibilities of creating business.

Councillor Vandal, former Councillor Vandal, it's important that I mention him because this is a political year saying "I remember a time when I was young where you could get a job at Packer's at J.M.S., Schneider's, Swifts and Burns. Those jobs are all gone. These are good paying jobs we're getting." This is the Schneider deal in 1996. These are not minimum wage jobs or Mac jobs.

I only hope that the Schneider's plant in St. Boniface can prove to be a catalyst for over 200 acres which are currently vacant in St. Boniface Industrial Park. Welcome to St. Boniface January 31st, 2000, Councillor Vandal, "these are jobs which an employee can raise a family on. There was Canada Packers, there was Schneider's in the old days" and he's referring back and harkening back, it's the same, same story. Each Schneider's job has a multiplier effect of 3.6. Why use the term, it's around 4, which will really mean that the 1,200 jobs will escalate.

I want to talk about the environmental concerns before I wrap up. I certainly appreciate the input and commitment of the presentation. There are some nay sayers.

Mr. Speaker, we in Manitoba have a new provincial government says the council of the day. We have a government that's committed to the environmental impact. I'm certain that these issues will be addressed. Councillor Gerbasi, six and January 31st, 2000, I don't think any of us are taking this decision lightly.

We who are in government here have to make a decision. Sometimes we have to make it quickly. The process can sometimes lead to cynicism. They see us rushing into a meeting and making a decision. You know, we had nine days between E.P.C. and coming to Council and in this case we had one hour between E.P.C. and a special meeting of Council. One hour for an economic development package. By the way the Schneider's evolution in 1996 was voted unanimously, January 31st.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Clement moves extension of time by two minutes. All in favour. Contrary? Carried.

Councillor De Smedt: Voted unanimously, Councillor Gerbasi goes on to say, you know these are real people's lives who need jobs. It's easy to sit back when you may have a job of your own, just doing fine and just saying no to 16 dollar an hour jobs, I'm not sure where they're at now, they'll be going up and down.

I'm not really comfortable doing that without a darn good reason. The message I'd like to send today is that we're going to do this differently today. We have a different provincial government, a provincial government that's committed to enforce the environmental standards, interesting. I don't know what's changed today. In fact, the environmental standards are probably going up and the government is just articulated the issue today that they will insist that they be met.

Councillor Thomas, you know, we've had many administrative negotiators that have been involved in ensuring that we will get the best plant in Canada. It's done within a framework of economic development policy. It's not a one time flitting here, flitting there. We've set up principles and precedents for this and for the future.

I'm confident we're doing this with the best of not just intentions but with the best of planning and the best of regulation and that we will all do our best to make sure that we accomplish it.

I'm trying to work collegiately. I can understand that sometimes you may

change your mind, but I see no evidence why you should change your mind. Now you may want to change your mind in a political issue, we've had too many times around this Council floor where the Mayor and members of E.P.C. are attacked because some others are not in E.P.C. They seem to be out of equation but it's always been the policy in this city, the Executive Policy Committee, of bringing economic incentives and economic packages to Council for their consideration because they are important issues. Was that my extension completed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You have had it.

Councillor De Smedt: I had it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Councillor De Smedt: I sure have. Mr. Speaker, I'll take 20 seconds to conclude. I think we need to let the process unfold. We've made a sensible decision. We did it before. We can work collegiately. You may have concerns. You may have interests. We all have interests. We don't have friends in politics, we have interests. But I suggest you allow the process to unfold. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

(Councillor Eadie in the chair.)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillors Clement please on the clause.

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't my intention to speak to this because it's one of those issues that I don't think you can win very easily one way or the other. Sometimes the most sensible thing is to say nothing, but the first thing I'd like to do though is to thank the residents that are here, both business and the residents who are concerned about this issue on a more parochial basis because it's not an unhealthy debate.

In fact I think it's exactly the opposite, Mr. Speaker, and I've always found that participating and interacting with residents is a lot easier than ignoring them and notwithstanding that I heard one of my colleagues suggest that some of us don't listen, I can assure you that that's not the case. I've listened to everybody today. I also have interacted with probably 150 people who are not constituents of mine, and about five or six that are, which is understandable because those five or six are quite a ways away from where this is taking place and I think we've heard enough about that today.

This wasn't done in a few days, ladies and gentlemen. It was dealt with publicly in meetings over a few days, but Executive Policy Committee dealt with this for quite some time. In fact, my recollection is that we had some discussion for several months before this came forward and most of the things that people have raised with me and raised in the media and raised with other Councillors and other elected officials were raised by E.P.C. members and always the same comments. Those are the questions that have to be answered by the Clean Environment Commission over and over at nauseum.

All we were dealing with was supposedly a land deal, and frankly if OlyWest would have chosen to go that route they could have purchased that piece of property from the city, and we would have sold it because it sat there for a long time not doing anything and they would have had to deal with whatever they put in there would have had to meet all of the zoning criteria because we wouldn't have changed that, and they could have gone to the Clean Environment Commission and what would you have seen was a notice sometime in the future about that meeting and you would have seen one notice in the newspapers. That's how often they advertised that and it wouldn't have gotten an awful lot of attention frankly so this is probably been a better process notwithstanding it's been somewhat stressful for everybody, myself included.

Every four or five years there seems to be an issue that comes forward that is a little bit gut wrenching, and not easy to deal with. This happens to be one of them, and I've been in this chamber for a little while, Mr. Speaker, as you have, and we've seen five or six of these types of issues over the years. They're never fun.

But I'm sorry that the debate wasn't a little higher level here today, frankly, that we had so many people here. It would have been a little nicer to have a little more decorum but it was kind of a special day that way I suppose, but it's not the first time that we've had people banging on the glass, it's happened once or twice in the past.

I have to tell you though that I am disappointed with a few folks in relationship to this whole issue. We didn't phone OlyWest and we didn't phone the province. The province phoned here. The province has pushed this thing from day one and until I understand this morning when Gary Doer was on CJOB there hasn't been word one from anybody in that province that supported this other than when they made the announcement and the local M.L.A's were standing on either side of the Premier clapping at his every word and then all of a sudden they found out that some folks didn't like the idea too much and then 15 days later they were all of a sudden opposed to this and actually came into this chamber requesting that we deal with it in a different fashion.

I don't know how they work over there. I'm actually not that interested frankly. I've never been very interested in provincial politics. I've found them very frustrating at times to deal with them, but I was disappointed with them. If he's finally come out and said something and taken a position, that's a good thing I guess for everybody because then at least everybody knows where the government stands.

I have to tell you I'm also disappointed with OlyWest in this because we voted on this in November and until the last week or two this issue has festered in this community with people running to meetings here and running to meetings there and hearing different types of rhetoric and frankly for a business to sit back that wants to do this and do nothing for six months and let this fester in a community is not a very positive way to approach something. That's my view.

I'm also quite frankly disappointed Mr. Speaker with the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. I was harkened to know that at least somebody from the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce evidently got involved at the site of this proposed plant yesterday and took a position because there's a lot of business people involved in this. There's no question that there are business people who are opposed to this. We heard from some of them today. We also heard from some that are very much in favour, but we don't have the luxury, Mr. Speaker, when we get elected to these positions to hide behind trees and not vote. When we walk into this chamber we have to be responsible.

I'm not going to tell everybody that we make the right decision every time. Sometimes we can be wrong. We have to deal with things based on the best information that we have and our gut feel for something based on fact, and it's not always an easy place to land, Mr. Speaker.

But I don't think that people that take positions at the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce have the luxury of hiding behind trees either and I don't know where they are on this issue, and I'm frustrated that I don't know, frankly.

I'm going to vote to take this to the next level, Mr. Speaker. I did it in November and I do so now and I will stand up and do it that way because I believe that we have to take it to the next step.

I believe we deserve to know whether they can meet the criteria that's established, and I'd like to believe, and I certainly hope that the Premier of the province and his followers will stay out of that process completely and let the people who are the Clean Environment Commission do their job, Mr. Speaker.

They have the tools and they have, they certainly have the ability and they, the people who are here, the people who haven't been here today but are very interested in this issue deserve nothing but the most important scrutiny that they can put towards this, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly hope as a person who is very

interested in our community as a whole that they're going to do it just like that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our City motto is in Latin 'Unum Cum Virtute Multorum' and in English that means one city with the strength of many. One city with the blessings of many.

We have over 100 languages spoken in our city, Mr. Speaker, and last month I heard a comment from one of my colleagues that said OlyWest is going to employ migrant workers and it was the tone and intonation of that that really appalled me, Mr. Speaker.

I must say that really did appal me because, yes, OlyWest, if they do employ migrant workers it was insinuated today by my esteemed colleague from River Heights that some of that money is going to go back to Mexico and that we'll be funding Mexico, we're going to be funding El Salvador.

Well Mr. Speaker, I believe that our city of Winnipeg with the strength of many, with the quality of life that we have here will sustain those migrant workers and make them stay here in our city.

I also had a chance to talk with Guy Vaudry and some of the executives from OlyWest.

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment, Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: I again rise on a point of privilege, under disrespect, 817 in the Council rules it says, shall not engage in personalities and shall not reflect on the motives of members who have voted for a particular motion.

Mr. Speaker: Can you tell me where the personalities or motives please, I didn't catch that so far.

Councillor Thomas: Well, the implication is made very clear by the Speaker and had been made very clear by other speakers that they're linking Councillor Benham's concerns with racial prejudice and I find that very inappropriate and we should be not indulging in those kinds of debates. I find it totally inappropriate.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor I didn't hear Councillor Pagtakhan mention another Councillor's name. I will check Hansard when it comes out just to make absolutely certain but I don't believe you have a point of order at all in this. I haven't heard any disrespect to any other member mentioned to the best of my knowledge here so Councillor Pagtakhan please resume, resuming debate.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say basically that if OlyWest is able to, if this project is able to go forth and they do hire migrant workers I believe that our city can sustain them. I also am confident that OlyWest will do everything they can to ensure that if migrant workers want to apply for Canadian citizenship here in our city that they will do that and that I welcome immigration and that is an incredible thing for this city.

We do need to grow our city, grow our population and the more multi cultural environment it is, the more powerful our city is and the more strength it leads to the credence of 'Unum Cum Virtute Multorum'.

I also want to say that I'm confident in the Clean Environment Commission and the process that's going to be taking place with the experts, the scientists, the environmental technicians that are going to be, it's a scientific body of information and they're going to be doing their due diligence.

I'm confident that they will actually show us that OlyWest at the risk of being presumptuous will actually pass the test and we welcome that type of facility. If do have the modern technology to live in harmony and to prosper in harmony with that area, all the more power to them.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say go forward with the amendment and with the motion, the notice of motion I won't be

supporting either one of them today. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lazarenko, closing on your referral motion with instructions please.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's too bad we've got into such a charade, a number of speeches have been made and innuendos being made and accusations and so forth but very few members of Council spoke to my motion, so just tells you right now their mind has been made up. They are not going to be supporting anything except what was dealt with back in November and the motion that is before us here with my motion seconded by Councillor Smith is a common sense motion, for crying out loud. What would happen if by chance the province of this city would be able to find a different location, a different site suitable for the OlyWest proposal.

What do you think would happen then if Council had not given the opportunity? No, we will not do it. We're not going to proceed laying it over for two months. This is ludicrous.

The Charter if anyone feels the adjoining property owners feel that their property of themselves injurious, it's injurious to them with this application they have the right to speak and I believe this is what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one thing. I've been in these chambers many years like some of us have been, dealt with a lot of issues, crucial issues, sensitive issues, and I have learned one lesson from 1977 when I was taken to court, challenged, couldn't get support from the city, lawyers, because we're not city employees.

I had to do this all on my own. I had to borrow money to fight this. I said never again would I ever get myself in that position. Last Friday I alluded this when I spoke to my motion, we had a briefing from our legal services, some Members of Council were not there, Councillor Wyatt was not there, Councillor Lubosch, the Mayor was not there, but the advice that we received from the legal services, people that are supposed to give us advice on all issues, declaration of office that members of council take, that I will truly, faithfully and impartially to the best of my knowledge and ability execute the office to which I have been elected.

That means when you have all the facts, truly, faithfully in good faith and partially, reasonably with due process without using anything that could be biased. Now this is what we, this is what we took the declaration of office and now how could I as one say that I will go against my oath of office that I've taken and to satisfy a few I will be voting for a motion that really has no substance and this is the motion that is before us now.

There is nothing, we would lose in a court of law, Mr. Speaker, and the legal services said it will be a substantial amount. It could be 20 million dollars; it could be 50 million dollars. We don't know, but we'd be putting the City of Winnipeg taxpayers at risk by doing this.

This is why the declaration of office is signed by each and every one of us, and if we are in violation of that, any doubt, and I say that is a serious matter that can be considered by anyone who wants to challenge that particular Councillor or Councillors. This is where I stand and this is what I've said before that I will keep going in a direction that I've been doing now for many years. Like I said, twice, once in 1977 and when I went to court I went through hell for six months.

I had to borrow money once, borrow money the second time because I was not being let alone when I was being challenged and I'll tell you it's not a pretty picture, something I felt that I wish I'd never got myself involved in politics but from there on I kept on going and I'm still going and I will not go against my principles.

I will not go against the credibility that's supposed to be given to each Member of Council just at the whim to decide to say that I'm going to kill this. For what reason? I don't know, but I'm going to kill it and that's it. It doesn't work that way, Councillors. You have to have reasonable

doubt beyond a shadow of a doubt when it goes to court because if not the courts will throw it out.

This is why that seminar or the briefing we had last Friday and I thank our administration, Annitta Stenning and also our head of our legal services that provided that information that gave us the briefing, we were told, made aware of, where we stand.

It's too bad that Members of Council did not speak too much to this motion that is before us on my motion to say to lay over for, you know, for two months and I hope that Council before the vote is taken to reconsider and there's nothing, nothing to lose except we will gain, we'll satisfy the needs of what people are here today for.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Gerbasi closing on the main motion please.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We've seen a lot of very interesting tactics and things today, things I've never seen before here but we've also seen a lot of citizens come out and participate and I want to thank the citizens and residents on both sides of the issue for coming out and exercising some democracy today.

It's the first time I've seen cheat notes handed out to members of E.P.C. When I was on E.P.C., I had to think of my own things to say on Council, but I guess they need a little help right now, I'm not sure why.

I've also noticed a lot of shifting of the focus to a six year old decision, and that and I realize some of us six years ago made that decision, and as all of us do you make a decision that in that situation, in those particular circumstances, the best decision you can make at the time and you know maybe it was the wrong decision, I don't know, but the point is that that was, that what is being done here today is simply a tactic to divert attention from the decision we're facing today and that's the one that matters.

Councillor Vandal isn't even elected to Council and I guess he's got the idea of Councillor Vandal maybe scares a few people but the reality is he's not elected here. Why are we attacking him? Why aren't we talking about the issue we're making today, the decision we are making today.

It was very strange to want to see as the residents who live in Winnipeg waited outside, heard speeches and waited outside while they have their speeches that somebody arranged to have the whole Council Chamber filled up with supporters of OlyWest with aprons on course they had to be removed because we all know that's inappropriate.

That's not going to fool anyone. The public was here, there's huge opposition of businesses, of huge opposition and know that, it was a nice try to try to make a different photo op than reality but it's not going to succeed because it's pretty obvious that there's, that the people who live in Winnipeg who have a, who should be the ones we are listening to today were in severe opposition to this today.

I was sorry to see the people having to stand up, they're up against the glass back there. They looked like they were in the jail with these bars and just, it really wasn't, if they felt shut out before I'm sure they feel much more shut out after that.

But the worst tactic I heard of all today was the racism card. Migrant workers can work for six months to two years and then they must leave. They can't become immigrants as Councillor Pagtakhan so rightly pointed out, that would be a great thing if they could, but they can't so let's talk about the facts and let's not accuse a person who doesn't have a racist bone in his body of racism.

That's the lowest thing I heard today and that's the only point of order. You can quote Hansard all you want, that's fine. I did say those things six years ago and I think its okay to learn. It's okay to change your mind. It's okay to have an open mind. It's okay to have a position that evolves, and I think that's something that the Mayor and the rest of E.P.C. and the

rest of Council might want to think about, and what kind, we also might want to think about what kind of city we are creating because we are creating it.

In spite of the arguments that our sphere of jurisdiction as Councillor Steeves says does not include issues on the environment, well, it's harder for us to deal with environmental issues since he voted and the rest of you voted, those who did voted to end our critical thinking and, and environment committee that was open and public and talked about these issues. That was killed by those members, so maybe they don't think we have anything to say about the environment, but I think that, yes, C.E.C. is the official process and that process will occur but City Council still has the power to play a role in our future. We can decide to subsidize a hog plant.

That's the decision we're deciding, whether to give them money to bring in lower wage, lower tech jobs that are chasing out higher tech more desirable jobs. We're making that decision. That's not the C.E.C.'s decision. We're making a decision, other decisions we've made to cancel rapid transit and so on, and that's our say in our future.

Council is not powerless because, you know, we have to vote with the Mayor or whatever as Councillor Steeves often tells us.

So I say that no one is fooled. No one is fooled when Councillors say that they have no choice because of legal issues. The front page of the paper says that we can get sued no matter what we do and I'm not going to talk about the legal counsel we were given. That's not appropriate. We can't even talk about that. It's something to throw out there, to divert attention from the real decision, and as Councillor Benham pointed out we as government have a right to make decisions.

We have a right to change our minds. We have, we represent the people of Winnipeg, and we should be doing that, not diverting responsibility to, you know some other level of government. We're part of the decision with the province. Of course they're a big player and of course they're leading this. They have a lot more money to make than we do and they don't have to pay for the water and sewer the way we do so, yeah, but that doesn't take away our responsibility.

So I urge you to make the decision, stand by your decision and do what's right. Don't just do what you're told. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor, debate is closed. We'll do a vote, first of all, on Councillor Lazarenko's motion number five which is a referral with instructions. All in favour of this motion please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion is lost. On the main motion, all in favour of the main motion please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion is lost.

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt

WHEREAS public transit provides essential and universal mobility to residents within Canada's urban areas;

AND WHEREAS public transit increases roadway capacity by offering people a transportation choice other than the automobile;

AND WHEREAS public transit reduces greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution;

AND WHEREAS transit infrastructure investment needs for Canadian transit systems in the period 2006-2010 stand at $20.7 billion, with over $5 billion of this amount not fundable under current programs;

AND WHEREAS municipalities have inadequate revenue tools to finance the full cost of transit infrastructure;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Council calls on the federal government to:
1. Make permanent the federal investment in public transit provided by Bill C-66 of the 38th parliament;
2. Ensure that this investment is distributed equitably to all transit systems across Canada;
3. Ensure that this investment is over and above any existing federal or provincial funding already in place.

Mr. Speaker: We have notice of motion number two, moved by Councillor Gerbasi, seconded by Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Gerbasi, notice of motion number two. We still have an agenda today. May I just ask, just get some, I should have done this long ago, but is this meant to go to F.C.M. or is this just going somewhere?

Councillor Gerbasi: Just one second please, this is, I'm just trying to find it here, apologize just give me one moment here. Okay, Bill C66, yes, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I was a little focused on this issue.

This is something that I'm a member of a transit committee with the Canadian Urban Transit Association and they're asking people to bring back motions like this to have municipal councils pass this to be forwarded on to the federal government, but it is something that this municipal council would agree to endorse the notion of Bill C66 being continued.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, I just wanted to be, I just wasn't sure whether it's supposed to be going to F.C.M. or elsewhere. So, did you wish to introduce it or is there any discussion on it or shall we just vote?

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, yes, I would just very briefly just mention that, it calls on the, as we know the federal government introduced Bill C66 which provides funding for transit municipalities, you're all familiar with it and really this asks the federal government to make permanent federal investment in public transit and ensure that it's distributed equitably and so on.

It's fairly self explanatory, I guess, and to retain it on an ongoing basis, and also to retain it over and above any existing federal funding so it's just an endorsement from our Council that we support this notion and then I guess the, CUTA and other organizations can take it forward to the national level.

Mr. Speaker: All right, thank you Councillor, Mayor Katz on this motion.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very much would like to support Councillor Gerbasi's motion. I can also share with the Councillor and everyone else, all the Councillors in the chamber, Mr. speaker, that last week I met with I guess it was last Thursday, I met with Minister Gannon, the Minister of Infrastructure and Transit and this was one of our conversations, and I think it's very appropriate that Councillor Gerbasi bring this forward because I think we have to reinforce it over and over and

over again, Mr. speaker, so I support it phenomenally. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Steeves on the motion.

Councillor Steeves: That was the information I was looking for, I wasn't sure if there was any background.

Mr. Speaker: Close debate, Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, I just appreciate Council's support for this and particularly the Mayor which is very significant and I'll be letting the Canadian Urban Transit Association know of our decision and they'll be very pleased to help them with their effort along with F.C.M. and others that are trying to get this funding. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, very good. All in favour of the motion, opposed? The motion is carried. Notice of motion number three by Councillor Wyatt.

Moved by Councillor Wyatt
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi

WHEREAS in 2005 the Government of Canada approved an additional $1.6 billion for housing programs in Canada;

AND WHEREAS the Board of Directors of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities recently urged the Government of Canada to honour this funding commitment of $1.6 billion for housing;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Winnipeg City Council urge the Government of Canada to live up to its previous commitment to provide $1.6 billion in additional funding for housing programs.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is pretty self explanatory; it's to encourage the federal government to live up to its commitment for housing of 1.6 billion in funding and would encourage the Council's support of it.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz on the motion.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to need more information on this one. My understanding and I'd like someone to correct me if I'm wrong, is that this was a commitment made by a previous government. I'm not sure how you can ask a new government to live up to someone else's commitment because it was not their commitment. If that is inaccurate I would very much appreciate, otherwise I will not be able to support this. How do you hold someone accountable for someone else's commitment but I may have the wrong information. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any other, Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Gerbasi: I would just say that yes, much like C66 there was, came from a previous government, but I think again it's really a matter of municipal council sending a message to the federal government that this issue is essential and we all know in terms of housing that its really essential that the federal government be a partner in that and be providing the lion's share of the funding for something like housing.

Municipalities simply can't afford it on their own, so this is crucial. It's very similar to the transit motion we passed before. It's just saying that we want to basically keep the pressure on as the Mayor suggested earlier with transit funding. It's really the same with housing funding.

We need desperately to keep that pressure on or we aren't going to be able to continue after our agreements in 2008, or W.H.I.I. program for example that was proven to be very, very successful and endorsed by Council unanimously, recently that report showing the success of the investment in the inner city.

This is exactly what we need to do. We have to keep the pressure on the federal government or we'll going to be losing our housing programs because we can't do it alone so I think anything that we can do to send that message is really important

so I really urge, which is why I believed I seconded Councillor Wyatt's motion. I believe this is hugely important as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Steeves on the motion.

Councillor Steeves: I'm not dead set against anything, but I'm a little bit I guess curious about the process here and why we're doing it like this. I don't know why this would go through more tape.

The irony of this place never ceases to amaze me; I want to add by the way. We just had like a four hour discussion on how there's not enough time and enough notice and now we're dealing with notices that just appear, but whatever, I guess. I'm not going to question that anymore.

But, in any event, could this not go back for a little bit of consideration? Would that be at all appropriate just to check out some things? I know that F.C.M. is mentioned in there. This does sound familiar.

I want to, I wouldn't mind if the movers of the motion are okay just to send it back so we can double check that what's being mentioned about the F.C.M. is exactly right on. There's obviously some potential embarrassment that might exist to me if I support this and it winds up not being correct. That's all I'm saying.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the motion? Councillor Wyatt, closing.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you; maybe I can add some clarification for the previous speaker. This motion was taken actually from a motion adopted by the Board of Directors of the F.C.M. at its last board meeting in Quebec, the last board meeting, and it was adopted.

There was discussion and it was adopted wholeheartedly and it's very much like the transit motion because yes, the transit motion previous to that was monies earmarked from a previous federal government and it was part of the same 4.5 billion dollar commitment, part of it to transit and part of it to housing and part of it to other commitments, made, the so called N.D.P. amendment made of the federal budget, 1.6 billion was for housing. So F.C.M. overwhelmingly supported this at the last board of directors meeting.

To me this is a no brainer, just; it shows the support is there from this Council which is clear from Councils across the country. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved By Mayor Katz
Seconded by Councillor Steeves

WHEREAS on December 15, 1999, Council initially appointed Bill Norrie to serve as the Chairperson of the Board of Directors for the Forks North Portage Partnership;

AND WHEREAS on May 26, 2005, Bill Norrie's term as the Chairperson of the Forks North Portage Partnership (FNPP) expired;

AND WHEREAS the Chairperson is appointed by unanimous recommendation from the three FNPP shareholders (Government of Canada, Province of Manitoba, City of Winnipeg);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Rick Bell be appointed as the Chairperson of the Board of Directors for the Forks North Portage Corporation for the term expiring May 26, 2009.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing including the execution of the necessary documents.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Mayor Katz
Seconded by Councillor Steeves

WHEREAS on January 25, 2006, Council re-appointed Gene Dunn as a citizen member to The WFC (Winnipeg Football Club) Interim Steering Committee Inc. for

the one-year term expiring December 31, 2006;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Bob Williams replace Gene Dunn as one of the citizen members on The WFC Interim Steering Committee for the term expiring December 31, 2006;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing including the execution of the necessary documents.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Mayor Katz
Seconded by Councillor Steeves

WHEREAS on May 23, 2001, Council approved a Term Sheet which outlined the terms and conditions which the True North Entertainment Complex Limited Partnership and the three Levels of Government would enter into agreements regarding the development and financing of a new multi-purpose sports and entertainment complex;
AND WHEREAS the Board of Directors of the General Partner for the True North Entertainment Complex Limited Partnership shall include two (2) appointments by Canada, Manitoba and Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the citizen appointments are made by unanimous recommendation from the three Levels of Government;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Ida Albo and Norbert Hansch be nominated for appointment for the two positions held by Canada, Manitoba and Winnipeg on the Board of Directors of the General Partner for the True North Entertainment Complex Limited Partnership for the term expiring December 31, 2007;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing including the execution of the necessary documents.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Eadie
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan
WHEREAS the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) is dedicated to improving the quality of life in all communities by promoting strong, effective and accountable municipal governments;

AND WHEREAS in June of 2005, at the 2005 FCM Annual Conference in St. John's, Newfoundland, Councillor Steeves was elected as the 2nd Vice President of FCM;

AND WHEREAS in June of 2006, at the 2006 FCM Annual Conference in Montreal, Quebec, Councillor Steeves will be running for election as the 1st Vice President of FCM;

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Council unanimously endorse the election of Councillor Gord Steeves as 1st Vice President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of the motion, opposed? The motion is carried. We have some additional motions, motion number one, moved by Mayor Katz, seconded by Councillor Steeves, appointment to North Portage, taken as read? All in favour, opposed? That's carried. Motion number two, appointment to the football club steering committee, taken as read? All in favour, opposed? Carried. Motion number three, moved by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Steeves, True North Entertainment Limited Partnership appointment, taken as read? All in favour, opposed? That's carried. And motion number four, endorsing our erstwhile colleague from St. Vital (in audible), taken as read? All in favour, opposed? Carried.

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Wyatt
Seconded by Councillor Smith

WHEREAS the City Council resolution enabling the building of a mega hog slaughterhouse and rendering facility in the St. Boniface Industrial Park was introduced only seven calendar days before Councillors were asked to vote on it, allowing for no public consultation or administrative due diligence;

AND WHEREAS many residents and nearby businesses have made it clear through meetings with Councillors and media interviews that they are opposed to the building of the mega hog slaughterhouse and rendering facility in that location;

AND WHEREAS some businesses currently located in the St. Boniface Industrial Park have stated they will move out of the area, and possibly out of Winnipeg and Manitoba, if the mega hog slaughterhouse and rendering facility is built in that location, which would be harmful to the economy of our city and province;

AND WHEREAS administration has reported that major considerations in favour of the St. Boniface Industrial Site location included the existing zoning of Heavy Industrial (M3) for said lands, good access to roads and city services, "buffering" by other industrial land uses (including light and medium industrial), and that the land (60 acres with an option for another 40 acres) was already owned by the tax payers;

AND WHEREAS a similar vacant property exists in west Winnipeg (Tuxedo Industrial Park Area) that is already zoned for Heavy Industrial uses (M3 - Industrial - Potentially Noxious), is 87.3 acres in size, has access to road (Kenaston) and nearby city services, and has superior "buffering" on all sides with lands that are already zoned for Heavy Industrial (M3) uses or for Agricultural (A) land uses;

AND WHEREAS this property, with all the above noted benefits, is already owned by Her Majesty the Queen Manitoba (Government of Manitoba) and therefore could be considered in a renegotiated incentive package as a replacement for the City of Winnipeg owned lands in the St. Boniface Industrial Park;

AND WHEREAS the businesses and residents opposed to the existing location in the St. Boniface Industrial Park have called on numerous occasions for other locations to be considered;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. City Council rescind the location stated by the OlyWest Project: Economic Development Incentive Package approved at the November 23, 2005 meeting of Council in favour of renegotiating a new location, with serious consideration to be given to the Tuxedo Industrial Park area proposal (Ownership: Government of Manitoba, Certificate of Title 1837939, Roll Number 10006339500), as noted in the attached Schedules A to E inclusive;

2. City Council instruct administration to immediately begin renegotiations with the OlyWest proponents, including the with the Province of Manitoba, to establish the proposed mega hog slaughterhouse and rendering facility in a new location, with serious consideration to be given to the Tuxedo Industrial Park area proposal.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, this hasn't been distributed. This is being tabled as a notice of motion. Nobody else has seen it yet so I'm going to wait for it to be distributed.

Mr. Speaker: It's been tabled as a notice of motion.

Councillor Wyatt: Notice of motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Nobody else has seen it yet. So I'm going to wait to have it distributed.

Councillor Clement: Can we have about a half hour to read this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It's been tabled as a notice of motion; I accept that, so it will stand until the next meeting, Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: I would like to call on this motion because if it is a reasonable motion, then I think we should suspend the rules and debate it now. We've just gone all through the issue, we got all the facts. Let's get on with it so I would move suspension of the rules to debate this motion at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, alright, I have to put the question on that motion then to Council, of course, it's master of its own procedure here when it comes to that, but Councillor De Smedt has moved that the rule be suspended and this motion be dealt with now. All in favour of suspending the rule please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion does not carry so it will be stood until the next meeting of Council. Where are we here? By-laws, please, Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the following By-law be read a first time, By-law No. 142/2006.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 142/2006.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 142/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 142/2006.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 142/2006 be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour. Opposed? Carried. Questions, Councillor Gerbasi.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question comes out of the recent city summit that was held, on an issue that came up quite a bit there was Plan Winnipeg and it surprised me at the summit to hear the Mayor speak somewhat dismissively about Plan Winnipeg and this is from my notes because, that the Mayor commented that we can't be great at everything and that Plan Winnipeg asks us to do too much and my question to the Mayor is does the Mayor support Plan Winnipeg and if not what parts of it is he prepared to get rid of.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Gerbasi for that question and the reason is obviously she didn't comprehend what was being said at particular point in time. What I was referring to, is Plan Winnipeg tells us what we should be doing but it doesn't provide us with all the time and all the resources to accomplish those goals and I believe that was exactly my quote and I would be happy to provide that to Councillor Gerbasi so she can read it at her leisure when she so desires.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Do you have a supplementary Councillor Gerbasi?

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes, Leonard Asper also spoke about Plan Winnipeg and I'll be very brief, that he stated that we need a plan, sort of if we don't have one and I guess I wonder if the Mayor would agree that it would be best to take our existing plan that's been developed over many years of public input and improve it or is he suggesting as Leonard seems to be that we start from square one? I just wasn't clear from the comments.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I will not speak for Mr. Asper but I will certainly speak for my self. We do have a Plan Winnipeg which is supported I hope by all of Council and I hope that makes things clear by the same token as we know every ten or fifteen or twenty years things change and new things happen and of course, we have to address new situations.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Councillor Gerbasi: My last question is on a different topic. On the Environmental Committee, the Mayor stated in December that we all care about the environment and I can state you emphatically that we have every intention of continuing the Civic Environmental Committee but so far there's been no sign of a Civic Environmental Committee and if they are meeting they're meeting in secret and no one knows about it so can the Mayor please advise Council whatever happened to a public accountable Civil Environmental Committee because there's been none that most of us are aware of in any cases current. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I can inform Councillor Gerbasi that there has been a meeting and I believe that there are people who are going to be sitting on this committee. For specific details I would request that she speak to the Chair, Councillor Steeves who I'm sure can give her all the details and I'm sure she will have that opportunity. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it has been in the media that the Mayor has been conducting a poll. It was presumably about the hog plant. Mr. Speaker what he didn't know is that a relative of mine would be asked some of these questions of the poll, and the questions are of a directly political nature having to do with the Mayor's popularity, the Mayor's campaign promises in 2002, which way people are going to vote. It is a highly political partisan poll and my question to the Mayor is in view of such directly political partisan questions why should the taxpayers of Winnipeg pay for a poll that is designed for the Mayor's re-election campaign during the Mayoralty campaign period. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, two things. Number one is that there is no campaign taking place. I can't even tell you what the questions were. I can't tell you how many there were. I can tell you that we do polling every six months and these were questions that were asked six months ago as well. This is not something new, and if Councillor Benham has any indication that this may have anything to do with the campaign I would just have to tell him that is not an accurate assumption.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, well I will point out to the Mayor that saying it isn't so doesn't make it not so. I would point out that a poll that asks directly political questions of potential voters is a political poll and it is being paid by taxpayers however it's interesting that the Mayor doesn't know the questions because my next question is will the Mayor agree to release to this Council and to the public all questions that were asked, the results of all answers, the polling sample, the sample size, the company that did the work and how much it costs and most importantly who paid for it, will the Mayor agree to release all those details. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked Councillor, thank you. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, every Mayor's office has done polling as long as I can remember. If this is something that has taken place on every situation then I would certainly abide by what's taken place in the past. By the same token, by saying it isn't so doesn't make it so then obviously saying it is so doesn't make it so either, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary, Councillor.

Councillor Benham: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Mayor agree to refer to the Secretariat Committee the appropriateness of using taxpayer funds to fund a poll during the campaign period designed to elicit directly partisan and political answers from the respondent.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz:

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, unless I missed it and maybe I did because maybe there was a press conference announcing that I was running because until you announce you're running there is no campaign Mr. Speaker, so that is my answer.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I don't have a question.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, you didn't, I thought you did. Sorry. Any other questions? Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Perhaps it was my thing that you, I was quite surprised to find out that we actually do have an environmental committee because we just had several motions in which we approved people to various Standing Committees that we have but we have had no motions approving members to the Environmental Committee and I heard the Mayor say that it has met once already. Will those names be released and will, well first will those names be released?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Councillor Thomas. For clarification when I said they met, what I meant was there was a meeting of people who are qualified and have an interest in this. Some of those are the same people who sat on the previous committee and it was up to them to decide if they wanted to continue on and as I said earlier that is a question that I believe Councillor Steeves would probably be better to answer that and I'm sure he'd be happy to do that, but there was no official meeting. This was a meeting to talk to people who had a genuine interest and a concern about the environment, people with expertise as well as people who represent the organizations and as I said some people who did sit on the previous committee Councillor.

Councillor Steeves: I apologize Mr. Speaker, point of order. Just for ease, is it appropriate for the Mayor to defer to me for that information right now? I'd be prepared to.

Mr. Speaker: I'll wait and see if Councillor Thomas wants to ask you a question Councillor. It is EPC question period.

Councillor Steeves: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas on your supplementary.

Councillor Thomas: When will those names be coming forward to City Council for its approval since I understand Council is supreme on the appointment of Boards and Commission.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would defer to Councillor Steeves to give that specific answer because I'd rather have a specific answer that's accurate as opposed to me guessing.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Yes, just quickly Mr. Speaker, there's been two meetings that have taken place now at this stage. The first meeting was on the original terms of

reference. There were invited I believe nine different organizations all of whom attended or sent a designate as well as three citizen members from the former committee. The terms of reference were reflected upon by the gathering at that stage, the group at that stage. We had a second meeting quite recently which reflected sort of the expanded terms of reference based on what we heard at the first meeting from the folks involved and I think now that we have, that meeting was just very, very recently, not exactly when but not in the too distant past and we're putting that information together. We expect we'll have a consensus on some terms of reference which were spoken to by the committee. They included expanding the terms of reference to include a public component and expanding some of the priorities of the committee so those things seem to be met, we seem to be moving forward with some degree of cohesion and consensus frankly. The citizens appointments, I have every confidence it will be done in the exact same way that the other committees have appointed Mr. Speaker, I don't see any difference at this stage.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary, Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Mr. Speaker, those answers were most edifying but they had nothing to do with my question. My question had to do with when they were coming forward for approval by Council. It's absolutely shocking to find that there's been two meetings and that people are working on developing a consensus around terms of reference when they haven't even been approved by Council and it's usually Council that does that so I really need my questions that I asked answered, those other questions were definitely edifying, but not my questions.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Are appointments coming forward Councillor Steeves?

Councillor Steeves: I guess we could do it either way. We could do it through Council first and send Council's ideas to people who aren't on Council or get people who aren't on Council ideas and bring it to Council. We've opted for the latter. I'm not sure what the difference is, but rightly or wrongly that seems to be the course that we're following so that's the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We heard today from one of the delegations, I think it is a Mr. Sangster that in the past the Oly Op group has attempted to get a meeting with the Mayor. It hasn't worked out. I know the Mayor has a very busy schedule and maybe it just didn't work out time frame wise but it is my hope, I've heard from Councillors today during debate, there seems to be a will to try to look at other solutions which indeed would involve a dialogue and my question would be to the Mayor, would the Mayor be open to having a meeting with the Oly opposition business group, the businesses that they represent without having any kind of preconditions to what that meeting can or cannot consist of?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you, I thank Councillor Wyatt. I guess it gives me an opportunity to address another statement that was inaccurate, is that when my office was asked for me to have a meeting with Oly Op we were more than happy to do that. As I said we're happy to meet with any individual or organization. When Oly Op stated that the starting ground was that OlyWest could not go there, they didn't want to talk about that issue, it was decided there was not much to talk about at that particular point in time. As I said earlier in my comments on the motion, is that I'm happy to talk to any individual or group but not if they’re trying to hold a gun to an entity's head or someone's head. If Oly Op wants to speak to me with an open mind which I will always have and objectively I'm happy to speak to Oly Op or any other group.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, then I take it then that the answer is basically is if they

contact your office to have a meeting to discuss this issue and the various concerns they have that you would be available to meet with them?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: The answer would be the same as it was the first time. The answer to that Mr. Speaker was yes, but then they laid down the rules of the fact that OlyWest could not be located there. It appears that that was the case then what was the point of having a meeting. If they come with an open mind on whatever the topic is, Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to, so the answer would be yes in that fashion.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: You would be open to having a dialogue with them with regards to the issue, at a meeting, which is part of the solution.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, that's the question.

Mayor Katz: I don't want to be redundant and give the same answer but the answer is yes based on the fact people are going into a room with an open mind.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Mayor, could you answer Councillor Wyatt's question one more time?

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions. I got you. Just wait. Okay, on the second round, Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I was going to ask more on the Environment Committee, but I was curious by the comments made by the Mayor and I would have to ask the Mayor to answer that question a third time because what I heard the Mayor say was that he wanted the Oly Op's group to come with an open mind that he didn't have one and that there were certain things they were going to discuss that he would not have the meeting, so which is it, is it going to be an open mind by both sides or only they are to have the open mind?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I will try for the benefit of everybody to do this for the fourth or fifth time because some people it appears aren't listening or don't want to hear the answer. It was presented today by Oly Op that they were unable to get a meeting with the Mayor on their request. That was not an accurate statement. The accurate statement is they asked for a meeting with the Mayor and they were told yes. They then set the parameter that the meeting starts where we do not even discuss OlyWest being located in the St. Boniface Industrial Park. As a result of that being the starting point there was no point meeting because obviously there wasn't going to be a conversation. They already made up their minds. I hope that is clear to everybody on the floor of Council, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Do you have a supplementary Councillor Thomas?

Councillor Thomas: So am I correct in saying that the Mayor has stated to Oly Op that they are to come with an open mind but he does not have an open mind when it comes to the meeting and that they are going to discuss things he doesn't like, he will not meet with them?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I'm enjoying this immensely. The realities are quite simple, is that if Oly Op wants to meet with me and discuss OlyWest I'm happy to do so. If they want to discuss OlyWest or they want to discuss any concerns they may have, I'm happy to do so. If someone wants to come and dictate to Council and the Mayor of exactly how things are going to be run, then Mr. Speaker, I'm not happy to do that. I hope that's a little bit clearer.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Okay, the question has been worded a little bit differently, but

I still don't have my answer. Is the Mayor willing to discuss location which is what the Oly Op's group wants to discuss with the Mayor, or does the Mayor have a closed mind on this aspect of the discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Okay the question has been asked, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I was just thinking about finger puppets, I was laughing to myself, Mr. Speaker. The answer to the question is this, if Oly Op or any group in the City of Winnipeg wants to talk about OlyWest or any other situation, I am happy to do so, but I won't do so if someone is going to start off saying this isn't the discussion we are dictating what we are wanting, if they want to have a discussion, happy to have a discussion Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, following up the questions, and I won't direct them to the Mayor them, I'm direct them to Councillor Steeves regarding the proposed committee on the environment which doesn't appear to be functioning yet after six months of the previous committee having been killed on this floor, so my question to Councillor Steeves is what is his commitment and what is the commitment of the Mayor to ensuring that those committee meetings are truly open and public, that their agendas are always published on the Clerk's Decision Making Information System, that the meetings are always open and that any recommendations from that committee going forward to any aspect of the City would always be open communications, three aspects that were all features of the previous Civic Environmental Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Zero, no commitment on that front. We've been talking about how sort of there would be public involvement. There's been no commitment on this committee being the exact same as the last committee. What people at committee level have said and our discussions informally is that they feel there should be a public component. Councillor Benham should know and can count on the new iteration of this committee being different than the last one.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Mr. Speaker, I'm simply astonished and I appreciate Councillor Steeves candour bit I'm simply astonished that he's conceding on this Council floor that this committee will be appointed in secret, will meet in secret, will have a secret agenda and will make secret recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: Donald Benham: Question, question.

Councillor Benham: I'm simply mentioning that I'm astonished by the previous answer and I ask him how can he justify.

Councillor Steeves: I guess I misunderstood the guestion.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, yes.

Councillor Benham: Secrecy with a body that is supposed to be part of this publicly functioning Council, How can he can he justify that can of secrecy for taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, the question has been asked and there are no preambles on supplementary Councillor. Did you hear me? Councillor Benham, no preambles on supplementary, did you hear me? You heard me.

Councillor Benham: I heard you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: You'll also be slaughtering hogs at the committee level.

Mr. Speaker: Get to it, please.

Councillor Steeves: Yes, what I meant to say was I don't recall saying anything

that Councillor Benham just said in his inappropriate and illegal preamble, and I can't believe for the record, Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Elmwood did not stand up in a point of order and defend me. I simply cannot believe it.

Mr. Speaker: Is that the answer to your question.

Councillor Steeves: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Well can we get to it, please.

Councillor Steeves: I'm being a bit tongue and cheek and having some fun with my friends. The original iteration of the committee, the original terms of reference which Councillor Benham was, saw, talked about that there not being a public component. That part has been adjusted as far as the committee is concerned and the advisory committee which is the model that we're looking at is going to have a public component. It's not set in stone for a couple of different reasons I suppose, not the least of which is that the committee still has some ideas on how it might work, administration still has some ideas so I don't know what the final, final look of the committee is going to be but I think what Councillor Benham is concerned about is, is this going to be a committee that operates entirely in private and has no public component. I feel comfortable enough today Mr. Speaker and offering Councillor Benham the assurance that that has evolved out and without sort of overstating my authorities because I don't know that I have the authority to say that this is exactly what its going to look like. It does look like to me right know based on what we've seen and heard and based on the interaction that we've had that the committee members there is going to be a public component. So all kidding aside I think that's what were going to wind up with and that should give Councillor Benham some comfort because I know he's deeply interested in these issues and he'll have a chance to be involved.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, final supplementary Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Mr. Speaker, why won't Councillor Steeves commit to having a committee that meets in public and has a public and has a public agenda and reports in public.

Councillor Steeves: Simple answer Mr. Speaker, I don't own this committee and who knows what's going to happen as it comes forward. Maybe my idea or the committee's idea on the terms of reference might be radically adjusted by this Council at the appropriate time. So I don't know exactly what Councillor Benham is looking for from me, is he looking for my assurance, my assurance that we're working on a public component. I think the spirit and intent of this question is, Councillor Steeves is there going to be a public component and I think it's moving that way. Hopefully it winds up going that way. I'll count on Councillor Benham's support at the appropriate time when it comes forward which incidentally we hope is very very soon.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi on the second round.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes I was kind of fascinated to hear Councillor Steeves say that he somehow wasn't responsible for what was brought forward. I thought he was the Chair of this committee but if you are in fact the Chair of the committee could you please elaborate on what that component will be. We do have ways that our committees and boards of commission work. Why can't this work like one of those boards and commissions, is it just an advisory group to the Mayor. Is it in fact a board of commission like our other, like what is it and what do you mean by a component of public.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I don't mean to speak as if I'm evading the question. I'm truly not trying to do that, but I'm trying to walk the balance between trying to answer the question as best I can without sort of presenting something that as a fait accompli when it's not there yet and when there's other people involved. That's sort of the balance that I'm trying to walk which I think is reasonable. I think at the

end of the day this Council is going to be presented with a committee that has an agenda that will be public. There might be some association with administration that might not be in the public or committee members will have a chance to interact with administration. I guess my vision and again it's only my vision, I'm only one person of sixteen here is that for an ongoing environmental and sustainable initiatives that were currently undertaken at the City of Winnipeg, that our administration have a chance to interact with members of this committee who are professionals and representing professional organizations and, yes I hope they have a chance to do it sometimes in a public meeting but maybe it doesn't always have to be in a public meeting. Maybe the committee members can attend at our administrative offices and offer their expertise in certain different things. For example, I know our fleet group has a bunch of things that are going on. They might benefit from the advice. I mean I guess it's, it's trying to get away Mr. Speaker from the old model where it was simply the report shows up and then the environment committee reacts and we then we have a big hugabaloo and then people pick sides, there's a huge fight and at the end of the day no one's happy. I think regardless of how we felt about things I think everybody here can agree that towards the end of the mandate of the committee things were getting pretty divisive and not very very constructive. I don't think it was a great experience for anybody at that stage of the game. So we're trying to modify that, give our administration the support that they want and involve that sort of public and political component as well, trying to strike that balance and I'm hoping to come up with something that everybody can support. That's what I'm working towards. That's what I hope to achieve.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, do you have a supplementary, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Councillor Steeves. I still don't understand though why there would need to be a secretive process, like other committees like the housing committee meet with the administration if they want to or you can have an in camera meeting if you needed to, but it really does seem like this is more of a political decision to be more secretive and question.

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm wondering how you can put it on the administration. Isn't it simply a political desire to avoid controversial issues that, that that's what comes forward.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Your question has been asked.

Councillor Gerbasi: You're trying to avoid controversy.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Your question has been asked.

Councillor Steeves: I guess I would like to have the chance for our administration to interact with the new committee in a non-political, non public forum at the earlier stages of idea development prior to getting to the report stage, so they can call on that expertise. One of the greatest problems I think we had at the last environment committee meeting which I thought was an excellent committee throughout its inception, thought it was an excellent committee, great work, but one of the problems that we had is that it was difficult to involve the expertise we had prior to getting to that sort of next to final stage. That's what I believe the weakness was. That's the piece that was missing. In my estimation I think maybe we can do both to a certain extent Mr. Speaker and then maybe we can solve this problem but that's what it's going to take. It's going to take some bona fides and take some good faith on behalf of all of Council. I mean, I sure hope that I'm not going to expect automatic opposition from certain Councillors because they perceive this to be bad. I mean, I'm getting the sense, because Mr. Speaker, I'm getting the sense that just because this has the Mayor's thumbprint on it to any degree whatsoever, just because he cares about this, that there's going to be automatic opposition, and I sure hope that's not the case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks.

Councillor Steeves: Just because the Mayor is involved is not a reason to have automatic opposition. That's not a good enough reason.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, final supplementary, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Councillor Steeves, would you provide the rest of Council with where you are so far in terms of at least the names of the people, if they are already meeting, you must at least know that, we're certainly as you know very supportive of environmental initiatives which is why we're asking these questions. We're trying to find out who is going to be giving our administration advice.

Mr. Speaker: Great. The question has been asked.

Councillor Steeves: The reason I'm banging the table Mr. Speaker is I gave that information out, five months ago. That information was public. Everybody knows we gave it to the environment committee and Councillor Benham distributed over everywhere, everybody knows. This is part of the problem, Mr. Speaker, secrecy, secrecy. You guys are hiding everything. My god, that's been public knowledge for half a year.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Councillor Steeves my question is, look, clearly who are the members of this secret committee of yours?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: All right, listen, the email was distributed. Everybody is aware. It is not a secret. ISD was invited, Fort Whyte was invited, the Chamber of Commerce was invited, SEAR was invited, three of the citizen members, Terry Willard, Ken Mackinnon, Rodney Macdonald were invited. Whoever else was on the list but I don't recall right now off the top of my head, oh the institute for, sorry, but John Sinclair, John Sinclair and his group development, my mistake. So that was the group.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, time has expired. Downtown Development Committee, there is no report. No By-laws. Questions? None. Property and Development Committee report of May the 2nd, Councillor De Smedt.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED MAY 2, 2006

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the report of May 2, 2006, Items 1 to 18.

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment, let me take them one at a time. Councillor Wyatt, you said what?

Councillor Wyatt: Stand down Item 9 please.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 9 and Councillor Thomas, four and five. Any others?

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to be recorded in opposition to one, please.

Mr. Speaker: So noted, so with the exceptions of clauses four, five and nine, Councillor De Smedt moves the balance of the report be adopted by consent. All in favour. Opposed? Carried, with that one exception. Beginning with clause four, Councillor De Smedt.

Item 4 - Appointment of Councillor to the Historical Buildings Committee File G-3.1

Councillor De Smedt: Could we deal with four and five together please (in audible). I would like to listen to the question from Councillor Thomas.

Mr. Speaker: Alright, if that's agreeable we'll deal with both of them together. If it's sufficient. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: I have the same question with regard to number four and number five.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Thomas: We have, the Exchange District has been declared an historic area and it's come to my attention that there are a number of buildings that may be raised and I've received a couple of emails with regard to that, and I'm concerned that the appointment of a Councillor and the appointment of the committee hasn't occurred and they're usual the ones who advise us on those matters so I'd like to know when there will be an appointment for the Council and the committee and if this particular item that is coming forward which includes the raising of the historic building will be going to this committee first.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi on four and five, we're dealing with them together, they are both time extension requests.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as Chair of the Historical Building Committee I've been dealing with some of the same issues you've talking about and I just wanted to advise you there haven't been any decisions to de-list any buildings in the exchange there. There may be some people out there talking about wanting to do that.

If they do so it will come forward to the Historic Building Committee which has myself and Councillor Smith and we do have a third appointee that will eventually come from the Property and Development Committee but it certainly, the experts on the committee that decide about the delisting are there and functioning highly and I wouldn't be overly concerned that none of those kinds of decisions have been made and I also know that the historic buildings By-law is being reviewed so that might have something to do with the delay of the membership because that's still being worked on in terms of finalizing the historic building's By-law so thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt, you want to close on both, please.

Councillor De Smedt: I move four and five. I don't have anything further to add. The administration as Councillor Gerbasi has said is working on a major report once that comes forward so we just need a bit more time.

Mr. Speaker: On four and five, all in favour, opposed? That's carried. The next one was clause nine.

**Item 9 - Subdivision and Rezoning - North of Rougeau Avenue and east of Rick Boychuk Bay
File DASZ 9/2006**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This was an item on related properties that first came to us last year on Council for a, this is a joint venture issue between Genstar and the City of Winnipeg. These are city lands. We had approved, and I think I made note to Council members here last July to recommend approval of phase one of this project.

There had been an interest by the Councillor of the area and others to have a seven, eight acre park which was really contrary to an infill development process that really this whole area is about but because of the shortage of housing to make sure that we could have lots going, being developed this year, we approved phase one.

Phase two is now coming to us. If you flag up your report you will see for a subdivision and rezoning of four individual lots plus a multi-family opportunity with a 3.8 acre park. The area by examination within, by the recreation staff and parks and with, contained within our policies it doesn't justify itself for a 3.8 park but we thought on balance this would represent a good compromise to provide a sufficient park.

There was a recommendation by the Community Committee that they wanted a 6.8 acre park but it just doesn't meet the context of what we would normally do. There is disturbed land in that area. It's been sitting disturbed for years and I think this is an opportunity to finish this particular subdivision.

It contained in the report is the recommendation that we would finish this 3.8 acre park. It would be completed and sod so that the community will be getting something in a finished state rather than just vacant land left fallow which doesn't really do much but accumulate water and I'm told a few frogs.

But the recommendation to Council by the committee and E.P.C. concurs in that recommendation is that the modified version of a multi-family subdivision plus the four single family lots and a 3.8 acre park makes the most economical sense.

Its infield, classic infield development and we feel very strongly although I know the Councillor of the area thinks otherwise but we could not justify having a larger park area in that district, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt on the clause please.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. speaker, I rise on this issue wishing that we didn't have to have this argument and this fight over this matter, but to put not too fine a point on it, in my opinion the Councillor for St. Charles is forgetting that he's the Councillor for St. Charles and has been more and more been acting like he's the Councillor for Transcona amongst other wards in the city and I understand now why he's probably not running again for the next election.

But Mr. Speaker I'll tell you what, I was involved with the setting up of this joint venture and there was no phase one, phase two with regards to this development.

Let me take back a little bit of history because for those who attend the committee meetings, I didn't realize Councillor De Smedt did but obviously he was in the back room, I couldn't see him but the community committee meetings made some very clear decisions with regards to this planning application.

This has been before us before Council. It was before us a year ago and how did it come before us about a year ago. Well, an application was made by the developer Genstar who is acting on our behalf of the joint venture.

They are hired to represent the joint venture. Having said that, our legal department has clearly pointed out to me in writing that if we want to get our you know what suit off, the best way to cloud this issue is with the joint venture and rightfully so.

We should be walking into the public hearing with an open mind without bias and with being able to make decisions no matter what other roles Councillors are playing on other bodies including the joint venture. That was made very clear to me in writing by Ursula Goeres.

Now what we have before us is an application Councillors that originally, it was a proposal that came forward from the joint venture over a year ago to the community, last spring, of 2005, for about 100 homes in this piece of property. This is infill property. This is a piece of property that was supposed to be part of a transportation corridor. It was identified through the joint venture as a housing potential for single family housing.

I don't know about what you guys have found but I've found that doing infill family housing is extremely challenging, especially to make it happen. But I'll tell you what, in the four years nearly that I've been on Council I've worked diligently to try to make development work, have laid matters over, have held community meetings, have required developers to have community meetings in an effort to find compromise and quite often we do find compromise most of the time and indeed in this case we found compromise.

The developer came back to the community, spring of last year, and said, you know what, we had the public meeting that you recommended and we have found a compromise, and the compromise is to take the proposal which was 100 homes, reduce it down to 70 and then the balance would be set aside as park which was going to be 6.9 acres out of the 17 or so acres.

So the developer, (in audible) was still getting 70 homes being built on land that was completely void, nothing was happening on it. Nothing was probably going to happen from it; it hasn't happened on 20 years and wasn't going to happen for another 20 years. At the same time the community sacrificed, the community still divided to a certain extent but agreed by and large at the community committee meeting that this was a fair deal, by and large. The settlement on 6.9 acres. And that is what was moved forward.

When it got to the standing committee, maybe because certain people have been on the joint venture said this is not what we agreed to, so they axed off the 6.9 acres of park and threw it over the side. We'll study that; we'll get back to you on that and push forward the 70 homes so that was pushed forward.

I made a point of meeting with the administration in September of 2005 to ask them what the process was for the 6.9 acres and the administration told me point blank, Councillor; we're going to do a year long public consultation with the residents. It's going to be a transparent process, we'll see what we can do and we'll report back to Council because the administration had misgivings on whether or not we needed to have more park space in that area. The community felt they did. But there was a commitment made at that time and I can name the administrator and I don't want to necessarily get him in trouble. He made that commitment to me and I took his word for it. I didn't take anything in writing, unfortunately.

Next thing I know an In Camera report which I can't discuss is being walked on to the committee last November. Again, we can't discuss it because it's In Camera pre-empting any public consultation process on that 6.9 acres and saying that we have to go back for development. So you can imagine the reaction in the community when all of a sudden an application is coming forward again.

What really frustrates me actually Councillors in all of this is that the Chair of the committee in November and then at the last meeting of the Standing Committee when this came forward did not even have the courtesy to pick up the phone and call me and say Councillor Wyatt, I have a problem with your decision.

I don't like what you decided, I have a problem with the committee, not even a courtesy, decided like some sort of military tactician to launch a sneak attack and have all the votes line up and said get everybody lined up. This is how it's going to be done.

We're no longer in the military here, Brigadier General De Smedt, we are on Council and we're to be working together. And I can ensure you that to me the overriding message and I think this struck me at the community committee meeting Councillors is that, the community came to the meeting recently, before this meeting at community committee and community committee turned down this rezoning on the balance of 6.9 acres because overwhelmingly we heard from resident after resident after resident and resident and what the heck, where is a deal not a deal.

We made a deal with this developer and believe or not the developer as you know in the process can come up and respond again to questions, came up and basically said yes, I guess we made a deal. Didn't respond to all the criticisms believe or not in the meeting which normally the applicant does, almost I said to him and I've got the transcript if anyone wants to see it, I said to him you know, sir it sounds like you're a man who doesn't really want to be here. Well, I'm doing my job.

They didn't want to do this, I think they were pushed by our own people because of the fog of the joint venture and that's wrong. Any other development application had been held the same way; it would have been a different conclusion.

Mr. Speaker the community said a deal was a deal, the developer admitted at the community committee meeting and now

this is being overturned by the standing committee.

I have done everything as I can as City Councillor of Transcona to encourage development. You can look at the record, you can see the activity, you can see the growth in new housing out there. The very fact we have a joint venture to encourage more development. Will there be also commercial development. I've encouraged it and gone out to see it, met with developers to try to encourage multi family, met with developers to try to encourage new home and housing growth to allow for competition in the housing sector to insure the consumer gets the best price.

I've gone out of my way to do it and build a good working relationship. But what I cannot stand Mr. Speaker, where I come from, a deal is still a deal.

I don't know where you guys come from but from where I come from, a deal is still a deal. I think it still matters in every part of the city.

So, I would suggest that this Council stand with the community committee which its role and responsibility is with regards to the zoning and rezoning of matters and sub divisions instead of starting over turning willy nilly because of political back room; you know its just mind boggling. I wish I could speak to the In Camera report but I can't.

But anyway, that is the reality of the situation Mr. Speaker and I would hope that this Council does not approve E.P.C.'s recommendation and concurs with, by doing so with the community committee recommendation. Thank you.

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

Councillor Thomas: Thank you Mr. Speaker, this may not be in my ward but it is in my community. When the residents came for the first proposal, they were quite frustrated because although the thirteen acres were not sold as park land having very little park land in the area, the grassy fields had been used a park land. They came to an accommodation with the developer for a piece of property that was a little less than half of what they hoped for, but all people felt comfortable in the end and it went forward.

As Councillor Wyatt said before me, the developer was embarrassed when he came back. If you want to listen to the tapes that were made at the community committee on the record, he felt uncomfortable about he being there.

He knew that he had made a commitment to the residents when he left that they weren't going to do any more, and we were all shocked he was back. Some residents were close to tears. They felt betrayed. They felt that they had gone for a compromise that was now not being regarded. They were getting nothing from this development and were very disheartened by what had occurred.

When the community committee works long and hard to come to accommodation with the development, developers, when the residents and the developers leave satisfied that they have gotten what they want, but suddenly, six months later, something else comes back, the community is betrayed, the city is betrayed, and the process that this Council put forward for itself is betrayed because that means that a Councillor's word cannot be trusted if this goes forward again. I am shocked that this is here.

I'm embarrassed that this is here, and this will not get my vote because this is not what the residents and the developer said they were going to have when they accommodated each other, and I want to know how this got back. It's most unpleasant. I'm disgusted and the residents are so upset and so, feel so disinherited.

Every time they turn around, their parks are leaving, they've got stink coming up one end and the other, and every time they turn around they find their sanctuaries, which is their home, is being invaded by more and more by this Council here. Do not bully these people any more. They've been turned six ways

from Sunday on this proposal. Do not continue that bullying of these citizens.

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

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. You know I do regret that Councillor Wyatt would like to think that Councillors in other areas of the city don't have responsibility for all parts of the city. The last time I looked, we are one city. It's not the city of Transcona any more or the city of St. James, we all are working together and the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that we don't get the full truth here. That's the problem.

First of all, of course, we all know that it's the responsibility of community committee to make a recommendation. It's Council's will as it goes through the process on rezoning.

And while most cases, we all listened very closely to the local concerns and try and integrate it with the Councillor of the area, there are times when it just is not appropriate, and the administration, of course give us information to indicate when we have certain evolutions such as this. Infill development of this housing development in relation to park space that's available in the community in addition to one that's going to be coming on soon with the Buhler Recreation Park which will take into account a huge contribution by all citizens of Winnipeg to make sure that works.

We sometimes try to balance everybody's interests. As I've indicated, and I stood on the floor of Council and mentioned this last July, that moving the first set of homes was just step one, that we were going to reconsider and it was in the report that the community wanted to have this 7, 8 acre park and we said its totally inappropriate, the administration won't support it and rather than have a fight at that particular time and negate the opportunity to get some rezoning done for needed infill housing and if you go over to that Rougeau garden area today, you will see that things are being put in place with stakes in the ground, and they're starting to get ready for this subdivision.

That was a good decision. But clearly a message was sent, Councillor Wyatt just does not want to accept that we had said there is a condition here while we will all line up and support you on this phase, that there's clearly no will in Council to support an 8 acre park.

However, considering that it is in your area, we will work with the applicant in this case on our collective behalf because this is Genstar working with the City of Winnipeg.

We're a partner in this, and that it was incumbent on the Councillor to let his constituents know. I take umbrage that the Councillor wanted me to go to him to say that there is going to be a problem. I mean, we've known from the moment the community committee was held in which there was, I think, a rancorous allegation by the Councillor that what we have when it gets down to city hall are nothing but, you know, liars and lawyers and lizards.

Councillor Steeves: Wow, wow, hey.

Councillor Swandel: Are you still a lawyer?

Councillor De Smedt: Can I get all three together. Well, I'll start off; we've got a lot of this. You know in any event, Mr. Speaker, I think the community was aware that the first plan wasn't going to fly, and we don't want to have a fight.

We certainly would like to encourage the Councillor to think positively. We're putting in a 3.8 acre park which is going to be behind all the residents in that particular area. An infill housing that is proposed so let's come through with our end too for multi-family, which is in huge demand in that community, and it's kind of ironic because the Councillor of the area did approach me several months ago and says we've got to get some infill multi-family development going. I have a huge demand. People are approaching me. I mean, we're trying to keep things in house here.

I take umbrage at some of the statements that are being made. Our committee, your committee on Property and Development, it's yours, it's not mine, tried to be the arbiter of most issues as best we can.

We just passed number one, Riverwood. The committee recommended that we not go along with the community committee, and you guys just approved it a moment ago to have a multi-family development. We've done that.

The Councillor of the area, the others, and the community committee were not as supportive of that. However, on balance, I think people realized that it made a heck of a lot of sense. This is another case. We very seldom do it. I encourage you to think of it in the positive sense. We are providing a 3.8 acre park which is much more than the requirements for parks and open space and land dedication for this particular development, much more.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that Council concur with the recommendation of the Standing Property Committee. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Debate's closed. On the clause, all in favour.

Councillor Wyatt: Recorded Vote.

Mr. Speaker: Pardon me? Recorded vote on clause 9? All in favour of clause 9 please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

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

(Interjections from the gallery)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you! Thank you! Escort the lady out, please.

(Interjections from the gallery)

Mr. Speaker: Escort the lady out of the gallery, please.

(Interjections from the gallery)

Mr. Speaker: We know you are. Councillor De Smedt, by-laws please.

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

Councillor De Smedt: I would like to move By-laws No. 143/2006, 144/2006, 145/2006, 146/2006, 147/2006, 148/2006, 149/2006, 150/2006, 151/2006, 153/2006, 154/2006, 155/2006 and 156/2006 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 143/2006, 144/2006, 145/2006, 146/2006, 147/2006, 148/2006, 149/2006, 150/2006, 151/2006, 153/2006, 154/2006, 155/2006 and 156/2006.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that Bylaws No. 143/2006 to 151/2006 both inclusive and 153/2006 to 156/2006 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 143/2006 to 151/2006 both inclusive and 153/2006 to 156/2006 both inclusive.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 143/2006 to 151/2006 both inclusive and 153/2006 to 156/2006 both inclusive be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Any questions for Property and Development?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Last month I raised questions about an offer made to the rural municipalities surrounding the City of Winnipeg with regards to setting up service agreements with them offering them our services in return that we would get a point or two off the mill rate plus the fees for the services. And that this was, apparently there was an extension made to the municipalities with a cut off in the middle of April to respond. Have any municipalities responded to this inquiry by the City?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Yes Councillor I think you're referring to the initiative that was taken by Council. The Mayor was in the lead to have an inter-municipal agreement protocol, and we did a canvass of the municipalities, if you recall so let's just go over it again. The administration did meet with the municipalities and to explain to them the bylaw and suggested to them that if they had a suitable project that could consider service sharing as well as revenue sharing which we could meet the interests of trying to build up our capital region, we would certainly look at it and then bring it to Council.

I'm not aware of the exact number. There have been several. I think three or four. I have not got the details. The administration is working on this. And when they have a suitable report prepared, obviously it will take continued negotiations with a particular municipality. If there's more than one, several municipalities to understand what the factors are and then they'll make a report and they'll come forward. I think this would be under the responsibility of Executive Policy Committee. So, I think at this stage of the game, it's still in the mill. I'm sorry. I might just play my first question here. I mean you did indicate that you were aware of a particular project and municipality. If you would share that with us and send us an email to all Members of Council then we would be certainly be informed of what perhaps individual Councillors are doing on the margins as we have a major policy issue here.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: When can we expect a report to that effect with regards to what's being considered for service sharing?

Councillor De Smedt: I can't answer that Councillor Wyatt, but I'll make an inquiry of the administration and certainly share that information with you and other Members of Council.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor Wyatt. No? Any further questions? Protection and Community Services Committee report, the one of April 10th that's been stood down for 30 days so we'll move to the report of May the 8th, Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNNITY SERVICES DATED MAY 8, 2006

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker regarding the report of May 8, 2006, I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Item 1. I don't know if you want to speak to it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I guess we're dealing with the E.P.C. recommendation, is that correct? I'm sorry, I'm getting behind here.

Councillor Steeves: I believe we're talking about the museum.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. So it's the E.P.C. recommendation that is being dealt with, recommending? The active recommendation is the recommendation of Executive Policy Committee. All in

favour, opposed? Carried. By-laws, Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I want to be 100% clear about what we just did.

Mr. Speaker: Just approved it, thank you.

Councillor Steeves: We approved it. Okay.

Mr. Speaker: By-laws.

Councillor Steeves: Okay. I wasn't clear because it was a tie vote.

Mr. Speaker: By-laws, Councillor Steeves, are you dealing with bylaws now?

Councillor Steeves: You just don't want to be seen to be deviating from process, you rascal.

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

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves moves that By-Laws No. 152/2006 and 157/2006 be now read a first time. All in favour. Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 152/2006 and 157/2006.

Councillor Steeves: I've got a little problem here with my machine.

Mr. Speaker: You're going to move the By-laws No. 152/2006 and 157/2006 be now read a second time.

Councillor Steeves: Yes.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 152/2006 and 157/2006.

Mr. Speaker: Over to you, Councillor.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 152/2006 and 157/2006 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 Protection and Community Services? None. Oh, Councillor Thomas, sorry.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. My questions are with regard to the committee or non-committee that the head of Protection and Community Services is chairing. I want to know when the list of members will be submitted for approval.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry Councillor I have to interpret you. Your questions are out of order, that's a separate matter dealt with by Executive committee. Councillor Steeves will only respond to questions dealing with the Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services.

Councillor Thomas: So, are you ruling that he is not the head of the Environment Committee in his capacity as Protection of Community Services.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I am, Councillor, under Standing Policy Committee question period, you can only deal with questions relating, directly relating to the standing policy committee's responsibility. That is in the bylaws.

Councillor Thomas: Well Mr. Speaker, this is one of the questions that we have for this committee is where is it? Is it under Executive Policy Committee? Is it under Protection Community Services committee?

Mr. Speaker: Yes that other committee you're referring to is a matter of Executive Policy Committee, which the Councillor has been designated as chair. His question period right now is for the

Standing Policy Committee direct responsibility.

Councillor Thomas: So you're ruling that it is under Executive Policy Committee.

Mr. Speaker: The other issue. Yes, the other issue.

Councillor Thomas: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Anything else? Report of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED MAY 9, 2006

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move clause 1 of the meeting of May 9, 2006.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko, did you wish to speak to that, did you wish to introduce it Councillor Clement? No, it's okay? All right. Councillor Lazarenko, I'm sorry, clause 1?

Item 1 - Award of Contract for the Winnipeg Water Treatment Program - Water Treatment Plant Foundations and Concrete Structures File WS-7

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker, at the Public Works Committee I voted against the clause because the report we have is over contract by about 57 million dollars on the proposed water treatment plant. What we approved was 235 million dollars, it's up to 300 million dollars, I want to be recorded in opposition. Because we had other options that we were able to look at and we refused to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any other debate on the clause. Councillor Clement, do you wish to close?

Councillor Clement: No. I'd like to move that we vote on it. I don't think there's anything to close to after that.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of the clause, opposed? That motion is carried. You've been recorded, Councillor. Thank you. You're recorded in opposition, Lazarenko and Smith? Thanks, okay. Any questions for Public Works, if not, Councillor Lazarenko moves we do now adjourn. Roll call, please.

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.

Mr. Speaker: Council is now adjourned.

Council Adjourned at 4:46 P.M.