COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday July 26, 2006

The Council met at 9:49 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 Benham.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have two pages working with us today interrupting their summer break to be with us here in July. We have Elaine Manipol of Kildonan East Collegiate who resides in Transcona Ward and Michael Dwilow of Fort Richmond Collegiate who lives in St. Norbert, on behalf of my colleagues welcome today and thank you for being with us.

Mr. Speaker: Welcome of guests and announcements, Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Yes, thank you and good morning Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce the North Kildonan Clean and Green Team and their manager, Al Briski. Since 2001 the North Kildonan Clean and Green Team has been eliminating graffiti, cleaning up and refurbishing our parks and doing other community and ecology related work and from the information that I have seen recently from the Mayor's office, the recently announced Green River Pilot Project is very similar to the North Kildonan Clean and Green Team and I commend the Mayor on this initiative and offer him our support and experience and I hope that his program is every bit as successful as ours has been for the past five years, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any other guests, none. I do have an announcement to make. For your information, I was, I've been advised that on Tuesday of this week, our three Sergeant-at-Arms, Sergeants-at-Arms, Terry Leblanc, Victor Peterson and Joe Mallet were promoted to the rank of Chief Warrant Officer by the Core of Commissionaires.

This promotion serves to recognize the increased and diverse responsibilities that have been entrusted to these gentlemen since the inception of our Sergeant-at-Arms position in 1995 and it acknowledges their important role in ensuring the safety and security of the occupants of the council building. I'm sure that all Members of Council will join me in extending our very sincere congratulations to our Sergeants-at-Arms on this promotion. Of course we thank all of you for your service to our city and to the people who occupy this building on a daily basis. Thank you very much.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham moves the minutes of the meeting held on June 28, 2006 of Council be taken as read and confirmed. All in favour, opposed, carried. I have a couple of procedural matters I'm going to deal with right now before we get down to business, other business.

First I emailed all Members of Council earlier this week with regard to a notice of motion that is standing in our agenda, a motion sponsored by Councillor Benham. Legal Services Department has advised me that the motion imposes duties and responsibilities on the Senior Election Official which are beyond the city's legal authority.

Section 35 of the City Charter Act sets out information, what information is required to be reported in an audited financial statement which is to be done by May 31st of the following year and the motion's reporting requirements add to that which are beyond the city's legal authority and the penalty for contravening either sections 34 or 35 of the Charter Act are set out in section 45 of the Act and the motion provides for disallowance and reimbursement, both of which are beyond the city's legal authority. And pursuant to

section 34 of the City Charter Act, any limit on campaign expenses must be included in the campaign and expenses contribution bylaw and any changes to those limits cannot be done by motion.

So in view of my advice I've received from the city solicitor I have to rule that, that motion is out of order and would be removed from the agenda. That's done.

Distributed this morning is notice of motion; it's notice of motion number 2, sponsored by Councillor Gerbasi. On the face of it, the motion is out of order because it contravenes section 38.2 of the procedure bylaw which indicates that Council can only deal with matters within its direction jurisdiction under the charter.

I'm inviting Councillor Gerbasi to ask Council to suspend the rule and if the rule is suspended, then this motion will be considered in September and if it's not then it is out of order by Council's decision. So Councillor Gerbasi, would you just move that the rule be suspended, rule 38.2 be suspended in order that this motion can be considered at the September Council meeting.

Councillor Gerbasi: So moved, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour. Opposed?

Councillor Thomas: I wish to rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, just a moment, Councillor, you're out of order right now, I am asking all in favour of suspending the rule, opposed? I think the motion is carried. So, the motion will stand as a notice of motion for September now. Councillor Thomas, you have a point of order?

Councillor Thomas: I have a point of privilege under 41 related to the rights and prerogatives and privileges of Council. I believe that the speaker has unduly limited the Sister City relationship by ruling that the suspension of the rules is required.

Mr. Speaker: You're out of order Councillor; Council has already decided to deal with this motion.

Councillor Thomas: I have been standing beforehand but the speaker chose not to recognize me.

Mr. Speaker: No, I recognize the sponsor of the motion which I had agreed to do earlier. So, you're out of order now. Council has already decided to suspend it's rules so it will be a notice of motion for the next meeting.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, Councillor Wyatt has a point of order.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, a point of order Mr. Speaker. I wish for you to make a note that I'd like to have this matter discussed at the next Secretariat meeting, with regards to this because, I believe that under 38.2, this was completely within order, this motion.

Mr. Speaker: Council has already ruled that.

Councillor Wyatt: But, I'd like to have it on the next Secretariat meeting. Thank you.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Okay, we proceed to delegations which we have quite a number of. Just get my stuff in order here, the first delegation is Mr. Gary Swanson, President of CUPE local who is appearing on two items, first of all in opposition to clause 1 of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services report of July 17th regarding the governance of Assiniboine Park and he's also appearing in support of item 1 of the Alternative Service Delivery Committee of July 17th regarding Glacial Sand and Gravel. So, Mr. Swanson I invite you to perhaps in your commentary deal with both and we can keep it orderly.

Gary Swanson: Your Worship and Councillors, thank you for allowing me a

few moments to discuss these two issues with you.

For more than 100 years, city officials and workers as well as public supporters have maintained Winnipeg's most popular attraction, Assiniboine Park. Each year, thousands of Winnipeggers and their guests visit the zoo, botanical gardens and the conservatory. We've walked the paths, skated the ponds, flown kites, shared relaxing moments with friends and family in the spacious lawns of this park. I think it's important that we keep this park as a public entity and I think I want to start off with a little bit of history of park development in Winnipeg.

It's important because it provides us lessons we should all be aware of today. What's not in the report that I have submitted is that it initially parks were privately operated in the City of Winnipeg and public, privately operated green spaces.

But they all failed because of the weather or the seasons that we have in the city. You can't make it work, green spaces and charge for them because of the winter season that we have and the various weather events, so it is entirely dependant on weather to how these things operate.

Firstly, Assiniboine Park was built with the intent to separate the commercial world from the natural. Today, Assiniboine Park continues to fill this premise. It is also a premise our CUPE local 500 members understand in the performance of their work and their passion for the park. We want to state to Council, your employees, our members are not the reason we are talking about a new model for park governance.

The early development of the city's parks took an important step in 1907 when the city hired George Champion as the superintendent of parks, a position that he held for 26 years. Champion and the parks board chairman (in audible) had a vision of a system of city parks that would be connected by scenic tree-lined boulevards around the city. We see that today.

The network would be anchored by one large park in each corner of the city, Assiniboine Park, Brookside Cemetery, Kildonan Park and eventually St. Vital Park. Assiniboine Park is the cornerstone of the City of Winnipeg park system. The issues facing Assiniboine Park are also apparent in other major parks in the city. Is there any thought, is the thought of creating an independent board for each of them in the future.

We believe that public ownership and control of the park will keep it a viable public asset. It is our history; we encourage City Councillors to keep the park public. There are serious financial issues that City Councillors are not looking at that will affect the viability of the park if it is managed by a not-for-profit board. We know there is and others are asking questions that Councillors should answer. What will be the committee of, commitment of the city to fund ongoing operations. What will be the administrative and monitoring costs for the city to ensure the new agency carries out its mandate in the best interests of the residents. If the park is an independent administration, who will be required to pay taxes like other organizations, who will be responsible if there is a deficit, if emergency funding is required or operational overruns.

There is a claim that a new structure will increase funding from non-governmental sources yet there is no evidence to substantiate this claim. In fact a number of not-for-profit organizations providing public and social services in Manitoba can dramatically attest to the fact that they are under constant pressure to fundraise for their services and it is increasingly difficult to do so.

We expect that a new board will be forced to seek funds in ways that restrict access to the park for Winnipeggers. We have predicted that admission fees for venues will be implemented or increased and there will be pressure to sell or lease land or take on similar commercial ventures.

We agree with the Free Press editorial July 20th, City Council needs to lay down the foundation for new management,

assure the park remains public property with the grounds open to the public and that it let the future take hold. This can only be done within a mandate that assures free public access to the park, secure and efficient operations by city staff, predictable funding with annual increases and transparent public accountability.

We disagree with the Free Press that City Councillors should be careful not to bind the hands of the new operators by guarantying city unionized jobs, not, by guarantying city unionized jobs in the park, nor should we strictly defined who will do what, where and how and that's a quote from the Free Press. City Council must make sure that a new administration is accountable to the public, is able to manage the whole park for the public and will act in the best interests of the community. City operations and control of the park organization will share a foundation for investment, a clear vision for park development as defined in the framework plan.

The checks and balances on vested interests and ultimately ensure long term viability for the park. Improvements and efficiencies in operations are needed but these can easily be done within the city governance structure. It is worth noting that many of the problems with the park today are the result of past efforts to restructure services. Until 1997, park operation was under the auspices of one City of Winnipeg department. Parks and Recreation was responsible for all city parks for over 100 years actually.

In October of that year, Winnipeg City Council approved an amended version of the Cuff Report which restructured the park's operation. This dramatically affected operations, planning, programming and maintenance. All three of these functions were transferred to different line departments that we see here today, Community services, Planning Property and Development and Public Works.

In 1997 one of the reasons used to justify the restructuring was the lack of funding for Parks and Recreation Department. It was thought that by streamlining the operation more dollars could be directed to front line services. Of course this has proven false as no such efficiencies emerged and there has been less real dollars directed to the park over the past eight years.

To leave the park operation in the hands of a volunteer board without assurances needed to keep the park viable and public is a sure way to let down Assiniboine Park and all Winnipeggers. We strongly encourage City Councillors to retain responsibility for the park and ensure us that it remains a public asset. Give city officials, volunteers and staff the opportunity to restructure operations and the resources to do the best for the park. Thank you.

I'll speak to the second. First of all, CUPE Local 500, this is on Glacial Sand and Gravel; supports the motion to prove that 2006 budget and business plan for the Glacial Sand and Gravel, Special Operating Agency. We feel that it is important to give our members, your employees who work for the Glacial the knowledge and assurance they will be working in the pit for the rest of the operating season. This temporarily relieves the stressor in their lives. The operation of Glacial Sand and Gravel S.O.A. has been in a state of limbo awaiting the results of expressions of interest process by the city. But, we would like to highlight some issues surrounding this year's operations.

Attached to a brief are some pictures. The first four show some of the equipment our members are using. All of which are long past their productive years. These pieces of equipment are prone to failure and are not competitive with the new machinery on the market.

The final four pictures contrast dramatically to what our members use. We bring this to your attention for two reasons. It is good business practice to update the machinery needed to manufacture aggregate.

Our members have been observing their competitors upgrading equipment for the

entire existence of Glacial S.O.A., yet they have been expected to compete with the decrepit equipment that they have. It is like going to play a baseball game with your team having sticks and your opponents having real bats.

These pictures also speak to a boom in the construction industry and why the Glacial S.O.A. should be a valuable asset to the citizens of Winnipeg. Yet the asset is not being treated this way. Please look at the price lists for the city's aggregate for this year and compare it to the private sector list. That's on the last page.

Our final point speaks to the morale of your CUPE employees at Glacial and for that matter Assiniboine Park. All our members in each operation continue to be productive and provide excellent service to citizens, their working spirit, however, has been eroded by these work place examples with work uncertainty, (inaudible) deficiencies, failing infrastructure systems and inadequate equipment. We bring these items to Council because they're not reflected in the report you received and we would like to work with the Mayor and Council to deliver better programs and services for all citizens. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Swanson, are there questions, Councillor Lubosch you have a question.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Swanson for both your presentations this morning. The pictures speak for themselves and obviously the city's operation is significantly undercapitalized but then when I look at the price list, could you explain this to us. It looks like, in just about every product category, Glacial Sand and Gravel is significantly lower priced than the competition, sometimes three or four times lower. What's up with that?

Gary Swanson: I think that's reflective of the, Glacial is not keeping up with what's happening in the marketplace. All aggregate is inflated dramatically within the past year because of like I said the construction boom in Manitoba and in Alberta.

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

Councillor Lubosch: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm still baffled when I look at as an example, 10 millimetre to 200 millimetre stone under coarse sand, 10 to 3, 10000 to 300, okay $7.93 is the price per ton that Glacial Sand and Gravel is charging and the competition for the same product is charging $24.85. That's more than three times as much.

Mr. Speaker: What's your question, councillor? There is no preamble, Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: I can't, I'm not managing the operation, so I can't speak to why they have the price list the way it is. I can only make assumptions that perhaps because of the expression of interest there is not a lot of effort, I won't say effort, not a lot of things being discussed in terms of how the pricing should be done at Glacial. But I believe it should, I mean if it's a valuable asset and I believe it is, and if you look at all the new equipment that all the private sector people are doing, are buying, they know that they have a market for their aggregate and they know that it's a higher premium right now and they're charging accordingly.

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

Councillor Lubosch: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Based on what you've presented here, would you conclude that the reason we're losing money at our pit is because we're charging a third of what the competition charges?

Gary Swanson: Yeah, and I think we should be careful here because we were very competitive with, in 2005. What's happened though, in 2006 is that a number of major projects are happening in Manitoba, and that's why aggregate is inflating dramatically, that's why you see increases for road construction, increases for the sewage plant or the water treatment plant, excuse me and the

market is reflected that there's demand and so now they're charging more of a premium price and we haven't kept up with it. That's clearly what it indicates.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, a couple of questions. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Swanson. First of all we have a presentation that's been presented to Council; you probably haven't seen it with regards to the Assiniboine Park which you spoke about.

It's from the Friends of the Assiniboine Park Conservatory and their concern is they were involved with the framework plan, developing the framework plan but when it came to the governance process which you spoke about, they had some issues there and they've articulated that in this presentation to us, with specifically talking in terms of the governance, in terms of the concerns about assets and land that could potentially be sold or leased for commercial purposes in the park. What is your thoughts? Do you think we should refer this report back to take in these considerations versus push forward right now today? What is your feeling with regards to the governance model before us today?

Gary Swanson: I think that the amendments that were made at committee allow a little bit more flexibility in terms of what will happen. I think it's important that all the stakeholders and I believe that our members are stakeholders in the park as well, have an opportunity to discuss with the Assiniboine Park Enterprises what kind of model should be there.

And I think the committee also recommended that a look should be made at the Millennium Library model that had an independent board working with the administration to rebuild the old centennial library.

And I think that's where I think we need to go and I believe that the consultant had it in their heads that one model and that's what we ended up with, option two. But I think there's other models in the United States that are just as viable and I think like joint governance or joint management models are out there that would serve the interests of both the volunteer groups and the city.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. On the, on your presentation, Mr. Swanson, with regards to Glacial Sand and Gravel, could you elaborate with regards to the, in your presentation you refer to the decrepit equipment and from the knowledge of the employees who are working there today, what impact is that having on productivity and on the success or lack of success with regards to the Glacial Sand and Gravel?

Gary Swanson: Our accountant, we were asking those questions when the expression of interest process was happening and our accountant indicated to us that for our, for the Glacial Sand and Gravel operation to make money, it had to produce four times the amount of aggregate that it is today. And that's strictly a restriction on the equipment that they have. So that's, and our members who have worked in that pit for again decades, understand the business and they've been felt betrayed by this whole process because in 2001 there was supposedly 1.5 million dollars in capital to upgrade the equipment at the operation and that didn't happen.

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

Councillor Wyatt: As it stands right now, it's the productivity is being directly impacted by the fact that equipment has not been upgraded and if it had been upgraded the productivity would be up and the revenues would be up from Glacial Sand and Gravel?

Gary Swanson: That's what our accountant has spoken to us, he said if we produce four times the amount of

aggregate and so long as the market was there then we would make money. So.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel you have a question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Thank you Mr. Swanson for your presentation today. With regard to Glacial Sand and Gravel I think we're both aware that one of the options that was looked at in the expression of interest process was the investment in new equipment and expanding the ability to produce and that was measured against other options. So, I won't go down that vein. But I think it's important to address what you said regarding pricing.

I just, I'll have to go back to our people at Glacial to get an explanation and to see whether or not that's industry wide representative or whether it's just specific to one supplier. But, are you aware, if the products are being manufactured and offered for sale this year? It was my understanding maybe they weren't.

Gary Swanson: Yes, the operation has been totally scaled down. Glacial's trying to sell off the aggregate that it's already produced and some of it, some of the aggregate like sand for example, is hard to sell because there's a glut of it on the market. So, and, but they have had other material where some private sector people have come in to try and buy and they haven't been able to sell it because they haven't produced it and that would have been a revenue generator for the operation.

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

Councillor Swandel: Sorry, just to follow up on that, I guess then there' been no huge spike in volumes of sales as a result of this differential in pricing.

Gary Swanson: Well, you have to have the aggregate that in the pricing, you know on the price list. You'd have to have that type of aggregate and because we have, the operation's been scaled downed they haven't been producing any new aggregate; they can't get into the market that way.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Swanson, you know with the governance of Assiniboine Park, do you see this motion that's before us, this clause that's before us, do you see it as interfering with it being controlled by the public.

Gary Swanson: If we strictly go with option 2 of the report, and out of the consultant's report, our concern is that we, that the city will lose, eventually lose control of the park and if you study the consultant's report and what they were looking at, over time all the volunteer groups except one eventually disappeared from the board.

That rings alarms bells with us and we are very concerned that if you go in that direction, if you are going in a direction that you may not be able to come back from and again we want to make the point that Assiniboine Park, which is the crown jewel of the City of Winnipeg, it is also a part of a greater system of parks and what do you do with all the other parks. Kildonan Park for example last year had an issue with too many cars in the park, parked in the park and the seniors groups there were upset because they use parks to do their walking, which is a healthy activity and should be you know supported and so there is that conflict in that park.

Now, we see that with St. John's Park as well where you know people are trying to make improvements in that park. But there's competing interests and so how do you manage that.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Smith: You know, Mr. Swanson, what I'm asking you, is if we pass this clause today, is that going to interfere with it being a public park, with, run by the City of Winnipeg.

Gary Swanson: I guess the response to that, the motion is to explore the

possibility and I believe that there will be a report back in November.

Councillor Smith: So you don't mind that being passed.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Councillor Smith: You don't mind that this clause being passed today.

Gary Swanson: Yes, I don't mind because I think it was recognized by Protection and Community Services Committee that our members, your employees are stakeholders in the park and that we will have a seat at the table.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any other questions. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker, thank you Mr. Swanson. I know the concern you have, I'm sorry to see that some Members of Council put you in a spot with the sand and gravel. Some have just missed the report.

My question to you is the governance of Assiniboine Park. What you want to see is to retain the present status of the city employees that are working at the park so that later on the report comes back in November to see a positive report, that that status quo stays with the employees that are present and are there now, such as your members of CUPE.

Gary Swanson: Our belief and I, and it's our knowledge that our members are very passionate about the work they do in that park and they have served the city for decades. CUPE, CUPE 500 has been around since 1964. But prior to that there was a civic union of civic employees, so the park has had city employees in it since its inception. And they've done excellent work and they know how to do the work because every day the public comes in there and they use the park for the purposes that I have described in here and they know they see an immediate tangible result of their work. And they have a passion, like I said, I will repeat it again, they have a passion for the park and they would like to remain working in the park so long as they continue to do the job.

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

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Chairman, yes, Mr. Swanson, I would like to ask a supplementary question. When this report will be brought back to Council in November, I would like to emphasize that you would want to see that you have the stakeholders of CUPE union would be still participating in the operation of Assiniboine Park like what they've been doing for the past, well past close to 100 years to make sure that that stays the status quo with the operation, with the employees. This is what you want. Because this is what I'll be.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor, there's no preamble. Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: I would echo your thoughts on this and our members would love to continue to work in the park and provide the excellent service that they do today.

Mr. Speaker: That's it. No further questions. Thank you very much, Mr. Swanson for your presentations on both of those. The next delegation is Mr. Nick Ternette with regard to clause 2 of the Protection and Community Services report of April 10th, I believe it is. Ten minutes, Mr. Ternette.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz and Members of City Council. See no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil, as always Executive Policy Committee continues to do things ass-backwards. Instead of confronting and dealing with the issue of poverty head on, E.P.C. continues to ignore the city's responsibilities, by suggesting that poverty is a complex, multi-faceted issue which extends beyond the control of any level of government ignoring the fact that one of the city's primary responsibilities is to act on the issue of poverty.

For example, in Vancouver the former Mayor addressed the issue of aids epidemics through the needle exchange

program. In Toronto, Council dealt with the issue of homelessness. In Winnipeg, we deal with infrastructure renewal. When occasionally City Council is pressured to deal with some policies relating to poverty like the urban reserves or the issue of homelessness, it tends to deal with it as quickly as possible in order to get it over with.

In the latest case, the city admitted that Council passed a resolution approximately eight months ago when it debated a new panhandling bylaw, that the administration develop a framework to address the social components related to health, housing, employment and substance abuse faced by panhandlers. After months of stalling since the resolution was passed eight months ago, E.P.C. has actually ignored the issue because I think they hoped it would go away. I keep saying why don't you stop being hypocrites out here and admit once and for all that you don't think that the city should be involved in the issue of poverty.

But since this is an election year, this would be politically wise and so you cop out and give a one time only stand up grant of 45,000 dollars to United Way to deal with poverty. Pray tell me, what does a poverty reduction council formed by the United Way know about panhandlers and their needs and their resources needed to deal with panhandling and poverty in general.

In fact, it is interesting to note that the police, who are in fact the most involved with panhandlers, were unable to answer any of the questions concerning panhandlers such as since the panhandling bylaw was passed eight months ago, what has happened to the 66 tickets that have been issued under the bylaw, were 22 panhandlers ticketed three times each or 11 panhandlers ticketed six times each or 66 panhandlers ticketed once each. And then there was no mention of what has happened to those who have been ticketed. How many have actually gone to court. What fines if any have the judges charged and how many have actually been paid.

Furthermore, if you are dealing with poverty in relationship to panhandling, how long have these panhandlers been panhandling, who are these people, what are their backgrounds, et cetera, et cetera. None of that information is available, nor has anybody been able to answer that.

So instead of looking at the root causes of poverty relating to panhandlers, City Council instead opts out by throwing money at a social agency to show that they care about the issue. Council did have a chance several years ago to address this issue of what they call aggressive panhandlers, when the BIZ group, the Downtown Business Group came with a plan to build a treatment centre on the Aboriginal Centre on Higgins so that aggressive panhandlers with an addiction problem could be taken off the streets and put into treatment. The result of that plan which would have been something to deal with concretely with poverty, City Council had no political will to deal with it at all. It’s never happened.

What is even more disturbing to me is the fact that most City Councillors, not all but most, as well as I think Mayor Sam Katz; feel that the issue of poverty is not the business of the city. Too often I have heard it said by some Councillors that the realities that poverty concerns us all; however city government is not mandated to address health, employment, justice, and other areas of provincial and federal jurisdiction.

Some Councillors have indicated that for political reasons the city has delved into some of these areas and the result as far as they're concerned is duplication, waste, bureaucratic empire-building and clients falling between the cracks because when more than one level of government is involved, buck-passing is the norm. At the same time, the core services that are the responsibility of the city rose and for instance are neglected.

Some Councillors feel that the same taxpayers are funding services at all three levels, so efficient and accountable provisions of services are required, that basically the provincial and federal

governments ought to be responsible for delivering them.

I wonder whether City Council, which on more than one occasion however, has passed policies related to poverty, in this case when it deals with the issue of aboriginals, when it deals with the issue of urban reserves and occasionally the financial tri-partnership agreements relating to the issue of homelessness, even if most Councillors would suggest that the only reason they do it is for political reasons, as many of them say, but more often than not any issue relating to poverty has been ignored. It is I think hypocritical, my personal belief, of Councils to pass policies which they did in this case eight months ago, okay, that they don't believe it.

If the majority of Council does not believe that the issue of poverty is within the city's mandate, then they should pass openly, stand up and be public about passing resolution clearly stating that in our opinion, that poverty is the responsibility of the provincial and federal governments and we are not responsible for the issue of poverty.

Then the citizens would know, I would say ultimately, where City Council stands on this issue ultimately because at this stage people in general feel the city has a significant issue, significant responsibility dealing with the issue of poverty and it seems to be doing nothing about it.

But if it is said publicly and the majority of Council stood up and said they don't want to deal with poverty, then at least we know where we stand and then the citizens can make up their minds in the upcoming October election whether they feel that that is how City Council ought to be functioning. It is fundamental and important that I'm so concerned about this complete back-sliding on the issue of poverty, especially this kind of issue because that's the one that the city's been involved in since 1995. We have had three different panhandling bylaws and resolutions have been passed that we want to look at the root causes of what causes panhandling and whatever else and after you know ten years to come up with a resolution, well let's have the United Way and its little committee deal with poverty, I hope, which I don't object that they should deal with poverty as a whole but on the panhandling issue, well you know they could also look at that, as if they know anything about it.

To me it is just an abrogation of one's responsibility that the city has. If you pass legislation that affects certain people out on the streets then you ought to be responsible also for dealing with the social problems that relate to those issues. So I would hope that this Council simply says, this isn't good enough, I don't have a problem if you pass this resolution at a sense, go ahead and pass it but put another amendment in or to say, no we also have responsibility for poverty or say publicly we don't have a responsibility for poverty. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Ternette. There are some questions, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. One of the issues around this was that the Standing Committee spent a long, long time meeting with groups and having delegations and coming up with policy ideas which is what Standing Committees are supposed to do, suggesting an intersectoral approach, working with the Social Planning Council, et cetera, and that basically was just dismissed at the E.P.C. level.

I mean I agree that it's fine, we can support the United Way but does it concern you that the policy committee's work is basically disregarded and the work of groups such as the Social Planning Council that have for years and years advocated on issues of poverty and for the most disadvantaged in our community, does it concern you the way citizens and non E.P.C. Councillors have been treated in this whole process.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, and this of course, if anybody, if any of the Councillors had been reading my latest articles about the whole governance of city hall, as you understand, my concerns

about it is that we basically have created, literally a democratic dictatorship. I know some people say that it's a contradictory term, but it's nobody's fault. I'm not blaming any singly individual Councillor, as you know I believe the CUFF report fundamentally altered the politics at city hall and fundamentally shut out business representation. For the last ten years basically, every year less and less people are hurt, less people are involved and less and less committee is involved. Ultimately resident advisory groups have been eliminated more or less, community committees are not listened to whatsoever, people don't feel that they have any role to play in civic politics anymore; ultimately Standing Committees are also losing their stance.

As you say, many Standing Committees have come up with all kinds of resolutions and to get to E.P.C. or to E.P.C. Secretariat and they wind up disappearing or not being talked about or amended to the point where it becomes irrelevant. It undermines the essence of democracy and I believe that ultimately this whole area of politics here is that you want to get rid of all Standing Committees ultimately, you just want E.P.C. and Councillors to exist and that's an efficient way of running government.

Unfortunately it undermines the whole essence of democracy and citizen participation. That's why you have so few people coming and as I said in my one article, I remember 1992 we had 70 to 75 delegations appearing on the actual city budgets. This past year you have three or four delegations, including myself. So there you are, I mean that shows you the kind of level of participation. I do believe that people have given up.

They don't think they're listened to and that's why we have this kind of level of apathy at city hall these days, it's unbelievable.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Do you think that the approach that was taken in the Municipal Aboriginal Pathways Strategy where we looked at the city role within an issue that affects all levels of government, all involved in; do you think that's an approach that should be taken?

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, yes, I do. Obviously all levels of government need that. I'm no way saying that the city is fully responsible for all the issues of poverty.

You have to have provincial representation, you have to have federal representation but you have to have community involvement in ways and if you determine what specific areas the city is most, can most effectively work in, then that kind of direction ought to be done.

As I said the whole idea of a transition house or treatment centre to have been built could have been built four years ago for a cost of 1.2 million dollars which would have taken all of the so-called aggressive panhandlers off the streets and put 'em into treatment centres. It was recommended not by radicals or by social workers but was recommended by the Downtown BIZ group as I think. Nothing ever happened to it. I mean those are the kinds of areas where the city could have direct responsibility and be involved and look at and say hey we're actually dealing with a problem that all kinds of people want to have a problem to deal with.

But there is no political will, as far as I'm concerned there is no political will to deal with poverty on this City Council level.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I thank Mr. Ternette for his presentation, another excellent presentation; we thank him for being the conscience of Council in so many ways.

Mr. Speaker, my question has to do, Councillor Gerbasi touched on it but I'd like to ask explicitly, Mr. Ternette says that the United Way is a good organization but doesn't have any particular expertise in panhandlers. As Mr. Ternette is aware, the original motion referred to the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg as Councillor Gerbasi just reminded us.

Would the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg in Mr. Ternette's opinion be a more suitable organization and one that has more institutional expertise on the issue of panhandling?

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, yes, first of all the Social Planning Council has been involved with the issue of panhandling and squeegee kids. If you remember, as some of you might remember that when I was involved in the squeegee kids issue we actually created a task force with the Social Planning Council in charge of it and in fact we did, we brought in all the various community elements and political elements and presented an outstanding report which, wish somebody would have looked at it, which dealt with actually the street kids and homelessness and had some relations to panhandling, although it specifically dealt more with the street kids.

And it was a report that was adopted by Council. Of course, most of the recommendations have never been implemented but they were adopted by Council. They are actually policy of Council. So they have shown an inclination and the knowledge base, they've compiled research material on panhandling from across other cities because social planning councils are the one social agency that deals with the issue of panhandling in other cities.

They are the initiators of various programs that exists in other cities relating to panhandling. So of course they're a significant group that should have been consulted and should have been asked to initiate it. Most social active kind of programs are initiated by Social Planning Council. The United Way generally is a funding agency. It's an outstanding job that raises funds for non-profit groups, for 90 to 95 non-profit groups that provide service.

But, they're not an advocacy group, they're not into advocacy nor are they to research particularly. They're into funding service organizations. So I'm absolutely surprised that they're even beginning to show some interest in poverty and it's a good sign, but that's not their normal mandate.

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

Mr. Speaker: Just before I stop the clock for a second, just a little housekeeping. I wonder if the next two delegations, Mr. McKeown and Mr. Fast, if they are here, if they could just come down behind the speaker's podium, the City Clerk needs to brief them on some legalities. So, Mr. McKeown and Mr. Fast if you're here, if you could come back down and the City Clerk can have a chat. Councillor Wyatt, I have started the clock again.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, thank you for your presentation, Mr. Ternette; it's good to see you're feeling better. Some of the poorest neighbourhoods we have in Canada are just right outside this door. You can walk out and not go very far to see the poorest neighbourhoods in Canada. You talk about a lack of political will. Do you think that is partly a function of the regressive attitude that we've always had poverty and therefore we always will have poverty in the future and therefore we throw our hands up and there is nothing that we can do about it to reverse poverty that exists now and improve the human condition in some of the neighbourhoods in our city.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, yes, Councillor Wyatt I think that is an attitude that's been held by a lot of people and a lot of politicians who just feel, you know it's like the usual cliché, the rich get richer, the poor get poorer. You know poverty is going to exist to us.

Yet we know that poor people can organize themselves and have in the '60s and '70s, there was a massive amount of tenant organizations and welfare rights organizations that got people out of the welfare cycles and whatever else and created job situations and environments and self-help has been a significant movement but it is important that policies, it doesn't always require money but policies that Council actually say we want to pay attention to developing policies that relate to poverty, what about child poverty. I mean the whole issue of child poverty, it's still not number one anymore I understand, but number two still in child

poverty rates and I think B.C. has taken over as number one in the latest statistics. But how do we deal with those issues. What kind of programs can we develop in the school systems that addresses those specifically.

Obviously we're not asking City Council to tackle all the issues of poverty but there are specific areas the city has a mandate to deal with and specifically panhandling they do, cause you're the ones who are controlling the panhandling situation, you're the ones who set the bylaws and you are trying to deal with the issue of so-called panhandling and aggressive panhandling and whatever else.

So, you have a responsibility, a moral, social responsibility to deal with the, what causes the problems, who these people are and developing some social programs and getting community organizations involved that will deal, were dealing with these issues.

We haven't got that many panhandlers, you know, we're not like Toronto and other cities that have massive homelessness but we have homelessness and we have poverty here and we can address some of those issues, where Council says yes this is an interest of ours and we want to spend some activity and energy into it and we want to bring in some new organizations to work towards solving these issues and I don't think that's, it hasn't happened, not at this Council level.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, thank you Mr. Ternette. Do you not, do you believe, you think it is correct to say we can learn from our own history in the city that 70, 80 years ago we had some of the worst conditions in parts of this city that you only see today in third world countries, that we have improved the human condition through policy, through legislative changes, bylaws, here in the city that we can learn from that and continue to improve.

Nick Ternette: Yes, Councillor Wyatt, I think you do. Some of the programs in the '70s, for example neighbourhood improvement programs that were carried out by Tom Yauk, in Point Douglas, for example, which allowed residents to renew their neighbourhoods and whatever else in terms of both recreational facilities, housing and health and whatever else, it's an immense amount of work. Today you still have some very strong neighbourhood organizations in those areas doing the kind of work. Those history lessons are there. But we seem to ignore them and forget about it and I think yes, we can learn a lot from past history.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, time for questions has expired. Thank you, Mr. Ternette. The next delegation is Mr. Frank McKeown, B.F.I. Canada; with support of item one of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee. I just want to caution that under section 54.12 of the procedure bylaw, that any delegation appearing before Council with regard to recommendation for an award of contract shall only address Council on the basis of the criteria set out in the invitation to tender and not on any other issue and any questions are also restricted to the same criteria. So, you have ten minutes, Mr. McKeown.

Frank McKeown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Your Worship Mayor Katz, Members of City Council, members of the administration, ladies and gentlemen.

Bruce Rutherford: Good morning, my name is Bruce Rutherford; I appear on behalf of B.F.I. Canada, Mr. Frank McKeown, Winnipeg District Manager of B.F.I. Canada is here beside me.

We speak in support of the recommendation of the city administration and the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works and the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee to award the contract to B.F.I. Canada Inc. under alternative number 1 of bid opportunity number 68-2006. And we do so over through the process, the objection of Waste Management Canada Corporation.

Waste Management Canada contends B.F.I. cannot withdraw a portion of its bid after the submission deadline.

This particular bid opportunity contemplates three situations. It calls for as many as three separate bids. It can be a bid under alternative one, there can be a bid under alternative two, which is divided into two sections. Alternative two, section "a", which is cart collection and/or alternative two, section "b", which is front-end collection. Bidders can bid on all or any one of those three situations.

The city can accept alternative number one or alternative number two, and alternative number two with one or two separate contractors. Withdrawal of bids is dealt with in section B-13 of the bid opportunity. Specifically, section B-13.2 which is located on page six of eight in the bidding procedures.

This section contemplates a withdrawal of a bid after the submission deadline. Portion of B-13.2 reads 'a bidder who withdraws his bid after the submission deadline but before his bid has been released or has lapsed as provided for in B-12.2, shall be liable for damages as are imposed upon the bidder by law and subject to such sanctions as the Chief Administrative Officer considers appropriate in the circumstances'. That's part of B-13.2.

What this allows is a withdrawal of a bid after the submission deadline. However it does expose the bidder to a possible sanction. In this particular case, the city is choosing and wisely in my opinion, not to impose a sanction on B.F.I. for withdrawal of its alternative two bid.

The terms for evaluation of bids are set out in paragraph B-14 of the bid opportunity which is located at page seven of eight which is the next page. The city is provided with a wide discretion.

Under B-14.2, the city may reject a bid for many reasons, including 'other irregularities'. The city may reject all or any portion of any bid or waive technical requirements if the interests of the city so require.

It is open to the city to reject alternative number two, bid of B.F.I. even if the bid was not withdrawn by B.F.I. Under section B-14.5.2, the city can choose either alternative number one or alternative number two, whichever is in the business interests of the city.

Just point out a part of 14.5.2, the first part, 'the city shall not be obligated to award any section to the responsible bidder submitting the lowest evaluated responsive bid for that section and shall have the right to choose the alternative which is in the best interests of the city'.

Finally, to further demonstrate how wide the city discretion is, I refer you to section B-15 which is entitled award of contract. Under B-15.2, I will just read it, 'the city shall have no obligation to award a contract to a bidder, even though one or all of the bidders are determined to be responsible and qualified and the bids are determined to be responsive'. This is about as wide as you can get with your discretion.

In summary, I will just mention, highlight several points; B.F.I. can withdraw alternative number two after the bid submission deadline, that's pursuant to B-13.2. Secondly, even if it wasn't withdrawn, the city could reject B.F.I.'s alternative number two bid under section B-14.2, which I've referred to. Thirdly, the city can choose the alternative it considers to be in the best interests of the city. For example, B.F.I. alternative number one and that can be done under the auspices of B-14.5.2. Fourthly, the city discretion is so wide that it could decide not to award the contract to anyone and could do that under B-15.2.

Those are my comments. I thank you very much and if you should have any questions, I would be pleased to.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Rutherford. Are there any questions? No, thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Rutherford: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The next delegation speaking in opposition to the same clause

is Mr. Neil Fast of Waste Management Canada who will also have ten minutes. Also subject to the same rules that address Council only on the basis of the criteria set out in the invitation to tender and not on any other issue. Mr. Fast, proceed.

Neil Fast: Good morning. Thank you Mayor Katz, Mr. Speaker, City Councillors for the opportunity to address concerns with respect to bid opportunity 68-2006, the collection of recyclables from apartments for the City of Winnipeg. My name, again, is Neil Fast. I'm the District Manager for Waste Management of Canada Corp. responsible for the safe and profitable operations in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

With me today is Pearl Reimer of the law firm Aikins, legal counsel for Waste Management of Canada Corp. I am here today to state our objection to the administrative recommendation that would allow B.F.I. to withdraw a portion of its bid and then award the contract to B.F.I. on the basis of the remaining portion of its bid. It is our submission that, that recommendation is unfair and inequitable and would set a terrible precedent for the city.

Many of you have already heard my submission. I have spoken in opposition; excuse me, to the administration's recommendation both at the Standing Policy Committee and at the Executive Policy Committee. I am cognizant of the fact that a decision to award this multi-year contract rests in the hands of Council today. With this in mind it is also the final opportunity for the city to do the fair and equitable thing and rectify an unfair situation.

In simple terms, the city has allowed B.F.I. to withdraw a portion of their bid and recommends awarding the contract to B.F.I. on the basis of the remaining portion of its bid. The apparent reason for allowing B.F.I. to withdraw is because there was an alleged error on the bid.

But, why should B.F.I.'s error provide it with the opportunity to change their submission and improve their position.

As I demonstrated at E.P.C., the error that is alleged is not apparent on the face, but even this is a red herring. Even if there was an error on the face, it does not entitle the bidder to withdraw a portion of their bid. By withdrawing a portion of their bid, they're changing their bid, period. With this imminent decision, the city would remove the lowest evaluated bid, giving B.F.I. an unfair advantage.

With this decision, the city would allow B.F.I. to use its alleged error to improve its position to the detriment of the other bidders and to the city.

With this decision, it is in fact detrimental to the city and its taxpayers as it actually increases the annual cost of the contract by over 82,000 dollars and to boot, all of this has transpired as a result of a request made by B.F.I. after the bids had been opened and they were fully aware of all the other bids.

My understanding is that this is a closed bid process to ensure fairness and equality of bidders, allowing a bidder to amend its bid by withdrawing a portion of its bid flies in the face of the closed nature of the process.

The recommendation to allow B.F.I. to withdraw a portion of its bid, I reiterate, is not fair or equitable and sets a very bad precedent. Given that the city's decision regarding this matter is imminent, we reluctantly started court proceedings yesterday. Unless council is prepared to fix.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, you can't make reference to that, just the criteria, please.

Neil Fast: Unless, may I make reference, unless Council is prepared to fix the problem by rejecting the administration's recommendation; we see no alternative but to continue in that fashion.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration of this important decision and I believe Pearl Reimer would like to make a couple of comments.

Pearl Reimer: Good morning, I'm not intending to get into any legal argument

this morning. Just a few comments I'd like to make in response to the comments made by counsel for B.F.I. this morning.

First of all, in response to his submission that there were separate bids, we say it was in fact one bid and with respect to the alleged errors made by B.F.I. in its bid, we say either that bid was incapable of acceptance by the city or if it was capable of acceptance, it cannot be withdrawn after the submission deadline. And finally, with respect to the exercise of discretion, we say that any exercise of discretion that there is pursuant to the bid opportunity must be exercised fairly and good faith to all the bidders so as to keep and maintain the integrity of the bid process. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, thank you. Any questions? Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not learnt in these matters at all so it genuinely is for information, Ms. Reimer just on your last point, that the opportunity should have been offered to everyone, if either of you would like to respond, are you saying that at that point the bidding had been re-opened and you had been offered an opportunity to bid, that that would have been a fair process or would it have been in keeping with the process for (in audible) criteria.

Neil Fast: My response with that is a closed bid process and if you have a scenario where someone is in a position to request removal of a portion of their bid, my understanding and we were not in a position to you know, look at our bid and re-tender at any given time. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary.

Councillor Benham: The other half of it would be, then, what if the bidding process had just been re-initiated, would that have been acceptable.

Neil Fast: My response would be if you look at the actual bids, the corrected bids in that scenario, you're aware there is an alternative one and an alternative two with two sections and if all of the bids would have been opened, corrected, in fact the most appropriate decision would be that the B.F.I. bid for alternative two, section "a", as a corrected number was 381,000 dollars annually and Waste Management's bid on alternative two, section "b", which was 208,000 dollars, that in my opinion would have been the appropriate decision to make. Not to remove a portion of their bids.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, final supplementary.

Councillor Benham: What is being proposed then as a remedy at this point? What would we as Council be able to do to remedy the situation? I'm not clear on that, as an individual Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, thank you, Councillor; there are no preambles, so the question's been asked.

Neil Fast: Without, not from a legal stand, from a business stand point, I'll be very simple. The bids that were provided, the decision that is with E.P.C. today is to award the contract on an alternative one to B.F.I. their corrected bid is 673,000 dollars on an annual basis.

If all the bids are still allowed, that you couldn't withdraw your bid, the most efficient and cost-effective decision would be to provide B.F.I. with the one portion at 381,000, Waste Management on the alternative two, section "b" at 208, which is actually 80-some-odd thousand dollars annually less than choosing their alternative one and over a six year time frame that's almost half a million dollars.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz, did you have a question.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Fast, thank you very much for your presentation and I believe everybody wants to be fair and equitable. If you look at the proposal and I'll make up an example, but if a unit price is 10 dollars and there's a thousand units, obviously I think we all know its a thousand dollars, now, from your argument, is the unit price was the same or is it the number that was different. I'm trying to understand what really the problem is here.

Neil Fast: You have the same problem that I have, is that I don't understand what the appropriate unit price is. Because if you look at my example from, with E.P.C. and I trust I'm addressing that, if you have a unit price in one alternative of a bid and they are changed in another alternative of the bid, which one is correct.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary.

Neil Fast: Have I responded appropriately.

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

Councillor Steeves: Thanks very much for your presentation. It seems to me there's a legal argument on the face of the tender and mistakes that should be apparent on the face or not be apparent on the face, there's a legal argument that exists.

I guess in that context, given that Council hasn't really spent any time with the tenders at all, and the recommendation is from administration, I mean, how exactly would this Council right now make a decision on whether or not your legal position is correct or the legal position of B.F.I. is correct.

Neil Fast: To respond, obviously we're looking for a fair and equitable process. When I provide you with two prices for something and you look at both of them and I'm using this as an analogy and you look at both of them and I go oh, that second price that I gave you, I'd like to take that back cause that's not beneficial for my company or there's errors on that, so I've made the decision to do that. How do you then make an appropriate decision when you start removing portions of bids on a contract.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Thank you very much for your presentation. The next delegation is Darlene Golinoski, Friends of Assiniboine Park Conservatory in support of recommendation, or Item 1, Committee on Community and Protection Services July 17th, Governance of Assiniboine Park. Ms. Golinoski, you've got ten minutes.

Darlene Golinoski: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Councillors. The friends of the Assiniboine Park Conservatory welcome the initiative of the city to consider a governance structure for Assiniboine Park. We have appreciated the opportunity to speak to you at both the Standing Committee on Protection and Community Services and to E.P.C. and have benefited from the dialogue that arose from those presentations.

We are supportive of the work that is occurring with regards to Assiniboine Park and are committed to working with the other non-profit organizations in the park, Partners in the Park and the Zoological Society of Manitoba and the city to further the goals of rejuvenation of the park.

However, it has been over a year since the Acumen Report was released. Unfortunately, the present report has not appreciably advanced the governance process during this period. The current report, Governance of Assiniboine Park contains a lot of ambiguity.

For instance, some have assumed that of course the proposed park board would be accountable to City Council. The Friends for the past year have advocated for this type of accountability. Not only is our recommendation not there but there is no mention of accountability at all in this report. The report only says a board that is at arm's length.

By this time in the process we should know what does that mean. As one Councillor worded it so well, what is of concern is what's not in the report. The Friends had hoped this new report would clarify the issues we have raised and lay some parameters or guidelines for the group that will be working out the details of governance. Parks embody a city's public realm. In many ways how a city embraces its parks and their diverse uses reflects its sense of community and its quality of life. If one embraces this perspective when examining the report on the governance of Assiniboine Park, the

following guidelines would help alleviate our present concerns.

The recommendations that the Friends put forth for the guidelines is one, accountability to City Council. The Friends firmly believe that since the park is owned by the city, this new board should be accountable to City Council, who are the ultimate stewards of the park.

Number two a clear financial commitment. We all know that operating funds are the most difficult to obtain for any non-profit board of an urban park. There are basically three ways to get those operating funds. One, the city provides them, two, the park board charges fees of admissions and looks at other ways of revenue raising and three, interests of endowments.

Usually a combination of the above are used. We have been told that operating the park costs between eight to eleven million. What kind of endowment fund do we need to earn that amount of interest. What kind of commercialization would need to occur to bring in that kind of revenue. Would there be a park left.

It is for this reason that we recommend a clear statement supporting a predictable dedicated source of funding from the city. The issues of condos in the park has not been firmly laid to rest. This report provided an opportunity to do so. There needs to be an unequivocal statement that assets and land will not be sold or leased for commerce unrelated to a park.

There are a number of ways the city can funnel funds to the park. As one City Councillor has previously stated that if we must have condos, they could be built on other city property and the profits given directly to fund the park. There are many other ways as well for the city to find financing.

In Pittsburgh, the Phipps Conservatory gets 1% of taxes and that provides them 40% of their operating funds. I don't want to get into greater detail than that, but there's a whole different way of, all sorts of ways of looking at that. Sponsors, donors and foundations that give grants will not provide moneys for operations as they feel that is what the tax dollars should be used for.

The Friends are not opposed to admission fees but strongly recommend that they be used with discretion and only after a thorough examination of their impact and exploration of other avenues of revenue. For instance there is an intergenerational practice in our community of popping into the conservatory.

What happens to that quality of life if an admission fee is charged. Why are other botanical gardens and conservatories now beginning to eliminate their admission fees. We must examine all these aspects before we make a decision.

The third guideline, use of park governance models not entrepreneurial models. The report cites local examples of public/private partnership models. These mentioned enterprises; these mentioned enterprises have virtually become private entities where the public no longer has any say in how they are run. That may be fine for a convention centre or hockey arena but it is a much different thing for a park.

We need a model that recognizes that there are some roles and responsibilities that are better done by government, for example, maintenance. Those areas that include economies of scale, insurance liabilities and there are those that are better left to a non-profit volunteer-based organization such as marketing, programming, visitor services, education, fundraising, contributing to capital improvements, advocacy and those areas that pertain to enhancements of the parks.

There's a lot of talk about partnership but yet at this stage of the process there is no clarification on what type of partnership is being suggested. It needs to be defined.

Four, transparency, the word transparency is mentioned in this latest report but not expanded on this to how this might be achieved.

The new board must have transparency and details developed as to how this will be achieved and maintained.

And lastly, inclusiveness, in the framework plan approved by the city, one of the park values listed is inclusiveness. The current governance report does not make any reference to this value. In fact, it sets a tone that will ignore it, that could well ignore it. Those who develop the governance structure need to respect and plan that the park and its amenities honour the value of inclusiveness.

In summary, the Friends of the Assiniboine Park Conservatory represent the largest single volunteer organization within the park with over 400 active volunteers donating over three-and-a-half staff years of work per year and a total membership of over 1100. In addition to our volunteer contribution which has conservatively been estimated at half a million annually, we also have been successful in raising funds for various projects to enhance both the conservatory and the park through volunteer gardens.

We contribute to programming and visitor services at the Conservatory and the English Garden. Throughout the years the Friends have contributed to plant collections and this year alone we have given 15,000 dollars in that, in this area. That may not be much in terms of actual cash but in terms of the ratio of what our budget is, it's a lot for us.

Our organization represents a broad cross section of citizens who are passionate about the conservatory, who have a strong interest in its development and who enthusiastically support the park.

We know that parks are hubs that bring people together, a place for relaxation, an aesthetic experience for recreation and education activities, a site for arts, music and other community events. Parks not only attract residents but visitors, and visitors but also draw community members like ourselves to participate in park programs and to volunteer our time. Parks cannot be viewed in isolation but as integral parts of the community fabric. They play a pivotal role in community vitality and renewal. The citizens of Winnipeg deserve the best park governance that is innovative and addresses the issues of the 21st century.

Just to reiterate, the recommendations that the friends are putting forth as guidelines for the development of a park governance structure, we recommend that the City Council provide some parameters to those who work out the details and these include accountability to City Council and how that will be achieved, a clear financial commitment from the city, a statement that assets and land will not be sold or leased for commerce unrelated to a park, use of park governance models and articulation of the major roles and responsibilities of the city and new park board, guidelines to assure how transparency will be achieved and maintained and a statement that conclusiveness must be the major component of any decisions made.

In addition we are concerned about the process for developing this governance structure. As you know there are major developments proposed for the park. None of which can really move forward until park governance is dealt with.

It is impossible to fundraise for these capital projects without being able to assure major funders how their contributions will be managed and the facilities maintained for future generations. Therefore the governance structure of the park should receive top priority and be concluded as soon as possible so that progress can begin on improvements to the park and the process of developing the governance structure must include representatives from the major stakeholders in the park and the city meeting together face-to-face to formulate the new model.

The framework plan was developed through joint meetings and unfortunately to date the governance process has not included joint meetings, thus common understandings and a shared vision have not been nurtured. If you have a close process to develop a governance then you stand a great chance that the end product will be a closed organization.

We feel that how we obtain it is just as important as what we get and secondly because of the nature of the discussions it is also recommended that this group be chaired by an objective, skilled negotiator. There are many complex issues and difficult decisions to be made. This process needs to be led by someone who is objective and who has excellent negotiation skills. Thank you.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Any questions, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, you know I'm wondering really if you really want a new governance or if it's just a question of you given up on City Council, not realizing the value of the park and not supporting it financially. It's basically a fund question, isn't it?

Darlene Golinoski: We support a governance structure, we feel that there should be one entity and I've said that before in my other presentations, that there be one entity for the park and now what we're concerned about is the nature of that entity and financing of it is one aspect of it. But there are others, like I said, transparency, accountability and those types of things.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further questions. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I read the report as well and from what I can see in the report organizations like yours will have representation on the board. Is that something that this, partly addresses your concerns with regards to what you've said today?

Darlene Golinoski: Yes we want representation on the board but we're a little, it's a little ambiguous because in the Acumen Report it says it would eliminate us and then we sent a letter stating that we did want to be included and then there was some indication that we would be and I'm not too clear whether that is just for the interim board or whether it's a long-range plan. I really don't know and I guess that's what bothers me about this second report is that ambiguity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your second supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: Have you posed those questions to the administration with regards to the ambiguity before this meeting to see if that could be addressed? Have you received any response or have you done that?

Darlene Golinoski: We have stated what our wish is but we haven't had a definite answer that yes that will be, that will happen. We have heard that the three non-profits will be involved but again I wouldn't want to state that it's a definite. That's the problem for us. So we have had those discussions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further questions. Thank you, ma'am. Thank you. The next delegation is Pauline Riley on behalf of the Burrows Central Residents Council, you'll get ten minutes followed by Holly Ferguson will receive five minutes in her presentation. Pauline Riley.

Pauline Riley: Good morning Mayor, Councillors, Speaker. My name is Pauline Riley and I'm appearing as a delegate on behalf of the Burrows Central Residents Council and I'm here to speak in opposition to the Executive Policy and the G.C.W.C.C. recommendation to city hall that Boyd Park Community Centre be closed and all funding be ended to this facility.

However, earlier today I was given assurance by my City Councillor, Mike Pagtakhan that the city is supportive of B.C.R.'s work and that the Council will do all it can to assist in regarding our continued use of the Boyd Park Centre.

However, I will proceed to make my presentation as I have taken the morning off work plus I also think it's very important that citizens do voice their opinions about the closure of the community centres and the process.

Last week I emailed you all packages of information which we had sent out so I'm assuming that you are familiar with who Burrows Central Residents Council are and the type of work we've been doing. Roxanne also made a presentation to some of you last week at Executive so rather than proceed to talk about who we are, I'll skip to what we've been doing and for several months Burrows Council have tried to negotiate the use of Boyd Park for our project.

This experience to say the least has been very confusing and resulted in nothing but frustration. Eventually, we did discover that the G.C.W.C.C. that would make the recommendations on City Council as City Centres to Executive Policy and then that matter would go to City Council for final decision. This in itself is somewhat of a complex process for a volunteer board.

We've been advised that 10 to 12 years ago because of a lack of volunteers and no interest in program that city made Boyd Park a satellite of Sinclair Park. Over the years less and less programs have been offered at Boyd Park until we have reached the sorry state we're in today with no programming.

Ten years is certainly a long time and since then the area's population and needs have changed. Burrow Central has a large population of seniors without transportation and the nearest senior centre is on Main Street. We have lots of children whose parents do not have cars. We also have people who would prefer arts and other types of programming, not just sports programming. It has been suggested that because Sinclair Park is in close proximity to Boyd Park that residents should merely go there.

We disagree because the types of programming and services we are willing to offer are not available at Sinclair Park. We are proposing a multi-generational multi-purpose facility, not a recreation centre. It's vital that we offer and provide alternatives to our youth and young families on limited income and that we include seniors in our programming. They all deserve the opportunity to access programs and find supports in their own neighbourhood.

Lastly on this issue, it's imperative we create the opportunities to bridge the gaps between the generations in order to maintain a healthy community to restore our sense of safety and well being. So, proceeding on what we've been doing in the last three weeks, I sent a letter to the Council for the community centres with our proposal. However, we didn't receive a response and I was given to understand that the person I sent it to was, indeed, away. So I don't know whether our proposal was actually considered by that Council.

We have no knowledge of any community consultations held in the burrows area. It would appear that Boyd Park is being closed by the board of Sinclair Park and G.C.W.C.C. so, we're all a little confused about who was consulted in this process and I'm quite sure other groups in the city are confused about the process too.

It certainly appears that this method of deciding which then to close is divisive and doesn't foster any type of co-operation between the community centres, community groups, or the community at large.

This year, we did contact the city of Winnipeg and we're after again going through various loops were given permission to use Boyd Park space under a shared agreement with Sinclair Park from July 4th to August 26th. We are currently housing our equipment there and our three urban green team students and a coordinator for the summer. We have been advised that Boyd Park is in need of repair and we are willing and able to pursue funding for the renovations. We assume that engineers' reports have been done on this property and would like to have that information so we could determine what extent of fundraising would be needed.

B.C.R.C. does not think that because buildings need repair that immediately this space should be closed and removed from the city of Winnipeg's community centres.

B.C.R.C. finds it difficult to understand why after the city approved B.C.I. building communities initiative funding for the renewal of Boyd Park play area, a new water feature and soccer field, that the city is now considering closing the centre. Will the closure of the centre and no access to washroom facilities mean that next summer the water park facility will also be closed.

In summation, B.C.R.C. is an established organization with a track record of implementing changes in our neighbourhood, we have partnering organizations, we have program funding of 112,000 dollars from the federal government, we have a committed volunteer board, we have resident support and we are prepared to work in co-operation with all parties concerned and we're prepared to approach various funders to renovate the space.

We believe if Winnipeg is to be a healthy and vibrant city, our neighbourhoods need to be strong and we suggest that City Council take the energy, determination and creative thinking of its citizens and work with us to develop this project.

Bigger is not always better and when it comes to community centres, we have grave concerns that this amalgamation and mega, mega project is seeming the way that the city is moving and we think that bigger often means we destroy our individual communities and if the city follows this path we could be left with a few nice new buildings but far less community.

Strong diverse communities and citizen participation is what makes a vibrant and healthy city. Burrows proposal is an opportunity for the city to share in a success story and show citizens in Burrows Central that the city cares about them and the future of their children and the quality of life of our seniors.

So B.C.R.C. and the residents of Burrows Central ask that you please take the time to review this proposal. We were initially considering that you should refer this matter back to G.C.W.C.C. for further consideration and community consultation as we believe there wasn't any and we ask that B.C.R.C. at this time be allowed to continue to use Boyd Park until this decision has been reviewed and a decision can be finalized on the matter. I'd like to leave you with a thought for the day.

I'd like to leave you with a quote from Margaret Mead. Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has. Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. I believe, that Ms. Riley, there are some questions. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, did I hear you right. Did you say there was no consultation at all with the residents.

Pauline Riley: I have not been aware. I live in the area of Burrows Central and we have Burrows Central Residents Council since 2001 and I have chaired that group. The board is not aware of community consultation. So it seems, I realize there was the Puff's Report, I realize though that they, you know son of Puff, Ralph or whatever it was.

But I wasn't aware of any consultation. If there was, then we certainly missed it. But this process has been quite a convoluted thing for a volunteer board to deal with.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, no further questions? Thank you, or Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I guess it is along the same lines, so you received nothing in the mail or no notice with regards to there being any kind of community consultations with regards to the closure of the Boyd Park Community Centre?

Pauline Riley: No, I would have thought that Sinclair was being consulted by the Council, that at some point because Sinclair actually had the, had Boyd Park as their satellite, right. So I would have thought at some point over the last few years or even the last few months

someone would have consulted with the groups in the area or even a door-to-door delivery of information to residents who may be interested in the future of Boyd Park because as I say I think the only time any consultation happened would have been a long, long time ago when they initially closed Boyd Park and gave it to Sinclair as a satellite and there was some minimal programming operated out of there but I have no knowledge of any, if somebody can enlighten me I'd be happy because I have no knowledge.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your second supplementary, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mrs. Riley, you mentioned that you had spoken to the area Councillor regarding this issue. Can you elaborate on that, what was?

Pauline Riley: This morning, I was advised that, that the, and I had been advised a couple of days previous to this but I still decided to proceed with my presentation that my Councillor, Mike Pagtakhan, is endorsing our project and that we have temporary use of Boyd Park right now and that I have his commitment and possibly others, that we will do all we can to ensure members of Burrows Central Residents Council may continue to do the work from your current location at Boyd Park. So I'm taking that to mean that there is some, something, I'd like to clarify what that something is, actually.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your third final supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: My final supplementary is that, if Boyd Park is reported to be coming forward today to be closed, how are you going to be able to use the facility?

Pauline Riley: At the moment we are using it but I don't know how that would proceed in the future beyond August the 26th. If someone can help me with that, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further questions? Thank you, Ms. Riley.

Pauline Riley: Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Holly Ferguson, you have five minutes on the same subject.

Holly Ferguson: Okay, so imagine the scenario. You get up in the morning, you go outside, and then you notice it. Whether it be on your fence or your house. A sign of graffiti and the first thing that usually comes to mind is don't those juvenile delinquents have anything better to do than to mess up my yard.

Well, I'm here to mention that if you were to close down Boyd Park that would be one less thing for adolescents to use to take up their time in order to keep them from doing such things as graffiti.

Well, you're planning on closing down Boyd Park, so I've heard, and the thing is that although it may lead to funding for areas such as Sinclair Park, if you were to close that down, that would mean less for the adolescents in that area. Now, although Sinclair Park is only three blocks away from Boyd, the point is that people don't like relocating.

You see, it becomes their special place, you see one park and if you take that away then they don't want to move to somewhere else and imagine yet another scenario, a parent, a kid gets in a fight with their parents, okay, they run out of the house. They don't want to go running all the way to a different park or what not to calm down; they want to be somewhere close by.

But if there is nowhere close by, then the odds are there going to end up doing something such as vandalizing a property, by throwing rocks through windows or what not, graffiti, writing on walls or even violence if they come across a kid they don't like and end up getting in a fight.

You see, the point is Boyd Park is in a sorry state right now but that doesn't mean you should throw it away. Because, it's like I see it like a pair of torn pants. You have three choices. You can either

fix it up, you can keep it the way it is or you can throw it away. But what would be the point in throwing away a perfectly good facility when there's a chance you could fix it up and make it a nice place to be again.

So, what I just want to say was that I think that we should leave it in the hands of maybe Burrows Central and let us do something to fix it up and make it a another place to be instead of just throwing it away.

So in closing I'd just like to say wouldn't you consider letting us take control of it and try to improve it before you make a hasty decision.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Holly, there is a question, Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Mr. Deputy Speaker and thank you very much Holly for coming today and thank you to the previous delegations about, Ms. Riley. I'm not really going to ask you a question, I going to sort of ask you a "did you know" because last week at Executive Policy Committee were you aware that's what we did with the motion, as we understand the spirit and intent of Boyd Park and what's happening with Burrows Central and the good work you're doing.

We are, we actually amended the motion to say that Boyd Park Community Centre is not going to be declared surplus but we are taking it off the community centre inventory which means that the city will still have ownership of it which still allows us to provide you with a joint use agreement which is what on a going-forward basis what the intent is here. So perhaps you weren't aware of it but I want to ask you, if you are aware of that, I hoping you'll be aware of it.

Holly Ferguson: I was not aware of that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No questions. Thank you Holly.

Holly Ferguson: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That's it for the delegations, Mr. Clerk. Okay now we can proceed with the report of the Executive Policy Committee, July 5, 2006, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 5, 2006

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to introduce the report of July 5, 2006 and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 through 6.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Report of July 12th, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 12, 2006

Mayor Katz: I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 and 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. The report of July 19th.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 19, 2006

Mayor Katz: I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 to 16.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Item 11 please.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Items 5 and 8 please.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: 5 and 8 and Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Number 7.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The rest is, all in favour, contrary? Carried. So, we stood down 5, 8, 7 and 11.

**Item 5 - General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres – 2006 Community Centre District Plan
File PR-2**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, the report is before us, I would very much like to hear what Councillor Benham, whether it's comment or question and then I can address it from that point.

Mayor Katz: Okay, I thought you said 5.

Councillor Benham: No, no, I'm sorry.

Mayor Katz: So then 5 is not,

Councillor Thomas: I said 5.

Mayor Katz: Someone said 5, okay so fine, I apologize for that Councillor Benham. Councillor Thomas and I'd be happy to hear your comments and your questions.

(Councillor Eadie in the chair)

Mr. Speaker: On clause 5, Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Yes, I'm here with regard to section 10 of clause 5 and I got great concerns with regards to, the closure as being recommended of Kelvin Community Club.

I have 11 neighbourhoods in my ward. This neighbourhood of the 11 neighbourhoods that I represent has the lowest income and the greatest number of social needs. I acknowledge that the facility is inadequate. It's very old; one half of it is not accessible. It's small, it's crowded and there is no place to expand. One would either have to go into the playground and remove the play structure, I gather that's already been done or go into the crowded parking lot or block off the back lane. So, it is challenging.

I also acknowledge that there's difficulty in getting sufficient volunteers for the board and difficulty in getting quorum for its A.G.M. That does not mean that the community does not need or is not interested in this green space and it does not need a drop-in facility in this area.

This area needs programming, it needs support, it needs assistance, not disregard. There has been difficulty in finding volunteers but this is not an indication of lack of commitment but an indication that the neighbourhood is economically and socially challenged.

I would call your attention to the attached report where they talk about reasons for keeping community centres, demographic trends and programming issues. Just to let you know that this, of the 11 neighbourhoods that I represent has the highest aboriginal population and the highest number of new immigrants to my ward.

It also does not have alternatives. We need to provide children who are there with other options. The 11,000-plus of this neighbourhood, the largest population of the 11 neighbourhoods that I represent, has no other green space; there's no other green space in the whole area and right now there is a drop-in program operating out of this community centre. Where would it go?

If you examine the contents of the report, what most concerns me about section 10 is what's not there, which is alternatives. All it says under recommendation is that it be declared surplus and removed from the inventory and that the field house be retained for future use.

But I'm concerned that something else under the rationale says that the re-development of Bronx Park fosters an opportunity for current catchments. I would just like to point out that while I support Bronx Park Good Neighbours in their effort; this takes into consideration several neighbourhoods.

The Kildonan Drive neighbourhood, Rossmere 'A' and Rossmere 'B' and Munroe West are all neighbourhoods that'll be serviced by the Bronx Park Good Neighbours facility as well as the good neighbours for the whole of the Elmwood, East Kildonan and North Kildonan Wards will be operating out of

this facility. And I cannot support the closure of Kelvin without there being provided options for my neighbourhood.

It is a facility which has not been, had anything done to it for a number of years. They haven't applied for C.G.I. grants, like a number of the other community centres have done. In my talks with past board members, it's because they, they wanted to improve the facilities; they just didn't know what to do with it.

They've had a number of drop-ins, including Friday night movie drop-ins, a lot of things that are there. The children that are there really need this facility as inadequate as it is and I think because it's inadequate, considering the huge population that it serves in the Chalmers neighbourhood and the attached Glen Elm neighbourhood which doesn't have anything other than a couple of peanut parks, one in the north end and one on the south end, it needs programming offered all year round and it needs help from the city with regard to staffing of the community centres, which I think should happen in all the inner city wards where it's difficult to get volunteers. And that was my concern and I expressed it at Executive Policy Committee and that is why although I like many things about what the greater council of Winnipeg community says, I cannot support clause 10. I need options for my community and I don't have any right now. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Steeves, snappy Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I'm really sorry about that, Mr. Speaker. That snap was a lot louder than I intended it to be. It was more of a, let's just wave. It occurred to me as I stand up here that maybe I should have waited until the end. I don't know if there are any concerns about clauses in this report. With respect to Item number 10 specifically and the concerns expressed by Councillor Thomas, I think I should inform Council after speaking with Mr. Bemrose and talking a little bit about the process, this community centre as alluded to by Councillor Thomas was a community centre that's been in pretty difficult straits for a very, very long time. And I think Councillor Thomas admitted that in her comments which at once is unfortunate, but I think at some point, Mr. Speaker, you have to recognize certain realities.

My understanding, although I'm not a member of that community, except of course as it is part of the larger Winnipeg community, I'm not dreadfully familiar with all the goings on in the area. I believe there's been an attempt at not one, not two, but three consecutive A.G.M.'s where they have not been able to muster a quorum to keep this community centre going in what is a pretty small catchment area.

The direction that's been I guess decided upon, and my understanding after numerous meetings which involved the local Councillor and I believe Councillor Lubosch from time to time, if I'm not mistaken, I'm not sure, there has been this community impetus, I can tell you the G.C.W.C.C., that group is moving forward with this idea and recommendation number 10 on I guess providing the express information that the catchment area would be divided between Chalmers and Bronx Park and that people in the community think this is a very, very positive direction.

People are excited about this, people think this is the right way to go and I mean it's in keeping, I think, Mr. Speaker, with the larger direction of the original PUFF studies, now our Rec. and Leisure study policies whereby we are trying to do exactly this, Mr. Speaker. This is precisely what we are trying to do.

I mean notwithstanding the comments of Councillor Thomas what we are trying to do is, we are trying to take whatever energy still exists at some of our community centres that are smaller, maybe older, maybe not functioning quite as well, not quite as robust and we're trying to incorporate whatever energy is left into existing community centres so we can kind of capitalize on that and at the end of the day provide these people and these neighbourhoods with I guess facilities, ultimately, that have a little more energy, a little more, that are a little more

robust and provide more to the community.

I mean, we went for the same thing in St. Vital with Glenlee Norbury. I mean these are two community centres who are actually quite old but not really, really big. In my estimation there probably was a time 40 years ago when they were built where people were a lot less mobile and couldn't get to places but now the Glenlee-Norbury community is essentially the exact same community and I dare say again without not having intimate knowledge of this neighbourhood if the catchment area is 11,000 people that is not a huge community.

I don't think the accessing of either Bronx Park or Chalmers would create any undue hardship and again at its very base this is exactly the type of thing that we are trying to accomplish with this study and with this new policy.

I mean we have to be really, really careful I think as a Council that every time that we move to declaring certain facilities surplus, as we know darn well that the likelihood is that there are going to be some folks coming forward saying I don't want this to happen.

Now we have to, as well as we can as a Council, try and stay strong and I would note that I haven't heard and I don't know if anybody on Council has heard a great hue and cry from the Kelvin community themselves as to this being a bad thing. So take that under advisement and I would suggest you support the report in its entirety and that we move this item forward and again congratulate G.C.W.C.C. for the work they've done and they're doing it in moving this very, very difficult file forward on our behalf.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I'll keep my comments brief. I didn't intend to enter debate today but Councillor Thomas's comments have spurred me on. I would suggest to her that if it is only item 10, of course she is aware of this procedurally, but of course we can proceed with a vote clause by clause I believe Mr. Speaker, that would be right if so requested by any Member of Council so if Councillor Thomas wants that I would certainly go clause by clause.

With regard to Councillor Steeve's comments as Chair of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services I assume it's partly in that role that he's speaking about this difficult process that we've engaged upon with the community centres.

He asks us at the end as he always does for unanimity in passing what Executive Policy Committee has put before us, but Mr. speaker, I submit that there's something fundamentally missing in that call for consensus and collegiality and unanimity and that is that there has been no inclusion of non-E.P.C. Councillors in this process, that's a great disappointment, Mr. speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the process started well, only a few days after the Mayor and I and Councillor Magnifico were elected in 2004, the Mayor called a Council seminar on PUFF's. PUFF's was released that day to us, it was released to the media and the public that day, it was indeed, imperfect but as Councillor Steeves has suggested at least in principle it suggested that we needed as City Councillors, as good managers and financial stewards, that we should engage in some process of discussing with our communities the rationalization of the number of community centres across Winnipeg.

I supported that principle, Mr. Speaker, I still do. There are community centres in my ward which have begun cooperative discussions initiated by the volunteers on the boards themselves. There is not consensus on where we should go yet but the discussion has begun with the community and that is a good thing and I agree with Councillor Steeves that in the long run that would be good for the City of Winnipeg.

But was has gone off the rails here Mr. Speaker, is that the ward Councillor does not feel included in this decision-making process. The ward Councillor is giving us

clear signals that this is bad for the neighbourhoods that she represents and the people she represents and the problem for me is as a non-E.P.C. Councillor is that I haven't been part of this discussion at all.

There is no consensus on Council because there has been no repetition of the kind of seminar that we had right off the top. We know that the source of this money was divisive if I may say so but it was a decision of Council and that's fine we have all had to live with that whatever way we voted in the first place on where the money came from.

But now Mr. Speaker where does the money go, it's a highly politically charged question, particularly three months away from an election and it's something that should include all of us, all of us as Councillors representing all the people of Winnipeg as we do.

So I believe that Councillor Steeves called for consensus and collegiality and unanimity on this would be far more convincing if all of us as Councillors had been included in the process that led to it. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak to the clause. I want to pick up on what I have been hearing in the chamber and that is just the concern with regards to lack of consultation, or the original intent which when I remember we all met in the Council seminar with regards to the work that the G.C.W.C.C. was going to under take and the reorganization or look at existing community clubs that there was a very clear intent stated that there would be involvement of the area Councillors with regards to this and that area Councillors would not just be consulted or updated but would be kept updated but would be consulted.

And I don't blame the G.C.W.C.C., I think they're trying to do what they can with the resources they have and this is a new experience for them. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that it's nice that we are hearing about I.E.P.C. getting consulted and getting updated with regards to the work going on, apparently there was a meeting two weeks ago with I.E.P.C. where they had a briefing by the G.C.W.C.C. but the rest of the Council is kept in the dark and we don't know what is going on.

We find out from our community club presidents, I had the opportunity to meet with the four community club presidents in my ward and talk to them and they are in some ways just as confused as some Members of Council with regards to what's taking place but they were able to give me a little bit more information than what we could have found out had we had the proper consultation that should have taken place.

I made a point Mr. Speaker of contacting Mr. Bemrose in talking to him recently with regards to the work that they're doing and I let him know my thoughts with regards to the need for better consultation and he agreed with me that there is a need to do that and they're doing their best with the resources they have and the time frames that they've been given and I understand that.

But we have to have this, this is involving our community clubs, involving our community club presidents, this is involving institutions that have been involved for a long time. Community club closures do not happen overnight and we speak from experience because in Transcona twenty years ago we did do a community closure, we merged two community clubs and there was extensive public consultations and the majority of the community supported it, there were parts of the community that did not support it but the majority of the community did support it. But that involved consultations about going out to the public, talking to people ahead of time including the area of Councillors which in the case of twenty years ago in Transcona it was actually my father who was on Council who was at the front of that saying this is good for the community, it makes sense and the majority of the community agreed.

And so it can be done, we know we can do the right stuff, we know we can build a stronger network of community centres, we know this can take place but I realize that sometimes in a rush to get policy development done especially with our political time lines in place, that we want to make things happen, I encourage, I implore E.P.C. when it comes to community clubs, especially community clubs, we have to involve all Council to make this work and it doesn't mean that it can't work, it can work.

And I see two community clubs or two facilities listed on this, in this report, in my ward this is a, the first I saw was when it got spit out at the top of the R.I.S., the R.I.S. system was the first I saw that these were the projects or the proposals coming forward which I know there would be many in my community who have many different opinions with regards to what's being proposed.

So I'll leave it at that, and would encourage, I'm going to be supporting the report coming forward but to encourage E.P.C. and I.E.P.C. or whatever form it takes to involve all of Council with regards to our community clubs. That's crucial.

G.C.W.C.C. has indicated they're prepared to do that which is fantastic, to make sure that that is part of our policy, not just, you know, good intentions but part of the policy with regards to what we're doing here today, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel?

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am rising a bit befuddled. I thought that the process that we entered into here was in part to take away this very difficult file from the politicians and put it into the hands of a stakeholders group that was being overseen by G.C.W.C.C. so that we wouldn't end up in the dilemma that we are sort of facing here in conversation today and that is that at the end of the day after this entire process where the dollars are being allocated to certain areas, it may be away from somebody else's special interest that now we start trying to serve our own political parochial wants and needs and I think exactly what we set out to do here was take it out of the hands of the politicians, put it into the hands of the stakeholders, have G.C.W.C.C. come back from their consultation process and report to us on what the stakeholders, what the end users wanted, what the community centres themselves wanted and making difficult decisions. At some point some community centres were not going to be the winners in this and some would.

I can tell you that as far as involvement in the process through the Riel Community Centres, G.C.W.C.C. board that I was able to go out and sit and watch the process I believe in three different sessions and it was a very inclusive process and one that brought a great deal of ideas to the table, a great deal of argument as well.

It wasn't an easy process, I can assure you of that, there was a great deal of consultation done and again I say it's a bit befuddling to hear the arguments put here today because the process was there, it was open, it was transparent, it was easy for me to go and look at the process and see how it was unfolding and where I might have wanted to make arguments to serve a particular need in my community I didn't see that as being the process.

I saw the process as G.C.W.C.C. coming back to us with their report of what this group of the end users and the end stakeholders, the most important people in this process, what it was that they brought forward for us and I'm quite satisfied to support what we have in front of us today and go forward with that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think there's been a lot of good comments here this morning. One of my concerns is, I agree with Councillor Swandel that we set this process in place and I think we all agree with that process but ultimately it is Council that will make the decision and we need to base it on the information we get and if we are excluded from the loop of getting that

information we can't make a very good decision.

I'd also like to say that again the G.C.W.C.C., they're new at this, they're working through this process but in terms of improving it sometimes the stakeholders may be a little wider than it seems. It's not just the members of the community club board.

It's the residents associations, obviously the area Councillor and other people that should be part of that and I guess I don't know if all those people were consulted. We had people here this morning who said they weren't. People that were part of existing residents associations for four or five years who said they weren't consulted.

Is that true or not, you know how do we know? We're on the floor of Council, we don't know and we don't have those answers and that concerns me and I'm not trying to criticize. I just don't have the facts to make a proper decision.

The other issue that concerns me is that the two clubs that have come to light that we're talking about removing these facilities from our inventory are inner city clubs in the most needy areas of the city and I realize, and that these areas we all know don't have the same capacity to have energy in their boards and so on as Councillor Steeves is talking about the energy and the bigger, no, they don't because they actually need city staff to come in there and revive them and help them and do community economic development and community development in those areas. That's what they need, but that's not in our policy.

So what concerns me, you know if Tuxedo or River Heights or whatever wants to amalgamate their facilities and build a big facility, you know good for them. But in the inner city, people have to walk down the street to their local community club and I've never supported the idea of taking away any capacity for recreation in the inner city and I sincerely hope that that's not what we're doing.

If I had, if these issues had come before all Members of Council, if not the Standing Committee where they used to come, then a Council seminar has been suggested so that we would at least, we could ask these questions, we could be confident that everybody was consulted, we could be confident that the new facilities were going to meet the needs and I just don't feel very confident with this current process and I'm not criticizing the idea of the policy.

It's how it's being played out here today and I'm very concerned about the capacity of these inner city areas, of course they can't keep in some areas they're having trouble keeping these facilities open because of the lack of community capacity which we should be building and I really am not convinced we have those policies in place to build that capacity, that the inner city needs.

So I hope that these concerns are unfounded, I really do, and I hope that the area Councillors such as Councillor Pagtakhan perhaps could explain to us and answer some of these concerns so that we could be more confident in supporting this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I have at least one more speaker. Are there any others? With your permission I won't see the clock and we can conclude the debate on this clause and then we'll recess for lunch. Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker I'm a little befuddled. These items were on the public agenda of the Executive Policy Committee, they were posted like with the rest of the E.P.C. agenda. Councillor Thomas availed herself of the opportunity and spoke at E.P.C., there was nothing kept secret, there was nothing hidden, there was nothing short notice. This was regular agenda for a regular meeting.

I look at the Kelvin Community Centre from my view, and two blocks east and one block south is Chalmers. Two very long blocks and one short block is a 13.3 acre full-blown community centre and

across the street Elmwood High School with its running track and open fields.

I looked five shorter blocks from that Kelvin site is a six-acre park at Brazier, Lacy, Gordon, whatever, I'm not sure of the name of it there.

When I was a kid we walked a mile to our hockey rink and our baseball field. It was no big deal. You're kids, you can do it. Here, not crossing Henderson Highway, are two community centres, one three blocks away, one five blocks away. This is not the end of the earth. They tried at this community centre to have annual meetings, innumerable times. They couldn't ever get a quorum. They advertised in the community. They did everything.

Nobody is saying we are going to sell off this land; we're not going to pave paradise to put up a parking lot. It's coming off the community centre inventory because there is no, it doesn't mean the building won't be used in the community for another purpose. It's just that the grants that go by square footage to community centres are going to be spread among the existing.

So I think it's a tempest in a teapot. They know what they're doing at the general Council. They've worked hard, they've worked for years on this, they have a consensus at the community centres, nobody from the community centres here or came to E.P.C. These are the people who are the experts in this field. We charge them with a duty; they've carried out that duty. Let's follow their recommendations.

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I very much thank Councillor Thomas for raising her concerns and I certainly do appreciate them. But I think it's been echoed here that number one this is not a political decision.

This is a difficult decision and that's why as was said by Councillor Swandel it was put in the hands of the citizens who are there firsthand and they have firsthand experience and that's what the G.C.W.C.C. has done and they tried to address the issues, Councillor Thomas is aware that they tried having several meetings; they could not get a quorum together.

I know that Councillor Thomas was if not asked I know that her E.A. was present so they had some knowledge, there's nothing, this has been totally open and totally transparent to make sure everybody specifically the Councillor for the area is aware of it. You know what; there are difficult decisions that have to be made.

I'm not going to say this is easy. I guarantee it wasn't easy for the G.C.W.C.C. but there is complete consensus and you know what, as was stated earlier by Councillor O'Shaughnessy, there is nobody here to object to that from the community, from the community centre which you know there could be different reasons for that, we can't automatically make assumptions but there is a statement there and I would ask that everybody support the G.C.W.C.C. in this very difficult task in trying to do what's right and what's best for our city. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, debate is closed on the clause.

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote please.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote on the clause. All in favour of clause 5, please rise.

Councillor Thomas: I want to be recorded in opposition of part 10 of clause. I already asked that.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, that can be done. I think Councillor Thomas has asked to be recorded against clause 10 and that's duly noted now by the clerk. On the balance, all in favour? Okay.

Councillor Gerbasi: If you could pull off all those recorded in, on clause 10 and the one on Boyd Park as well, since it

hasn't been explained very well, so I'll support the rest of it.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, all in favour. Go ahead. Well, it looks like it's unanimous with those exceptions so that'll be noted on the record. Carried.

The hour being 12:00, we will recess until 1:30 and the next clause will be clause 7 when we return.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of July 26, 2006 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We'll resume the afternoon sitting; we are now dealing with clause 7, Executive Winnipeg Soccer Complex. Well, let's get to work.

Item 7 - Winnipeg Soccer Complex
File S-7

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz, do you wish to introduce the clause?

Mayor Katz: The Winnipeg Soccer Complex, Mr. speaker, I believe it was Councillor Swandel who asked to have this pulled, and I'm ecstatic that we've been able to come up with a win-win-win formula where we have University of Manitoba, the Manitoba Soccer Federation, along with the private sector who have managed to take 6 million dollars from the three levels of government and they're going to have a complex that will be approximately 11 million dollars utilizing land from the University of Manitoba which the city will be able to collect taxes from, where the ownership of the facility will end up in the hands of the Manitoba Soccer Federation and where the Manitoba Soccer Federation will also have first opportunity for all the time allotments, and on top of that, the responsibility for any overruns and costs, for any operating expenses will be the responsibility of the private sector.

I think it's a perfect example of a successful public private partnership. I'm looking forward to seeing, to hearing any questions or comments from Councillor Swandel. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I stood this down, number one to express my gratitude for this facility landing in the St. Norbert Ward, in particular at the University of Manitoba. The partnership is, it truly is an amazing example of when we get a little bit flexible in the way we do things, how private sector could get involved in conjunction with in this case an educational facility and with the not for profit soccer federation to really bring a great deal of added value to the city of Winnipeg.

As you all probably are aware from looking at the report that there's still a requirement for the, the soccer federation to raise approximately I think the number is half a million dollars in total, but 225,000 of that they're trying to raise by September the 15th I think the number is. I could tell you that businesses in the St. Norbert Ward will be getting a letter from the Soccer Federation asking for their support as there will be economic spin-offs in the business sector.

I've been championing it to a certain extent and I'm pleased to announce today that we have a cheque in the amount of 10,000 dollars coming forward to the Soccer Federation from another private sector source to help fund this.

So, I would encourage you all to do the same thing as this is a facility that will benefit all of our wards and in particular those in the south end of the city where we're quickly losing indoor soccer facilities and if you have any connections with people that through the private sector involved greatly or have a great love for soccer, that you do something to encourage them to assist the soccer federation in raising their required monies. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to first of all say how happy I was that we're able to provide the news of this new facility and I'd like to thank some folks. We've got

pretty solid administrative team, Mr. Speaker, and they had to work pretty hard on this issue. There were a lot of people that had to be brought together in this particular matter, and it was a difficult one to bring forward given that there were a lot of obstacles and a lot of different people who had their oars in the water here and I think they did a great job, and I think that should be noted.

I'd also like to thank the private sector folks who are involved in this particular matter as well. It's nice when you see a private public partnership like this come together, and they're putting a lot of money into this and a lot of time.

They, in fact, will run this facility, and the facility in fact will pay taxes, which is another unique aspect of this as a result of their involvement.

The university winds up winning in this matter by getting new turf in their stadium as one of the issues, but more importantly providing the land for this useful purpose for basically a dollar a year I think it is, and so I think that this is a really good culmination if you like to something that's been an initiative that many of us have tried to bring forward for the last two or three years, and for the soccer people, it's all a win-win for them.

They don't have to raise very much money, and they've got time to do it. They're going to be provided with basically first right of refusal as I understand it for the prime time use of that facility and in twenty years, they're going to own it. So I think this is a real good resolve to this long-standing issue and I'm very pleased to be able to support it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the clause? No. Mayor Katz, did you wish to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All I can say, a first class facility long overdue. I think everybody here on the floor of Council is aware of that, and I certainly hope this will get the support of Council.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of the clause. Opposed? Clause is carried. The next one is clause 8, please.

Item 8 - Elmwood Cemetery – Financial and Operational Sustainability Plan
File PC

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz, did you wish to open.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to hear from Councillor Thomas any questions, any concerns, and then I certainly will be happy to address them.

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

Councillor Thomas: Yes, most of the time, the issues about which there is discussion is about those which there is not consensus, and I felt it was important to come forward and thank Council today for their continuing support of Elmwood Cemetery and to acknowledge their continuing contribution to the cemetery.

This is the oldest cemetery in Winnipeg, and many early pioneers who contributed much to our community are buried there. This facility was bumbling along, struggling along, until it was rescued from both a literal and figurative brink of disaster by a community board.

What I mean by literal as parts of the cemetery were actually literally falling in to the drink, into, at the brink and I'd like to thank Council for its contributions that they've given, which has allowed this cemetery to have riverbank stabilization done, and I'd like to thank the community board who has worked so hard to bring this facility back to its former glory and how they continue to work hard, and I'd like to thank Council for its continuing contribution to this facility.

Mr. Speaker: Any further discussion on the clause? Mayor Katz, did you wish to close now. No. All in favour of the clause. Opposed? That's carried. The next one is clause 11.

Item 11 - Residential Infill Tax Credit Program File EX

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this has been something we've been working on for a long time. I think we all know that infill housing is one of our priorities. In this particular program, which is a three-year program up to approximately 600 residences, 3 million dollars and I believe there's a ceiling of 230,000 dollars to qualify with a maximum of 10,000 dollars, I think it's a very positive step, and I will be happy to hear from any Councillors who have questions or concerns and address them at that particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt moving, you have an amendment which is motion number 9 moved by yourself, seconded by Councillor Gerbasi. Do you wish to open it, please.

Moved by Councillor Wyatt
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi

THAT Recommendation No. 7 of Item 11 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 19, 2006 be amended by adding the words "to Council in 60 days" after the words "report back" and before the words "on the willingness".

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, it's very straightforward amendment, Mr. Speaker. I'm supportive of the clause before us, the amendment simply offers up on item number 7 that with regards to the administration exploring the willingness and feasibility from the province's side of whether or not they can participate in a similar program or tie in to this program.

This addresses the municipal side of the property tax bill, the provincial side of the property tax bill represents in some cases over 50% now of the bill, and therefore, there's a real opportunity for them to be involved in something similar and to support something similar.

So I, basically the amendment is to call for this to be reported back to Council in sixty days, Mr. Speaker, to give a time frame for the administration to report back. So it's fairly straightforward.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Wyatt: Can I speak to the clause now or?

Mr. Speaker: Sure.

Councillor Wyatt: Do it all at once.

Mr. Speaker: Yeah.

Councillor Wyatt: Clock's not on, so, ready. The clause itself I think is very positive. I think it's a step in the right direction; this is a city wide program now, Mr. Speaker. I think that's a positive step. It offers an incentive for infill housing in areas where services are already provided and we don't have to necessarily extend services for infill housing and so it makes a huge difference.

I think it's positive that we have limited it to with regards to the total assessed value of the single family house of 230,000 dollars. We'll have to monitor the program, I think, Mr. Speaker, with regards to how once implemented, I realize when you always design these programs, the implementation sometimes is not always, ends up being what the intent was or falls through.

Some, clearly some areas of the city may benefit more from the credit than other areas just based on assessment values. The program limits the assessment to an annual credit of 75% of the municipal tax portion of the infill to a maximum 2,000 dollars and then to a benefit of five years, a maximum of 10,000 dollars.

I know from infill housing taking place in the Transcona Ward and looking at what they pay tax wise, the tax bill, they probably would not after five years max out at the full 10,000 dollars of credit which I think is unfortunate.

I think it would have been maybe better to look at a program which tried to ensure that it got as much of the benefit as possible without having the 75% restriction, for example. But I'm sure

there's a logic behind doing that, I'm not aware, but you know let's see how it works. This is a positive first step. It's over three years; the program will be reviewed after three years, a maximum of 3 million dollars or the estimate of 600 infill homes.

It's a step in the right direction. I know also, so I'd like to complement E.P.C. for bringing this forward and the Mayor for bringing this program forward. It's a very positive step in the right direction with regards to housing. I know we've talked about this at the Housing Steering Committee, and I think it's a good step. I know also that the Mayor and E.P.C. is working on the multiple family housing grant program and looking at that as well. I hope that, I know I've raised it before in this chamber and there's a number of revisions going on. I hope it can be brought forward before the next, before the election, I hope it can be brought forward in September to be adopted by this Council before the election; because I think that's a very positive program as well.

So this is a very positive program. I pulled it off the agenda because I think it's something we should always highlight, Mr. Speaker, when we're doing things like this. I think it will make a difference in my ward I know and I'm sure in many other parts of the city as well. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan on the clause and the amendment.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to rise in support of this great program. I think I want to applaud the Mayor's office, the staff and especially our administration for working so hard on this. I think it'll really be a, it will really help catalyze a lot of private sector development in areas that really need it the most, the inner city, major rehabilitation areas.

There's some great development that's happening right now with many, with the W.H.H.I. and other stakeholders, (in audible), Winnipeg Housing Rehabilitation Corporation, Manitoba Housing, Green Tree Homes and I it's a, I think this will simply complement the good work that's already happening in the inner city, in the areas that need it the most.

On the amendment Mr. Speaker, I don't have a problem with that and it's a fairly mutual and friendly amendment. So I would be supporting that as well.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi on the clause and the amendment.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker, yes I too am very supportive of this program. On the amendment, I wanted to emphasize one of the reasons we want to have those discussions with the province and have, is that the city's covering the whole cost, really, of another incentive program, and they also collect school taxes, and school taxes could be utilized as an incentive which is what we really wanted to get negotiated, so I just wanted to point that out, that was the thinking there, and I was happy that they talked about working with the province on that.

I'd also point out that this infill program, it's going to be excellent for most of my ward. It's going to be excellent for a lot of the older neighbourhoods in the city. It's not, obviously does not replace or will be very effective and is not intended to be in the areas of the highest need like West Broadway and Spence and the Point Douglas areas. Those areas have our W.H.H.I. programs in place that are working there. The price gap for those areas is just too big for this kind of a program to really be effective there, but it is very effective in other large parts of the city. So I'm very pleased to see it and I wanted to also speak in support of it.

I think the staff did a fantastic job in bringing some of this, this program forward to the, really came up with a good report and just wanted to acknowledge that as well and thank E.P.C. for bringing this forward. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith on the clause and the amendment.

Councillor Smith: Yes, I definitely will support this clause. This is very, very important and I'd like to congratulate the

Executive Policy Committee for putting it forward.

You know, when you have, when the home builders, when there's a whole thing with building homes in subdivisions, because there's such large efforts in so many homes, it's so easy and the economy is there. When you have a single lot, it's fairly expensive for a developer to come in and build a home on a single lot.

So this program will really help them, and I think in my area, by the way, I have the only; my ward is the only ward that's all inner city. I don't have any suburbs. It's part of my ward. So you understand that I really appreciate this clause.

Mr. Speaker: Any other debate? Did you need to close on your amendment, Councillor Wyatt? It's straight forward.

Councillor Wyatt: No.

Mr. Speaker: Do you wish to close on the main clause, Mayor Katz?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I very much appreciate the comments made and the support, and as some have already done thank the administration, but in particular, I would like to thank David Stansen who did the yeoman's work and was a big help in making this become a reality. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of the amendment, all those opposed? The amendment is carried. On the clause as amended, all in favour, opposed? The clause as amended is carried. Clause 11 Mayor Katz. I'm sorry, we did, we don't need to repeat it again, do we.

We have an, the additional report of Executive Committee which was distributed this morning, Councillors. It's got three items on it, report of Executive Committee dated July the 26th, Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 26, 2006

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move suspension of rules for Council to consider report of July 26, 2006.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Just a minute, they have to be done one at a time. Suspension of the rule to deal with the report. All in favour, opposed? That's carried. Clause one.

Item 1 - Michael Komenda Memorial Skateboard Park and Skatepark West – Additional Funds
File PR-1

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz did you wish to introduce.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, quite simply as you know, we've allocated funds for skateboard parks. We have two that are on the board right now, one of them that were supposed to be built last year. Both of these parks have gone forward and the private sector, the citizens have actually raised money on their own.

As most people know, due to construction costs, the prices have come a little bit higher, so we are looking for some additional funding, and the total is 150,000 dollars Mr. Speaker and that's exactly what that's about.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt on the clause.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to keep my comments very brief. I'd like to know; maybe the area Councillor can answer the question.

I know 150,000 dollar shortfall, I know from various park projects taking place in my end of town that in the past, what normally happens when a tender goes out for a project is that the project lists all the various work and then the Materials Management of the city requires that the contract then list items that can be deleted from the project in the event that the tenders come in higher than what was previously budgeted, and then they go down that list and delete until they meet their budget.

That is normally how it works and that's how it's always been done, and I know that there's a list, there's a line-up of many skateboard parks throughout the city and water play parks across the city that we're all waiting for in various wards, and I'd just like to know why this one is jumping up and being dealt with immediately right now.

If there's a logical reason, maybe there is, and the Councillor might be able to elaborate on that. But, you know, 150,000 dollar shortfall is quite a jump. So, I'm just curious on that. Maybe he can assist. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement on the clause.

Councillor Clement: Yeah, I'll take a stab at that because one of these is in my ward. First of all, this is two skateboard parks, it's not just one and I'll speak to the one in my area.

First of all, when these things start out and this particular park was actually supposed to be built in the spring of 2005 and I'm not going to get in to the myriad of administrative issues that held this thing up, but clearly that had something to do with the final cost, and as a matter of fact, it's even hard to break it down, Councillor Wyatt, because although there's numbers in the agenda. If you look at it, one is for 42,000, one is for 108 but even some of that wasn't easy to break down because there's a contingency that's built in to those numbers. There's also bonding dollars that are in to this, and oh what was the third thing, there was actually a third issue there, and it was hard to break, I don't know the breakdown of each of the numbers for the two projects, so.

But the problem with this was they came forward. They were ready to proceed, and nobody bid on them, which caused a bit of a problem. They were put out a second time because people said they were going to bid on them and then they didn't bid on them a second time, and so we were trying to solve it.
The bottom line is that when they were able to create a resolution for these two to go together because that was the way this company was prepared to deal with them as a package because they weren't done like a design build, they were already put out for consulting, which was the other number by the way that I was missing, there was a consulting number in there too, and I don't know why those numbers for consulting, bonding, and contingency aren't at the front end of these numbers. I don't have any explanation for that because I don't work in that area, but that was news to me too when it came and it came late.

Bottom line is they're able to start construction of these. These people have been looking forward to it and I can't speak to the one in St. James. I know there's a lady that's been doing a lot of work over there fund raising. In this other particular case, this family lost a child while he was skateboarding. They chose to grieve by doing something and trying to make something useful come of that. That's what they've done.

They've gone out and they've raised whether through pig roasts, golf tournaments, even selling cookies, the kid's friends selling cookies at Charleswood Motion and you know how much she raised, it was the intent what the issue was, they've gone out and raised over 130,000 dollars of their own money to put towards this thing to try and make this thing happen and, you know, it was ready to go. This thing's been designed. You can't just take a facility that looks like this and then carve off 10 feet on this side or 20 feet on that corner and make a change.

This thing was designed completely with a total concept in mind, and it's not that simple to do, unfortunately. It would have to go all the way back and start all over again and I just don't think it's fair to these folks. They've worked really, really hard to make this happen.

This is not dealing or taking money away from this initiative in terms of that so much. There is an 850,000 dollar pot in the 43 million dollar one that is for skateboard parks and it's called a skateboard reserve. It doesn't come out of

the sprinkler parks and those kinds of things.

It's a totally separate pot of money that was allocated for that and that's what we're suggesting be moved forward because it's not that all of the money will be spent this year because they won't get these projects completed, but they have to have the money before they can put, before they can agree to the tender amount and without that, they can't do it.

So the money would be simply brought forward as a first charge against the capital. Next year, I guess, and it's what this is all about, and it would allow them to let the thing go and then they would get a start on it. Beyond that, I can't give you a better explanation than that.

Mr. Speaker: Any further discussion on the clause. Do you wish to close, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: No, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of clause one, opposed? That's carried. Clause 2.

Item 2 - The Manitoba Opera Association – Loan Guarantee
File FC-2.2

Mr. Speaker: Do you move the clause, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, this is simply a matter of continuing a guarantee but at this particular point in time, the guarantee drops from 285 to 250,000 dollars.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. all in favour, opposed? That's carried. Clause 3.

Item 3 - Winnipeg Arts Council Inc. - Executive Director
File FG-3

Mr. Speaker: You're moving clause 3, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. All in favour, Opposed? That's carried. Motions.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Benham
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi

WHEREAS Mr. Speaker Councillor Eadie issued a memorandum "To all Members of Council" on February 13, 2006, regarding election year regulations for the Councillors' Representation Allowance;

AND WHEREAS the regulations prevent City Councillors from spending public money under their control on their re-election campaigns;

AND WHEREAS the regulations apply to all Councillors whether or not they run as candidates;

AND WHEREAS the regulations do not apply to the Mayor, who is not governed by the CRA policy;

AND WHEREAS there are no other regulations or legislation that prevent the Mayor spending public money under his control on his re-election campaign;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. City Council hereby authorizes the Senior Election Official for the City of Winnipeg to institute immediately the following measures:

a. During the campaign period for Mayor, May 1 to October 25, 2006, the Mayor must report to the Senior Election Official all expenditures made by him, all staff of the Mayor's Office and all staff of the Executive Policy Committee Secretariat from any and all City accounts under their direction;

b. During the campaign period for Mayor, May 1 to October 25, 2006, the Chief Administrative Officer must report to the Senior Election Official all expenditures made by the CAO Secretariat or any other branch of the public service at the request of the Mayor, his office staff, or the staff of the EPC Secretariat, or any other spending which she deems to be in potential conflict with the spirit of this resolution;

c. The Senior Election Official or his designate will examine all such expenditures to determine if they are campaign expenditures, using the same criteria as being applied to the Constituency Representation Allowance for all City Councillors;

d. The Senior Election Official will disallow any spending that does not meet the criteria and ensure that the public purse is reimbursed for the Mayor's campaign expenses.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: We have a lot of them. Motion number 3 moved by Councillor Lubosch seconded by Mayor Katz, taken as read. Yes, you want to approve it today? All in favour, opposed? That's carried.

Moved by Councillor Lubosch
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz

WHEREAS on June 29, 2005, Council allocated $3.9 million for the development of Bronx Park Community Centre as part of the approved $43 million Recreation and Leisure Facilities Project List;

AND WHEREAS Item 5 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 19, 2006 recommends that the Bronx Park Community Centre project (a new facility to house Bronx Park Community Centre and the Good Neighbours Senior Centre) proceed with the $3.9 million in funding approved by Council on June 29, 2005;
AND WHEREAS on July 25, 2006, the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee approved a Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $200,000.00 (funded $175,000.00 from the North Kildonan Ward allocation and $25,000.00 from the Elmwood-East Kildonan Ward) to assist with the cost of the redevelopment of Bronx Park Community Centre

AND WHEREAS a shortfall of funding in the amount of $50,000 still exists;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1 That additional funding, in the amount of $50,000.00, allocated from the East Kildonan—Transcona Land Dedication Reserve, be approved to assist with the cost of the redevelopment project for the Bronx Park Community Centre.

2. That the criteria of the Council Policy for the Land Dedication Reserve Fund be waived for any expenditures which do not qualify.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Mr. Speaker: Motion number 5, moved by Councillor Lazarenko seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy, taken as read. All in favour, opposed? That's carried.

Moved by Councillor Lazarenko
Seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy

WHEREAS on July 25, 2006, the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee recommended that funding to assist with the field expansion and retaining wall project in the amount of $40,000.00 be allocated from the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Land Dedication Reserve to the Luxton Community Centre;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council concur in the recommendation of the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee, and adopt the following:

1. That funding to assist with the field expansion and retaining wall project in the amount of $40,000.00 be allocated from the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Land Dedication Reserve to the Luxton Community Centre.

2. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Mr. Speaker: Motion number 7 moved by Councillor Pagtakhan seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy, taken as read. All in favour, opposed? Carried.

Moved by Deputy Mayor Pagtakhan
Seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy

WHEREAS on July 25, 2006, the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee recommended that funding to assist with the purchase of a tractor and accessories in the amount of $5,000.00 be allocated from the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Land Dedication Reserve to the Sinclair Park Community Centre and the Council Policy criteria for the Land Dedication Reserve be waived in this instance;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council concur in the recommendation of the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee, and adopt the following:

1. That funding to assist with the purchase of a tractor and accessories project in the amount of $5,000.00 be allocated from the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Land Dedication Reserve to the Sinclair Park Community Centre.

2. That the criteria of the Council Policy for the Land Dedication Reserve Fund be waived for any expenditures which do not qualify.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Mr. Speaker: Motion number 8 moved by Councillor Pagtakhan seconded by Councillor Magnifico. This one should be automatic referral according to our policy. Automatically referred to Executive Policy Committee.

Moved by Deputy Mayor Pagtakhan
Seconded by Councillor Magnifico

WHEREAS the Council of Caribbean Organizations of Manitoba has requested the City of Winnipeg endorse an application to the Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund (MRIF) for development of a Caribbean Cultural Centre;

AND WHEREAS on July 19, 2006 Executive Policy Committee received as information an administrative report that outlined the scope of this project;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has a long history of supporting the development of cultural centres that celebrate the diversity of our city's population;

AND WHEREAS funding has been approved from the Land Dedication Reserve and Community Incentive Grant Program for the Council of Caribbean Organizations of Manitoba by Council on March 22, 2006 and the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee on February 21, 2006;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg endorse the application for funding from the Council of the Caribbean Organization of Manitoba through the Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund for a Caribbean Cultural Centre and that the criteria of the Council Policy on MRIF be waived in this instance.

Mr. Speaker: What have we got here? Just a moment, I've got a late motion. It's as though we haven't been here for two days. It's about to be distributed, but I'm going to wait till it's distributed and I'm not going to reserve judgment until everybody can see it. I'm just going to get, let me just get to my pages here.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, did we deal with motion number 6? I just wasn't sure or is that under a different

Mr. Speaker: It's another committee.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Bylaws, Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 182/2006, 193/2006, 194/2006, 195/2006 and 205/2006.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 182/2006, 193/2006, 194/2006, 195/2006 and 205/2006.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-laws No. 182/2006, 193/2006, 194/2006, 195/2006 and 205/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 182/2006, 193/2006, 194/2006, 195/2006 and 205/2006.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 182/2006, 193/2006, 194/2006, 195/2006 and 205/2006 be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour. Opposed? That's carried. Questions? Councillor Benham. Oh, is there another bylaw? I think that comes later. I believe this one should be automatically referred, motion number 10. It would be an automatic referral to an Executive Committee for a report back.

Moved by Councillor Benham
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt

WHEREAS on October 19, 2005, City Council adopted the Rapid Transit Task Force Report;

AND WHEREAS the report recommended City Council establish a reserve for building rapid transit and that $5.5 million be added to the reserve each year;

AND WHEREAS that was not done in 2006;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council now indicate its strong support for setting aside $5.5 million for Bus Rapid Transit in the 2007 and subsequent capital budgets.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Questions, Councillor Benham.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Aquatic Hall of Fame and Museum of Canada is packing up and leaving Winnipeg. Will the Mayor convene and lead an immediate emergency meeting with city staff and representatives of the Aquatic Hall of Fame to save this national museum of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Benham for that question. I'm not sure exactly what packing up and leaving. My understanding is they are packing up and putting some artifacts in storage and others are going to be displayed in different parts of the city at this particular point in time. I can share with Councillor Benham and I know that he was at E.P.C. making representation that our administration worked very hard with the Aquatic Hall of Fame to work out a solution and it appears, you know through no lack of effort, nothing has taken place to date, although the parties certainly have tried. So at this particular point in time, I guess what you do is you try your best and if you can't come to a satisfactory conclusion, its up to them to make the call and they certainly have made that call, but if you read today's paper, it very plainly stated that some of it will be at the Winnipeg Convention Centre, some will be put in storage and others will be at other parts of the city. If that is inaccurate, I would love to hear that.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Certainly the facts are, the Board of Directors are seeking a

new home in another city Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, given that the federal government has contributed money to this museum, it is not a federal government museum but it is a national museum, what is the responsibility, what is the fiduciary responsibility of the City of Winnipeg to other levels of government in maintaining the Aquatic Hall of Fame and Museum, Aquatic Hall of Fame and Museum in Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I have had communication with members of other levels of government on this matter and once they know all the facts, I think they understand that the city is exercising due diligence and doing what is necessary. I do believe that we are all of the opinion that the end result is very unfortunate but the bottom line is that the city is exercising its due diligence. Thank you.

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

Councillor Benham: Thank you. Why won't the Mayor not step forward and say the Aquatic Hall of Fame and Museum and keep it in Winnipeg.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I believe that the administration came up with a plan to keep the Aquatic Hall of Fame in the City of Winnipeg. It was their decision in the end not to fulfill that plan, I mean no one is going to tell them what to do and I can also tell you Mr. Speaker and I know that Councillor Benham was aware of it, when you referred to the Board of Directors, its yet to be confirmed whether there is a Board of Directors and how many there are, there are many unanswered questions and as I said earlier, I think its very important for the City to act responsibly and I don't think that we can just say we're going to say something no matter what the costs are. So I believe the City has acted very properly and very (in audible). Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Three years ago or more I had the opportunity to sit down with the Director of Property and Development and the Assistant Director at that time and discuss with a contractor about the length of time and delays with regards to issuing of building permits and today we have to open up our morning newspaper and read a column written by one the leading lawyers of our city, Harold Buchwald about the fact that it takes a building permit three months to go through our system to get a simple building permit issued or longer. And I know the Mayor is frustrated with this, I'm frustrated with hearing about this kind of crap from our business community that's frustrated, from contractors, from builders, from those out there who are trying to do business with the City. How long are we going to have to continue to read about this, or get headlines in the national newspapers like we did three years ago in the Globe and Mail. When are we going to end this nonsense and have a system in place where builders, contractors, individuals wanting to do business in the city can get building permits and any other permits, don't have a huge waiting period where in this case, it was actually the contractor that kept phoning and if it hadn't been for that, they, he estimates it could have been months longer to get the permit, so.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Councillor Wyatt and he certainly is accurate when he says that I think my goal and objective at City Hall is certainly to be to provide customer service and basically move these forward as quickly as possible. I think the unfortunate part of this article, we certainly are reading about what many may call a horror story with a builder trying to get a permit but I will say this to Councillor Wyatt, I've also gotten copies of letters from people who have completed construction of a building and basically thanked and commended the department for how quickly the process took place and how they were able to complete their goal. It's rather obvious there are exceptions to the rule. I think its important we address these issues and I can assure Councillor Wyatt this is something that I will look into, but I do not

want to give the impression that this is the norm, cause I have seen the other side as well, but the bottom line is this should not be happening and I certainly will be addressing this.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Wyatt: I thank the Mayor for response, I'm just wondering specifics, it seems to be rather a lot of inconsistencies, you're hearing good things, I'm still hearing bad things, when we heard there was a need for more potholes to be fixed immediately, the Mayor put a

Mr. Speaker: No preamble Councillor, to your question please.

Councillor Wyatt: You know they still have an office which is still open, closed on Mondays. What are we going to do to get this system up and operating Your Worship in short order to start to address this so we can start issuing these permits on a timely basis, consistent.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I think first of all I'd like to point out to Councillor Wyatt that you can't believe every single thing you read in the paper. I have no doubt in my mind that a major problem existed in this particular case and I will also tell you I do not believe this is the only instance it's happened. By the same token and I can ensure you that I was actually presented, there was a letter that Councillor Pagtakhan basically showed me for an accommodation for how well the department was serving the public. I think what we want to establish here is a situation where our goal is to be 100 percent satisfaction guaranteed. I think that's what it's all about, servicing the customer, right now those are the citizens and I have no problem whatsoever of assuring Councillor Wyatt that I'm happy to take this on as an initiative and sit down with the department and get a briefing on this and address these types of instances, but I want to make it very clear, do not make the assumption this is what happens all the time, cause that is not correct. It obviously has happened and I think in no matter what line of work you're in, every so often there is a problem, there is a glitch and we should try to eliminate that and I'm committed to doing that and you got my commitment on that.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you and if there is any way I can be of assistance to his Worship, I will be on this issue. When will you be able to get back to us with regards to your follow up with the department on this matter so that we establish a consistent system in place dealing with everybody equally with regards to permits and having the productivity high and approvals as quickly as possible.

Mayor Katz: My goal Mr. Speaker would be to get back to Council, obviously by the next council meeting or sooner if possible. As you know there are many things happening such as the month of August, but that would certainly be my goal and as soon as I have the information I'd be happy to share it with Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker, just a quick question. Recognizing the challenges in finding appropriate funding for community programs such as North Kildonan Clean and Green Team and the GreenWave, I'm wondering if the Mayor could provide us with information as to how much the GreenWave program is going to cost and where the funding is going to come from and how other Councillors might be able to apply for some of those funding sources.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Lubosch. The initiative is, I believe there is 20 high school and university students who will be part of this program. It's in cooperation, Tom Ethans, who is part of it obviously in working as liaison from Take Pride Winnipeg. What we have done is, it's very similar to the province's program,

the pay will be the same, I believe its approximately seven or eight dollars an hour, I will get you the exact number, but its similar to what's being paid, these are obviously summer students and these monies are coming out of my budget Councillor Lubosch, just so you know where the monies are coming from.

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

Councillor Lubosch: No, he answered the question. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. At E.P.C. last week, I guess it was the issue of the police commission, a new motion was tabled by even though the Chair of our committee had supported our motion at Standing Committee and a new motion came forward with a different approach to looking at a police commission and there's a number of concerns I have about that approach and were not debating that today because its being referred back again to the administration, but what I'm wondering is, is there any timelines for when we're going to see this back at Council, the reason I'm asking is that citizens including aboriginal people, the inner city housing coalition, political activists and the Councillors who've been working on this issue for months and months and want to see something happen on it, you know basically have not been in the loop of this new approach, and we don't have any timelines as to when we're going to hear back about the concerns and I also would just mention that the concerns that most of those citizens came forward with had to do, a lot of it had to do with the LERA process, and the motion completely eliminates even looking at that as part of the process, so I just thought I'd mention that. But, basically what I'm asking is, is there going to be timelines, or is this thing going to be deep-sixed until long after the election and we have to start over.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Councillor Gerbasi and I had a smile with her last terminology. No, nothing is going to be deep-sixed. That's number one. I'm sure that everybody is aware of the fact that there are many issues that we're dealing with when it comes to basically crime and safety. The police commission is something that's been discussed. As you know Comstat's been discussed. They all do basically intertwine and these are issues that must be addressed, Mr. Speaker. When it comes to LERA, I know that Councillor Gerbasi knows that is a provincial process and I believe that we should be able to deal with this as soon as possible, there is no intention by anybody and I can ensure Councillor Gerbasi, certainly by, not me in any way, shape or form to stall this but to make sure we do it right and we do our due diligence and we deal with all the serious matters of crime and safety that are out there and I can assure Councillor Gerbasi that will definitely take place.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Gerbasi: With all the issues that they're been lately, we, I haven't heard any response from the Mayor or E.P.C. stating whether they feel that there is a need in Winnipeg for civilian oversight related to issues of police misconduct beyond the LERA process and really re-evaluating that, and I'm wondering if the Mayor believes that that really is an issue at all, or if it's just a matter of other things that police commissions do. Because I've never heard a comment at

Mr. Speaker: Okay your question has been asked Councillor. Thanks.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I personally spent about three hours in a meeting with residents in the Spence neighbourhood area and I can tell you that I was made aware that there definitely were concerns and there definitely were issues. Councillor Smith was there as well and I'm sure he heard everything I heard. The bottom line, it's not a matter of stating an opinion. The opinion that I stated publicly to the media that I was totally open minded to a police commission. I wasn't for it, I wasn't opposed to it. I want to hear all the

information, and I believe there's still some work being done, and when I hear all the information, I will be happy to share my personal views and I'm sure that Executive Policy Committee members will be happy to share theirs as well, Mr. speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well if that's the case, Mr. speaker, why does clause 5 of the motion you passed state that the board itself would not be dealing with complaints of police misconduct, that it would only be listening to the police chief discuss LERA related, findings of LERA related to accusations. Why has that conclusion already come to in the motion?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, if you are able to identify the problem, there may be more than one solution to the problem. We certainly have heard about the police commission, everybody knows about LERA and that doesn't mean there may not be other solutions that may be viable and may even be better, but until we finish and complete our due diligence, no one's going to make any decision on that at this particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker: Anything else? We'll move on to the report of the Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED JULY 11, 2006

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the minutes of the meeting of the Committee on Infrastructure Renewal, July the 11th, and move clauses 1 to 6 as consent.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 5 has been stood down. Any others? With the exception of clause 5, Councillor Clement moves the balance of the report be adopted by consent. All in favour, opposed? That's carried.

Item 5 - Graffiti Control Program - Additional Funding File ER-1.5

Councillor Clement: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is simply a plan to bring forward the 200,000 dollars that we added in the budget for graffiti control, and I'll wait and see what Councillor Wyatt wants to say about this.

I think it's a fairly positive move, and there may be something that comes out of what he says that may prompt me to close. Right now, I'm going to just leave it alone and let him speak.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt on the clause.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the clause. I think it's a positive program. I want to thank the chair and the committee for bringing this forward.

It is a real problem. I can tell you personally that last Friday, I went out in my ward at 7 in the morning with overalls on and cleaned graffiti with my graffiti crew, graffiti chairman throughout the ward, cleaning up graffiti, removing it from buildings, from the backs of street signs that we have, everything that you can imagine.

It seems with the hot weather and the nice weather we've had a real raft of graffiti problems taking place at least in our end of town and I know that other parts of the city have the same difficult problems. So, I wanted to see firsthand what it was like, and this funding will definitely be a big help to non-profit groups such as the Transcona Anti-graffiti Campaign, which is attempting to keep in control the graffiti problem.

Because, it seems that no matter what we do, it's there. It's constantly out there, but it has to be funded and has to be funded properly. This is a first step. I see it as a first step, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it will eliminate graffiti in the city as we know it today, but it will go a long way to not only pumping another 200,000 dollars into graffiti removal across the city, but it will

also leverage funds that are out there now with groups and organizations doing graffiti removal, whether it be business improvement zones, whether it be groups and organizations like the one we saw today in Councillor Lubosch's ward, the green team in that area, which will help them do what they've been doing already but to show the support that is there from the city.

I want to also thank, Mr. Speaker, and take this opportunity to thank the Department of Public Works, Mr. Okabe who has worked behind the scenes at putting together this program and Bill Larkin and Bruce McPhail for seeing this report through and bringing it back in a timely matter.

We were before the committee just this spring; I believe it was April or May and we now have a report here in July which is going to deliver the program and the funding which is good to see. I believe the funding proposals must be submitted by August 11th.

So, it's a positive step and it's good to see this funding that will be flowing into the communities. I want to thank the chair again and the Mayor and E.P.C. and all the Councillors on the Standing Committee of Public Works for their cooperation and for their support. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the clause, Councillor Clement did you wish to close.

Councillor Clement: I agree with those comments and I'll move the clause.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That's carried. We have a notice of motion submitted last meeting under Infrastructure Renewal moved by Councillor Smith seconded by Councillor Gerbasi regarding auto bin pickup. Councillor Smith on the motion to introduce your motion, Councillor Smith.

Moved by Councillor Smith
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi

WHEREAS the Autobin collection system has been haphazard during the past year with the contractor and the Water and Waste Department monitoring the level of garbage in the bins before making the decision to empty them;

AND WHEREAS overflowing Autobins create unsanitary conditions in back lanes and are thus a health problem;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Autobin pickup be serviced every 7 calendar days.

Councillor Smith: You know garbage has been a real serious problem in my ward and this motion I think deals with the problem. You know, it's a question of health, of safety. You know, we just cannot allow the situation to go and get worse and worse all the time. Right now, it's okay, but, you know, allow a few months to go by and it will slide back to what it was. So I urge you to support this clause.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi on the motion.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm rising in support of Councillor Smith's motion to have auto bins services every seven calendar days.

This is one of those issues that not every Councillor has to deal with in their ward as only a small number of wards have auto bins, and I can tell you that the part of my ward that has them in West Broadway, this has been a huge issue over the last year. In fact, this spring, a large community meeting was held. Excuse me, sorry it's kind of distracting, there's two conversations right here. Thank you.

In fact, this spring, a large community meeting was held after one of our affordable housing projects in West Broadway burnt down, and incidence of garbage bin fires were skyrocketing a few months ago.

The loss of our own and other governments and the community's investment was really, really disturbed people and that resulted in this very large meeting that occurred, not to mention the heartbreak that occurred to the people who lost their homes from this arson. I'm not even sure if it was arson, but there was certainly a renewed fear of arson, a number of other issues, other auto bin fires that were happening at the time.

At this meeting, a member of the arson task force spoke to the group, and he was in agreement that regardless of other measures the city was doing in terms of enforcement of illegal dumping and things like that, that the auto bins need to be emptied on a regular basis.

Now, I know many of you remember the actions that were put in place to deal with the arson crisis in 1999, and these measures that were put into place cost money, and it costs money to pick up garbage.

We already are in a contract arrangement that does not require pickup once a week. The head of solid waste had said that while we were in the midst of increasing arson incidents in the spring, he said that the garbage would be picked up more often, but what I'm saying and what this motion is saying is that we need a clear policy that says and clear wording in our contracts that say the garbage will be picked up once a week like everyone else's garbage is picked up.

In the long term, now that this short-term kind of crisis is over, it can easily go back to where we were before and I think that's the concern of Councillor Smith.

Now I know this came, there was a report that came to Public Works and there was a lot of discussion and they weren't able as a committee to agree on a decision, and so that report basically disappeared off, didn't come up to Council.

So that's why Councillor Smith and I brought this forward to Council to discuss because it really is something that affects other members of Council that aren't on Public Works Committee, and I think all of us need to have an opportunity to debate the options in that report. Auto bins, as I said, only exist in a small number of wards and so I would hope that other members of Council would consider the needs of these particular areas.

So I guess that's, and the other thing I'd point out is because all these services are under a private contract, I don't think we can expect the private contractors, you know, to just pick it up more often. I mean, we're going to have to put it in the contract. We're going to have to change the rules so that that's the expectation within our garbage pickup contracts. So that's what I'm urging you to support today, and I would thank you for that support. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy on the motion.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Councillor Gerbasi said, there was a report on this, but it didn't go, didn't reach as far as Council and maybe I don't read the exciting Public Works agendas as thoroughly as I might.

But most of us have had no information on the matter. The motion says simply that it be serviced every seven days. So what I'm going to do is move referral back to the Standing Committee because as they've said, it would affect an existing contract. How much would that cost us to change that contract by approving something. If its 7 million dollars or 7 dollars, I don't know, and I'm not willing to vote on it without knowing what the cost would be to this Council.

Mr. Speaker: You've done it within 45 seconds, but should really say at the beginning and then you get 3 minutes, but. Well, Councillor O'Shaughnessy has moved that this be referred. Do you wish to.

Councillor Gerbasi: Call the question.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. All in favour, opposed? That's carried. I'm going to; it's been referred, so it will have to be dealt with. No, no. Bylaws Councillor Clement.

Bylaws. Councillor Clement, you have bylaws?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Clement: I would like to move By-law No. 204/2006 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 204/2006.

Councillor Clement: I would move that By-law No. 204/2006 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That's carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 204/2006.

Councillor Clement: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 204/2006 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That's carried.

Any questions for Public Works, Councillor Smith.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Smith: Yes, the Chairperson of Public Works, can you tell me why we have removed the bicycle stands around city hall, the one in front of city hall and the one beside the courtyard.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a question of urgent and pressing importance, Councillor?

Councillor Smith: Well yes, look it, we want alternative people to go by bicycle as much as possible and relieve the congestion on the roadway.

Mr. Speaker: And I think Councillor that's a question you could direct that to the administration. That's hardly a policy matter. Councillor Wyatt. Send him an email. Councillor Wyatt, question. Councillor Wyatt, please.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Recently, we had a following, following the seminar, Council seminar on priorities that was held back I believe it was in June, there was a follow up received from Connie Walker to Councillors with regards to c.c. the Mayor, Annitta Stenning and others with regards to the status of the infrastructure deficit. This question is to the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, Councillor Clement, this is for you.

Councillor Clement: My questions are over.

Mr. Speaker: No, Councillor Wyatt has now got the floor. He's asking a question, please.

Councillor Wyatt: No, that's okay.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll start at the beginning again. No, that's okay. The, Connie Walker following the Council seminar on priorities that was given for Councillors sent a, requested a slide or a summary updating the status of the infrastructure deficit in the city and she kindly did that on June the 20th, and I wanted to follow up with a question, Mr. Chairman, because she outlines in her presentation that the infrastructure deficit, that there's a funding gap right now as of 2006 of 142 million dollars and that at the present rate of funding, it's going to go up to 260 million by 2016. So my question is, and she goes on to say about that this is going to be causing a crisis if we don't deal with it. What steps are being taken by the Chair of the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works to deal with this looming crisis.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well, actually, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Infrastructure and Public Works actually isn't dealing with it because it's really a budgetary matter more than it is a Public Works matter because frankly, it's not just streets and curbs and sidewalks that are in part of that package. It also includes roofs over hockey arenas, it involves boilers, it involves issues with swimming pools. It involves all types of playground structures and on and on and on and so it involves more than just one committee, Mr. speaker, and all of these things are a budgetary issue which will be dealt with in my view in the future capital budgets. It's a very, very good question, mind you, because it is something that I think we have to deal with. We've had this issue growing for some time. The bottom line was, is that the type of borrowing we were doing, Mr. Speaker, wasn't sustainable a few years ago, and you have to start somewhere and the choice of the Council of the day was that we would stop spending with our credit cards and try and deal with our debt which was the first issue, and we have resolved that I think pretty well and have ourselves on a pretty decent path in that regard and our finances in the city are in pretty good shape as a result of that and our bond rating as well. I think that the question of trying to attack this with a long term plan is reasonable. I think the timing is probably imminent, and I think that we probably are in a financial position now to at least make a reasonable stab at it, and I think that over the next course of time, that's what will come forward, but it will come forward through the budget process, not through the committee process I believe. I mean, we'll deal at committee with specific initiatives obviously, we'll deal there with you know the regional streets issues or the residential streets issues, the lanes issues, and those kinds of things and policy and all that type of thing, but the overall budget and how much we're going to spend on each of these different areas will be dealt with by Executive Policy Committee through the budget process as I understand it.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Mr. Chairman, my supplemental is, well based on the response, yes we do need a plan, but the Chair was previously, the Councillor was previously Chair of Fiscal Issues prior to that being the Chair of this new committee and a new committee with a new name; it was renamed Infrastructure and Renewal. He's been the Chair for, well since the fall

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Councillor Wyatt: Basically what you're telling me, just to understand you correctly; you have done nothing with regards to coming forward with a plan to deal with this issue. I just want to get that very clear right now.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Your question has been asked. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well thank you Mr. Speaker, I guess that some people have selective hearing because I think I made it pretty clear that the city has had a number of issues over the last number of years. As Chairman of Fiscal Issues, all we did was reduce the debt by over 250 million dollars in the last few years, with no help frankly from the provincial government and some of your friends over there. We've dealt with that, well we've frozen taxes, so that we've been able to solve that issue because that was the issue that was bothering people the most out there Mr. Speaker and the, the bottom line is, is that we now have the best credit rating that this city has ever seen and we're now capable of creating a plan to deal with infrastructure. I'm quite happy that I'm going to be involved in that or have been involved in that at Executive Policy Committee, but its not the Public Works Committee that deals with that, its Executive Policy Committee and I can't help it Mr. Speaker if the representative from Transcona doesn't understand that, its not a matter of me doing nothing at Public Works, I do lots of things at Public Works, but the issue that he's asking about is being dealt with by Executive Policy Committee through its budget process and long term planning, not by Public Works Committee. I don't know if

that's clear this time, but I'm doing my best.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: Councillor likes to talk quite a bit about the financial plan that we adopted some time ago. Where's the infrastructure renewal plan Mr. Speaker. We still have

Mr. Speaker: The question's been asked. Sit down Councillor, your question's been asked. Councillor you've asked the question. Councillor, sit down. Your question was asked. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Mr. Speaker, its, I'm glad that he's final getting it, that yes there's no question that I chaired finance for seven of the last eight years and that I'm quite proud of our record there Mr. Speaker and the fact that based on the diligence of that committee and councils and Executive Policy Committee for the past number of years, that we've been able to get the city's finances in order so we could afford an infrastructure program which I've already suggested is imminent and there's no point, you can create a plan all you want, if you've got the money. We are now in a position to do some of that. I think that just about everybody in this chamber understands that we've received a significant amount of money through the federal government, GST money and that that money is starting to flow, as a result of that this past year we increased funding for regional streets by something in the neighbourhood of 30-35 million dollars Mr. Speaker as an example. So that's part of the plan, I guess, I guess Mr. Wyatt missed that part last year when we spent all that extra money. The fact of the matter is, is that the five year capital was increased significantly as a result of those monies and the fact that we had ourselves have mildly increased our cash to capital funds. The piece that's missing Mr. Speaker, we're not supposed to call it a new deal because the Premier doesn't like that term or something like that, but the fact of the matter is that the piece that's really missing is how much the province is going to ante up in that. We went through a process here, if you remember Mr. Speaker for a couple of years under a former Mayor and we went down that path and the provincial government didn't bite whatsoever in that regard and we were trying to develop a plan then and those kinds of discussions I know still belong on a weekly and monthly basis and there will be a, hopefully a further plan, Mr. Speaker of greater expenditure as the GST money increases and hopefully that the provincial money will increase at the same time. But I'm not clairvoyant, Mr. Speaker. I can only tell you that we've got a five year capital budget and as the money flows hopefully a little bit freer from other levels of government in particular, we'll be able to expand on the five year capital which is the plan.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I think it was Macbeth where William Shakespeare penned the phrase, it is a tale told by an idiot full of sound and furry signifying nothing. I'll try not to be symbolic of that statement but there are some important issues to put before you here today. Recently, we've seen on more than one occasion the increase in costs of construction coming before the various committees, whether it be Public Works, whether it be Fiscal Issues, we know our city's term borrowing rate is 5.5%, my question through you to the Standing Policy Committee Chair on Infrastructure and Public Works Renewal is, are we doing any sort of work to compare the current rate of inflation on infrastructure projects or costs and projected rate of inflation to our current borrowing rate to see if we should not be borrowing at this present time. It would be a greater cost benefit position to the city.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Mr. Speaker, I think that question actually should be posed to the Chairman of Fiscal Issues, but I can try, I guess. One of the problems, first of all, before you can do that analysis, you've got to have the data in front of you and that unfortunately spiked this year to which is going to cause other problems

and I kind of thought that was going to happen. I met with the Heavy Construction Association and their board or whatever you want to call them and was told there was no problem and they could handle all this extra work. And I happen to be in contracting and I know things have increased in cost but I don't believe that things have increased the way that the numbers coming in on these tenders. I think it's more to do with the fact that we're doing a lot of extra work and I'm not convinced that there's exactly enough of those companies in town to spread it around to be honest with you. But as far as planning fiscally for the longer term in doing that type of work, I believe that the Chairman of Fiscal Issues can answer that specific thing a little better than me.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Just briefly I don't, what I wanted to get, Mr. Speaker and through you I'll ask again, is just a sense from, the Chair of Public Works has a great deal of history with Fiscal Issues and I just wanted to get a sense from him if there should be some investigation being done on our behalf to see if that is a benefit to the city or not and if he'd be advocating for that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I think that all these things evolve and I said a little while ago that we couldn't afford what we were borrowing, couldn't afford to sustain it a few years ago so we stopped doing that and tried to get a little better handle on things. I think we're at the position now where we can start looking at things like that. I can only give you one person's view like if we were looking at rebuilding the Jubilee Underpass, as an example or fix some project like that, that was a long term facility or piece of infrastructure that would be built. Is it reasonable to borrow for that and charge that against more than one generation of taxpayers, maybe. Is it reasonable to pick a street and, in Richmond West and say that we should borrow the fixed residential street, maybe not. And I think those are the kinds of discussions that we're going to have and we're going to have to try and see whether some mix of that will work and I think frankly that and that's why I said when Councillor Wyatt was asking the question the first time, that I felt that we now have, I think have the flexibility to at least go down that path to review that and I know that some of that review has started.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, the time for questions has expired so we're going to move on. You won't be able to ask a question and get it answered in 30 seconds. Committee on Fiscal Issues, Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED JULY 11, 2006

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured to move the report of July 11; I'll move Item 1 as consent.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That's carried. By laws.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'll move that By-law No. 203/2006 be read at first time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 203/2006.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'll move that By-law No. 203/2006 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 203/2006.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 203/2006 be read a third time and passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? Carried. Any questions for Fiscal Issues, Councillor Swandel.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Swandel: I think it's only appropriate seeing as I put the question to Councillor Clement that I also put the question to the Chair of Fiscal Issues for some commentary on whether or not the rate of inflation on our construction projects versus our current borrowing rate at the city, whether or not we should be looking at doing some borrowing to counter that at the present time, would it be wiser, in his opinion if it would be.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I just going to quote from Hamlet, what is this I see before me, a dagger that's handled toward my hand, but anyway, Macbeth right, different son, same father. I guess the question we'd have to look at first shall be changed in the city policy, which is not to borrow for capital works and be repaid out of the current budget. We have a very short term situation that has surfaced in 2006 for the first time since we made that policy back in the 90's not to borrow. Would it be knee jerk or is it prudent to start looking at it. Perhaps either I'm not sure, but certainly to consider borrowing for projects now would be in contravention of council's policy. On the other hand to re-examine the policy I think might be indeed prudent, I'm glad you brought it up and I'm going to ask the clerk to make a note so that we can put the matter for discussion on the next meeting of Fiscal Issues. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Swandel: No, that's fine.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Similar question I guess, the Chair of Public Works indicated that this is more under Fiscal Issues (in audible) with regards to the infrastructure deficit. I was confused by the response, he referred to a plan, sustainable plan to deal with the 142 million funding gap in infrastructure renewal as pointed out by Ms. Connie Walker and growing to 216 million by 2016 that the plan is imminent to deal with this, a long term plan, at the same time he said that last year was part of the plan which is a bit of a contradiction here, is there a plan imminent to deal with a long term sustainable plan, much like our fiscal plan, dealt with it, when you guys adopted it back, you were here Councillor in the 90's and indeed you've, has arrested the problem with more debt and rising property taxes. The question is, is there a plan imminent with regards to the fiscal problem with regards to infrastructure deficit which is growing.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Now Russell, no I'm not going to contradict Councillor Clement. The infrastructure deficit in conjunction with the 2007 capital budget and five year capital budget to follow has been a matter of some preliminary discussion within members of the Executive Policy Committee, nothing has been arrived at at this point and I'm sure E.P.C. will be able to give recommended direction in that area when it comes time to bring forward the estimates for 2007 and beyond.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Does the, I realize this is coming forward, does a plan or the future capital forecast address in any way, shape or form long term plan to eliminate or reduce the funding gap and the existing infrastructure deficit.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'm unaware of any finalized plan at this point. What I am aware is that there will be nothing brought forward by E.P.C. before November.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: So we will not be, no plan, no imminent plan that we heard

earlier coming forward in September before the election is what you're saying.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: There is no schedule at this moment to bring anything for the 2007 current or capital budget in September, no.

Mr. Speaker: Any on Downtown Development? No report or any questions for Downtown Development? Seeing none. The Committee on Property and Development, Standing Policy committee report 'A' of Property Development June 6th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JUNE 6, 2006

Councillor De Smedt: I'm please to move the report of June 6, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That's carried. Committee report of July the 4th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 4, 2006

Councillor De Smedt: I'm pleased on behalf of committee to read the report of July the 4th, item 1-26.

Mr. Speaker: 1-26, all in favour, opposed? That is carried. The report of July 13th which is now, I believe, a, it's now a hand out report that you got earlier.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 13, 2006

Councillor De Smedt: Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd like to pull off 2.

Mr. Speaker: Give me a second, Councillor. I'm sorry, I, oh I'm sorry yes, I'm sorry, I was misreading my agenda, the report of July 13th, clauses 2 and 3 and was it you Councillor Gerbasi that wanted to stand down 2.

Councillor Gerbasi: 2 actually has an amendment on it now, I realize. So, it should be stood down anyway because there's an amendment.

Councillor De Smedt: Right, might I then Mr. Speaker, stand down 1, I'd like to deal with 2 and 3 first and then come back to 1 because we have a by-law to pass.

Mr. Speaker: We'll deal with that other one; we'll deal with that other, the West Waverley one on a separate basis Councillor.

Councillor De Smedt: Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry I got behind on my own agenda here.

Councillor De Smedt: Therefore, can I move then Councillor Gerbasi asked for motion, report 2 to be stood down, could I move 3 as consent.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That's carried.

Councillor De Smedt: And I'll wait for Councillor Gerbasi as a motion.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, clause 2 is,

Item 2 - Amendment to DASSF 545/99 - Traffic Control Signals to Service Proposed Commercial Development - west side of Osborne Street, south of Mulvey Avenue DASSF 545/99

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, just a moment please, Councillor De Smedt I would, you can introduce clause 2 if you like. I have motion number 1 is an amendment to the clause as I have been advised so I will invite Councillor Gerbasi to open on that but I'll give you the opportunity to open on clause 2.

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt

WHEREAS Osborne Street South is a major traffic point of congestion and delay and that this problem has increased dramatically with the new development

that has occurred in the area and in the City at-large;

AND WHEREAS the consultant's report shows that the projected traffic volume at the proposed signalized access on opening day will be well above the intersection's capacity during the A.M. peak resulting in an unacceptably poor level of service;

AND WHEREAS the result of not installing left turn storage lanes would be to reduce Northbound Osborne Street effectively to one lane only during the A.M. peak;

AND WHEREAS separate North - South left turn storage lanes on Osborne Street would result in an acceptable level of service during the A.M. peak hour;

AND WHEREAS on July 19, 2006, Executive Policy Committee concurred with the recommendations of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development and Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, that deemed the cost of the left turn storage lanes to be too much of a burden to place on the developer and recommended removal of this requirement from the zoning agreement;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the cost of separate North - South left turn storage lanes on Osborne Street at this location be referred to the 2007 Capital budget process.

Councillor De Smedt: If I can help Mr. Speaker, might I just make a suggestion. It's not exactly an amendment but it's a motion to refer a matter for the capital budget and on behalf of my committee members and other members of Council, we have no objection to do that.

Councillor Gerbasi: It's adding a resolve that the costs of another item be referred to the capital budget.

Mr. Speaker: Well if we want to agree that we take motion number one as a motion and it be referred to the capital budget process and if that'll clear it from here and it'll be dealt with in that process, is that agreed. So this motion amendment number one is so referred. Okay, on clause two then, is there any.

Councillor De Smedt: I would wait, if there is nothing further I would like to move clause 2.

Mr. Speaker: Tongue tied, is there any discussion on the clause? All in favour, opposed? That's carried. Okay, we will now deal with this report, West Waverley structure plan.

Item 1 - Waverley West Area Structure Plan File SP 4/2005

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and I'll just take a couple of moments to hit the highlights and I think it's important we do take a few moments here today.

I think as all Members of Council are aware, Council had approved on February 22nd, first reading, we had a public hearing at Riel, it moved back to the administration and came to P&D and it's been in lay over for a while until P&D moved it to E.P.C. two weeks ago.

It's here today Mr. Speaker because I think it's now time that we move ahead with the West Waverley Area Structure Plan so that we can send the proper signal back to our community, the development community that the integrity of the plan is here and that we are ready to proceed and to await hopefully in the fall area neighbourhood plans.

Mr. Speaker, what you have in front of us is some amendments to the West Waverley Structure Plan that Council had seen last year and it's by agreement of the Executive Policy Committee that they agreed with some amendments, both made at Riel and P&D and with additional amendments, one through eight.

The intent of this Mr. Speaker is to finally acknowledge that we have received and this is a blue banner day, that we have indeed got some significant support from the province to move ahead with a major economic route, transportation route that goes through Waverley West which is Kenaston Boulevard as part of their

obligation in funding major thoroughfares through the city.

In many respects this is a first in the context of policy. I know we do get assistance from time to time from the province and on regional streets and other infrastructure needs but I think this highlights the importance that we have attached as Council, we recognize this back in February 22nd when we indicated that we expected to receive public support from the province to fund 50% of the Kenaston route to meet the intention of Waverley West Area Plan.

I'm pleased to confirm and to really highlight a couple points to you. One, I think I appreciated and you should realize the leadership shown by our Mayor to work in Intergovernmental Affairs with the province to secure an understanding and in agreement that they indeed will fulfill an obligation to pay for 50% of the costs of the Kenaston throughway. I think this is a milestone event. We all wanted Kenaston Boulevard to function as an expressway. We wanted to do it the right and I think the best way it can happen and Council had already acknowledged this was to have partnership funding from our province.

This didn't happen quite easily. I think that perhaps there's been some misunderstandings in exactly what the funding relationships were and what exactly was needed, but the time has come that they've acknowledged this and I'm sure the Mayor if he had some comments to make would want me as well to acknowledge we do appreciate their support.

Up until the weekend we had about an eight million dollar short fall to meet this obligation. That has been met to within 600,000 dollars with the opportunity for it to grow as a function of the growth in the economy of West Waverley over the next 20/25 years, perhaps in the next 10-15 years in the M.H.R.C. component of Waverley West is built out, the profits from that will be sunk back into Waverley West, infrastructure, as well as inner city housing.

So, I am pleased to acknowledge this. The amendments to the plan and you see a map that changes map three which changes the transportation network, not departing from the bifurcation or the split pear approach which had been presented in the area structure plan, but eliminating some of the more expensive items related to it without the leading of the efficiency of these roadways.

It was the obligation of M.H.R.C., please read in that the province to pay for this infrastructure that originally was going to work out to some 64 million dollars by making some adjustments without taking away from the efficiency in the operation of this transportation network, they brought that down to some 38 million dollars.

The consequence of making the other amendments where we don't have these fly overs which were the expensive items, it is, the province does recognize their obligation to fund two lanes of this Kenaston expressway including the additional value added to them and cost to them of having to twin pairs and additional road way works necessarily for that as well as identifying the need to pay for the interim grade and separation or grade level intersection upgrades at Kenaston and Perimeter Highway.

In addition they recognize contributing towards the 50% of the upgrade for intersection upgrade at Kenaston and Bishop Grandin. Now if some of you are recalling our discussion last February, there was one item that Council had agreed upon is that we also had intended to get a signal from the province that they would fund 50% of a grade separation of Bishop Grandin and Kenaston which really in the minds of engineering staff is at least some 15 to 25 years out. It will probably be in the lower spectrum rather than what the professional engineering transportation people are saying would be some 25 years or more. I suspect it's going to come much sooner if we're going to function this throughway in a proper manner and do it the right way.

So, what we have here today, I think, after long negotiations is an

acknowledgment by the province for the integrity of this road work to work the way it should. We are now able to send a signal to our communities, business communities that were prepared to move ahead with the area structure plan, it meets the intent of proper planning, proper phasing and integrates some innovative measures that hopefully people in this city will be proud of in the years ahead.

The funding is there, with that one exception that I think we'll have to be negotiated in the time ahead is that large, significant grade separation, not needed immediately at Bishop Grandin and Kenaston but having said all that, I guess it is a, either an orange day, blue day or red day standing up here with my own political stripe acknowledging the very critically and supportively the assistance of the province to this. They do take some credit and I hope it signals to the future the way we need to develop transportation plans in this city. It is the only major city in the province of Manitoba and as we grow with the capital region, we are going to have to continue to invest more and more into proper transportation economic networks. There's many yet to be done.

Amber Trail, Charleswood Parkway, in the Transcona area, we put all these together, there will be a network in our lifetime and it will probably start with Waverley West in the 5 to 10 year period getting Kenaston done properly, all the way down the Perimeter Highway.

So, I do acknowledge with some significance the work by the administration, Planning, Property and Development Department working very assiduously with M.H.R.C. in the province to bring this plan together. I acknowledge the leadership of Mayor Katz to working in Intergovernmental Affairs to make sure that all citizens of Winnipeg benefit from this.

This was not just meant to be a local area charge. This is a regional issue and it's a provincial issue to make this economic route work properly because it is going to hook up to the bypass of St. Norbert and Highway 75 and that is going to be our lifeline to move goods back and forth to the United States border and areas beyond.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to move the amendments that E.P.C. made here today after which we can have agreement on this plan, then I would then move the by-law for second and third reading. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First I would like to say that it is extremely frustrating and I believe inappropriate to be changing, making changes as significant as were made this morning when Council is voting on the issue the very same day. Changes to the maps, decisions with regard to major funding implications have been made at the last minute and on the fly regardless of how that wasn't the intent that does seems to be what happened.

The public hearing is over, citizens can't speak to this today and changes have been made and I think at the very least this creates; excuse me a perception of a very bad process if not in fact a very bad process.

As a Councillor as well who has to make this decision today, I would prefer to have time to digest the significant changes, such a major policy document, talk to our Public Works staff and make sure uncomfortable with these kinds of changes, especially knowing that these decisions will affect our city for years to come. So I just wanted to make that comment first of all.

I was also disappointed to hear this morning, with the Mayor's announcement, that the province of Manitoba will be taking half of the projected profits from Waverley West in the amount of 7.5 million away from the inner city to pay for the expressway that E.P.C. so desires.

At the January 4, 2005 public hearing at E.P.C. on the Waverley West Plan Winnipeg amendment, in a presentation from the M.H.R.C., Terry Walk stated that profits from the development will be

redirected to continue with inner city revitalization and affordable housing programs. Yet, giving us half of the profits is now something we're supposed to be grateful for and excited about.

So I sorry if I'm not thankful today, but the money directed that could have all been directed to the inner city is being cut in half. If the province, the province should be funding those other things but funding them out of this pot of money is not good news for the City of Winnipeg.

I was also very surprised and disappointed by the resolution that was approved by the Riel Community Committee and supported by Executive Policy Committee and the Standing Policy Committee. The single major concern that was openly stated by our planning department was the concern that there should be a policy statement included in the plan regarding residential density. A higher density development was touted as justifying the Waverley West development. This development was going to be different. A higher density development fits with the principles of compact urban forum as outlined in Plan Winnipeg.

We were all given the impression at the time of the Plan Winnipeg amendment, that Waverley West proponents supported the notion of including higher density development and but now that we are at the next stage of the area plan, they're singing a different tune and they were singing a different tune at the public hearing.

No one really expects large scale suburban developers to voluntarily forgo the larger profits that come with single family large lot urban, suburban development. However it is up to City Council and this planning process to provide guidelines and policy which support Plan Winnipeg and the principles in it. This is why I was absolutely astounded when I heard of the Riel Community Committee decision.

Not only did they decide not to include the statement from the planning department about density, but they included the clear statement in their recommendation where they said, they do not concur with the suggestion of referring to Plan Winnipeg policies that support the principles of compact urban forum.

Well I guess they're at least being honest, but I hope that citizens of Winnipeg and Members of Council are paying attention. What this Council is basically saying if it supports the Community Committee recommendation that is we don't give two shakes of a rat's tail about Plan Winnipeg or compact urban forum.

Another issue I would like to raise is the fiscal sustainability of supporting this massive suburban extension. The issue goes beyond Waverley West and the 40,000 new residents that will be there but all the current suburban expansion from St. Boniface to Transcona. It was in the media a while ago that Council was considering a 5,000 dollar development charge per lot or what became known as an impost fee. It may well be that this kind of fee is needed to cover the true costs that come with this kind of new suburban development, Bishop Grandin grade separation come to mind anybody.

It applies to the offsite development costs which generally extend further than the site itself. The impact of the development of this size will go far beyond the street system within the development and will put increasing demands on the cities coffers.

Most city have these kinds of fees. They are seen as absolutely necessary to work toward sustainability and city budgets that have significant suburban growth. Although this issue was widely talked about last year, just as suddenly as it appeared in the media, it disappeared of the radar screen. I recall when it happened, Garth Steek and other representatives came to me with the Mayor and following that, the issue never came up again and it seems to have been completely taken off the table. It is disappointing and undemocratic that decisions like this are made behind close doors in secret without including all members of Council in the discussion and the debate. We should have had a debate on that issue.

But the biggest point I'm trying to make here, is that in the long term, this development is only beneficial to the city's bottom line if the true costs are covered. This decision to embrace massive suburban growth will have huge impacts on our operating budget. It is one thing to say that we will make tax money with this development but if it isn't directed into expanding the city services in our operating budgets to service these new communities, services will decline for everyone.

If this new money goes to future business tax cuts, for example, where will the money come from to provide more and more transit service, recreation, police and fire services that will be needed for the new areas as well as continue to provide them in the existing neighbourhoods.

This is why in the new deal discussions there was talk about moving away from so much reliance on property taxes. We need to find an alternative to this dependency on sprawling out our city and then being stuck with unsustainable operating and infrastructure costs.

The promises and justifications given at the initial Plan Winnipeg amendment hearing that Council heard when some members here voted to support Waverley West are now falling very flat. We are now seeing the commitment to a higher density development and support for inner city housing diminished. Not that saying I told you so brings me any joy, but based on the above reasons I will not be supporting proceeding with this plan at this time and I hope it isn't a waste of time to say this but it needs to be said. We have a city plan. It's called Plan Winnipeg. It speaks to compact urban forum and land use policies that would move our city in a sustainable direction. Perhaps we should be paying attention to it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel on the clause, please.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll be as quick as I can. It's sort of troubling to see, to listen to Councillor Gerbasi, I'm not sure that she's actually read Plan Winnipeg in its entirety but I will tell you that in, one of the first one or two pages of Plan Winnipeg it says where two or more statements in this plan conflict or may conflict with application that Council of this city, the committees of the Council and officers of the city having jurisdiction shall apply their judgement regarding the best balance between or among those plans and policies.

What we have here before us today is something that is consistent with Plan Winnipeg. It is bringing an area structure plan forward, which Plan Winnipeg talks about. If you look at some of the environmental components in this document, like the lineal parkway and the new approach to land drainage and water retention in the proposed plan area, it certainly is consistent with Plan Winnipeg.

In one case it gets away from Plan Winnipeg in that I see in the open housing of the first neighbourhood structure plan where it talks about maximizing the spacial use of the land with the first neighbourhood structure plan because we strive so hard to maintain additional green space and to deal with some environmentally sensitive lands, we're actually not doing that but on balance this structure plan does meet the policies and the intent of Plan Winnipeg overall not just specifically to the statement of compact urban forum.

Compact urban forum and you get into the argument on density, when it refers to in the plan, it refers to an argument of adjacent to and compatible with and we have yet to see how this will be adjacent to or compatible with as the drill down in this process is going from very high level and the Plan Winnipeg amendment where we've done a transportation study and a cost benefit analysis showing how we're going to deal with some of the off-site implications.

We're now with the area structure plan process where we're taking a look at those bigger picture items and how they're going to be dealt with in the boundary areas of the area structure plan and the next level is to get down into the neighbourhood structure plan where we

will again have another public hearing process where we can look at some of the more particular land uses and get into the collector streets and where schools may be located and perhaps maybe gain some density by increasing land areas where there might be more multiple family housing as opposed to single family housing.

So there's a great deal more work to be done with this, and I can tell you that the amendments that are before Council today are in my eyes and as the area Councillor and somebody who sat at the public hearings at the Riel Community Committee are consistent with the intent of what we were trying to do and what we move forward.

I think the argument on profit, I agree with the Councillor's statement but I think the one thing that was left out was that by eliminating 26 million dollars in costs of flyovers the potential for profit is far greater and that we should be able to see a far greater return both to the City of Winnipeg and the citizens as a whole and our transportation infrastructure needs here and in addition to a very, very worthy cause which is a contribution to inner city housing.

Now one other point that I want to make. I have heard that this morning that Mr. Kostero who was a negotiating piece, counter at the province, the negotiating partner for the province has announced that he is retiring sometime in the very near future so I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank him for his service to the public and certainly for the fine work that he's done on this file. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas, please.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I will not reiterate the very eloquent words of Councillor Gerbasi with regards to my frustration in connection with this project. I will just say I've been suckered.

We were told that compact urban forum would be addressed. I notice that's the first thing to go contrary to the recommendation of the administration and contrary to Plan Winnipeg.

Where's the transit planning that we were promised? There's so many things that were promised here that I will not reiterate Councillor Gerbasi's speech about all the things that were promised, but time and time again people who came and spoke to us warned us that these things would happen and we said oh, no, this'll be different. Well I am not going to be one to stand here after telling those people to their face that this would be different and then say oh, well it'll be just like all the others. That's okay now and it's not okay. It's not what we promised. It's not what we said and it's not what I'm willing to do. That's it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Katz please.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe discussions on Waverley West started in the spring of '03, quite a long time ago. It was in January of '05 when we had the public hearings almost a year-and-a-half ago. I can tell you that many of our departments, Property and Planning, along with Public Works have done phenomenal work on this project. Unlike others here I am absolutely ecstatic that the province of Manitoba and M.H.R.C. understand and accepted the fact that we must do things right because 20, 30, 40, 50 years down the road we do not have the ability or the funds to correct them when they're done wrong which is what has been taking place in our city for a long, long time, and I would also say to you that we have been either the victim or someone who has accepted lower standards than we should be accepting.

In a situation like this it was very important that an expressway exist and be maintained. It was also very important to acknowledge that the city of Winnipeg did not have the funds to make this happen and the province of Manitoba has stepped up to the table as well as M.H.R.C. and one, I want to thank them for that commitment, and I'm very happy to see they acknowledge the importance of Kenaston.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that since I was the one speaking today; never did I say that any monies were being taken

away from inner city housing. I specifically said that 7.5 million dollars will be going towards this project and also 7.5 million dollars will be going towards inner city housing which I think should be applauded and commended, and I can assure you, Mr. speaker, if there is no development that takes place there, I guess then there would be zero dollars going to inner city housing.

So Mr. Speaker, I think that the chair of Property and Planning along with all of the members of that committee have done a phenomenal job along with our administration. I think we finally have a deal that works for the long term of our city and I hope all deals like this are done the same way where we do what's right. We never rush this. The reason it took so long is we had to get the right deal and today we are finally on the right track, and I certainly hope that Council will support this. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I will keep my remarks brief, but I just totally support the comments by Councillors Gerbasi and Thomas. I, too, am very disappointed in Waverley West.

Waverly West could have been so much more. It could have been a showcase for new ideas, for new approaches for a different way of doing things and it's just another cookie cutter suburb. In fact, if anything, it's probably about 30 years behind the times.

Mr. Speaker, when I moved to Ontario briefly in the early 1970's, Ontario premier Bill Davis was winning, in the process of winning a huge majority government by stopping the Spadina expressway. In 1971 in Toronto, the people of Toronto decided that expressways had gone far enough in carving up their city and carving up neighbourhoods, and they wanted no more of them, and they stopped it, and they instead supported rapid transit. Yes, an extension of the subway because that's the system they already have.

What has this council done. It has gone backwards in time. It exists in a 1950's world in which all we want is concrete and cars and more expressways and more efficient ways to allow the car to dominate our city.

If we had simply gone ahead with bus rapid transit on September 29, 2004, I would be a supporter of Waverley West because we would be giving the people moving into Waverley West an alternative means of transportation, but Mr. speaker, we not only are failing to do that, we are reinforcing the old-fashioned system of expressways of moving cars as quickly as possible, not, it's not about moving people, it's about cars. Cars are the centerpiece of our planning and of our thinking. There's so much more that could have been right about Waverley West, the density could have reflected the need for compact urban forum even that far out.

Yes, there's this idea that the farther out you get the more, the less dense it is and so on, we could have reversed that. We could have built, the original talking was, the original discussion was about Wolseley tight neighbourhood outside of the inner-city. What a joy that would have been, Mr. Speaker. What a joy for people to have some kind of alternative.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that was discussed in the early going was geothermal heat, again, not something out of science fiction. The Minister of Conservation for Manitoba, the Minister of the Crown has installed geothermal heat in his home in northern Manitoba, and he says it's great and there's a payback period and so on.

I went to a seminar held by the Manitoba Home Builders Association at which Manitoba Hydro was giving a seminar on geothermal heat and they knew nothing about it. Absolutely nothing about geothermal heat, they could make no commitment that it would be put into Waverley West. They could make no commitment that they could make it operate and so the Home Builders there quite naturally said well if you can't promise us that then you have to give us the normal electrical grid and a normal natural gas pipeline grid, so what will happen, Mr. speaker, there won't be any

geothermal built in Waverley West. We'll be 30 to 40 years behind on that one as well.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker that this is simply another move backwards; it's another move that shows how clearly the majority of Councillors, led by the current Mayor, led by E.P.C. are fixated on a 1950's view of what Winnipeg should be. We are marching backwards, ever backwards and today is a significant step in that process. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, I will not be supporting this clause either. Let me tell you this, you know when the province spoke about this development, they made a firm commitment that the profits were going to go to inner city housing, all of it, and the Mayor informs us this morning that this is not the case. You know, aside from the other arguments, you know, urban sprawl, you know, we haven't even taken into account all the costs that this development will mean to the city of Winnipeg.

You heard Councillor Benham talk about the automobile and really you know I can remember seeing a National Film Board short where it made it look like the automobile was ruining the country, and really as a city council this is what we're saying. We're saying you have to have an automobile and, you know, urban sprawl is very costly to us, and so I'm going to vote against this.

Let me tell you, you know, if we had the whole, all the profits from this venture going into inner city housing, I would be sort of impressed with that direction, but, you know, what happens with this development is that people are going to move out of some of our existing neighbourhood. They are going to move into Waverley West and it's going to be further decay of some of our older neighbourhoods.

You know, I love the city of Winnipeg. I don't want to see it deteriorating further, and if you just look around in the inner city, to see the deterioration of all the services, all the services, you know, the back lanes, for example, I get one back lane done, well I've got 35% of the bad back lanes in the city of Winnipeg in my ward.

This is the deterioration that takes place because we cannot afford to maintain our existing neighbourhoods and to go ahead and have Waverley West will further deteriorate that because resources will be put there and, you know, it's just going to be downhill as we go along. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, when Waverley West came forward for being taken as part of rural policy area to neighbourhood policy area and Plan Winnipeg change needed to take place I spoke against it at that time and voted against the proposal to send it to the province.

It was passed by Council and Council's decision has been made on the matter. We're here today now discussing the secondary plan that is before us today or the area structure plan which I will be supporting because in light of the fact that we had the debate, we had the discussion, we had the arguments, and I still feel strongly about my position at that time and still do not think it was the right thing to do.

It was sent to the minister. The minister did sign off with regards to having the property moved from rural policy area to neighbourhood policy area and now there is a subdivision that's coming forward. Keep in mind Councillors, that this is only one step in the process, that there would be need for rezoning and subdivision to take place in the future, there are safeguards in place there and there are negotiations taking place right now with the provincial government with regards to their obligations.

This is not our project. This is a housing development by and large, controlled, the majority stakeholders, the province of Manitoba, and they've come to us requesting this as a developer in a sense, and they have to also pay their

obligations, and I know that E.P.C. has been, well, for better lack of term, holding their feet to the fire with regards to that, and I think that's positive with regards to the long-term obligations that need to be addressed with regards to the infrastructure needs that this development will build.

Will it meet all the traffic needs of the future, I don't, probably not. It'll probably be traffic congestion north of there, but if anything that's going to require the building of rapid transit faster would probably be this. This will probably necessitate a move up and speed up of the building of rapid transit then anything else that I know of because the public and the people will demand it and that is a tendency of how it's working because there's really no money to widen or in some cases no land to widen the rest of Kenaston north of there, so from four lanes to six. So this is going too actually I think in some ways believe it or not in my view assist with getting rapid transit faster in the city.

With regards to the issue of the enviro-geothermal, I don't think this plan precludes it. The province and the ministers in fact on Broadway are very eager to experiment, if they wish to, that's definitely their opportunity to do so. This is their application. This is their development; this is them coming forward to us wanting to make this happen. They've set aside land off, letting somebody else develop it, they've chosen to keep land and develop it themselves. And, that's their choice.

Now I understand, I heard a figure, 7.5 million or something to this effect for inner city housing, well considering that right now we have a budget 1 million dollars for housing and housing renewal, that's seven times the amount. That to me is an improvement. I would like it to be more. I think we should push the province on that, but the fact of the matter is we're directing some funding back towards inner city housing.

The reality is the city; the population of the city is growing. We know that there is demand for lots in this section of the city as there is demand for lots in other parts of the city. For us to simply put the brakes on everything and say, you know, we've got to stop development would send a message that I don't think we want sent about our city, not just in Manitoba, but across Western Canada, and that's not the right thing.

I think we need to have a city which, yes, we have the unique neighbourhoods like Wolseley, we have the unique neighbourhoods like old Elmwood, we have unique neighbourhoods like downtown Transcona and old Transcona or the large lots and gravel roads in Charleswood and, yes, we have our own downtown Councillor Smith, we block it off if when we know you're coming. Anyway, the four way stops keep you out. But the reality is, you know, we have a lot of unique neighbourhoods in our city and unique characteristics and many residents of the city opt to live there.

But the fact of the matter is that also there's many residents in the city who wish to and who want to, they live in a type of home we have today, a mid-sized home they want to move up into a larger home. There are those who want to be able to purchase homes and the price of land because of the market is being driven up because of the lack of land and access to land at least in sections and part of that is artificial and that's making housing actually more inaccessible for young families and young couples who are wanting to get a start in life with regards to housing starts.

So I think, you know, all said and done is it the perfect plan, no, it's not a perfect plan. There's parts of the plan that can be improved but the plan does speak to transit. It does speak to parks and walkways and pathways throughout the plan, it does speak to, with roadways and future demand in that area.

By and large I think it's a balanced plan, this is a relatively new experience for the city to go through these extensive secondary plans, and I share a lot of the concerns raised. I want to just say that right now, Mr. speaker, a lot of the concerns raised by Councillors Benham,

Smith, Thomas and Gerbasi but to simply put the brakes on and say no we cannot go forward because it's not a perfect plan. Well, we're not going to get a perfect plan and I believe, I believe that if the province is true to their word and they're going to start to address these concerns that we've been raising then I think they will, if this development is going to make sense for them as a stakeholder.

So I'll be supporting the area structure plan here before us today knowing full well that I did not support it when we were looking at the setting aside of this land out of the Plan Winnipeg amendment that needed to take place, and would hope that with regards to other area structure plans that we have this kind of detail and debate because I think it's a healthy thing.

This is developing the future of our city in the past, to be fair. We never really had these area structure plans. You know, we just went in and started development and worried about the problems after. We're at least making an attempt now to try to address some of these issues ahead of time which is different than what has occurred in the past and that's a positive step. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves on the clause.

Councillor Steeves: Thanks Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the area, of the report as presented. I just want to caution Councillors about what's contained in the report because actually I think it's maybe not quite as bad as folks might otherwise think.

I guess I'll start off by stating that personally I probably, I probably sit somewhere between folks on for want of a better term more right side of the spectrum and folks on the more left side of the spectrum in this particular debate and I share some of the concerns as voiced by Councillor Benham and as highlighted by Jenny or by Councillor Gerbasi. I think they're actually valid concerns and a lot of what was contained in Councillor Gerbasi's speech and Councillor Benham's remarks are actually comments that do make sense, not only from a liveability community standpoint but also from a long-term fiscal sort of outlook standpoint.

The point that I think is being made that at the end of the day sprawling development that has no density at all is just more expensive to maintain by virtue of the simple fact that there's less people per acre to pay the taxes to buy the roads and the sewers and the parks and the sidewalks and what have you. That's a fair point; I think one that makes sense.

I guess what I would ask folks to look at though is in this particular plan the way it's kind of evolved is that we've essentially taken, oh, I forget the exact number, 68 million dollar total cost and that's been ratcheted back by over 20 million dollars and the flyovers have been taken away ostensibly kind of eliminating that expressway type effect to some extent which I know displeases some Councillors who are very interested in establishing the formal new expressway idea for the city because we genuinely do have a significant departure of philosophies on this Council, on this issue.

There are Councillors who are sitting in this chamber right now who are pushing very, very hard for the idea of the new expressway freeway idea. This plan wouldn't please I don't think, those folks who are very interested in that kind of I guess freeway type of model.

In fact, I think it does the opposite, it takes away the flyover component, moves it back to I think a more, a slightly more street level component and saves 23 million dollars in the process, give or take, money which doesn't have to be expended on street infrastructure which I think might please Councillor Benham in terms of his philosophy and the things that he's talking about.

So it, the irony of this I think and although Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Benham are speaking and Councillor Thomas are speaking against it, my personal I guess opinion on this report is that it actually is moving back in the other direction which I thought they might be supportive of. The couplet idea which, Mr.

Speaker, does represent some significant expense is a design that's designed to encourage based on the (in audible) that were conducted in the public consultation encourage more of a community atmosphere.

That's what exists, and I would encourage folks not to give up hope on the geothermal. Now the geothermal is an issue unto itself and I agree with Councillor Wyatt, I don't necessarily think that this particular report has a whole lot to do with that. I'm not saying geothermal is necessarily going to happen. I maintain some of the pessimism that's been mentioned. I completely sort of acknowledge that concern, I think it's a fair concern but I don't think this really shoots an arrow through the heart of the idea of geothermal.

The problem with geothermal right now I think is that the developers on the one hand are saying well it's all very well and good to say you want geothermal but if I'm going to put my house on the marketplace and I'm required to put in some type of geothermal infrastructure, obviously I have to pass that cost on to the consumer, it's going to make my house more expensive versus houses in the Maples or in North Kildonan or at Sage Creek or whatever and that's a competitive disadvantage, and they're looking to the province to some degree to offset that cost and how that story is going to end I don't think any of us really know. I think it's too early to tell.

I share Councillor Benham's wish that perhaps this story will have a happy ending because I too, would like to see geothermal go into that. I still do know that there's people at the provincial level who are working very hard to try and make that a reality because I think that is the one component that really could separate this development from other developments not only in Winnipeg but from other developments throughout I guess Canada to some degree but it's, is in peril, and it's becoming a bit of a challenge, but I think to a large degree outside, unfortunately, the ambit of this City Council and certainly in my opinion outside the ambit of what we're talking about today, just my thoughts, and I would remind that there is a significant and I think pretty progressive trail system contemplated for the grander area of Waverley West.

I mean, I'm not going to overstate it and claim it's the Shangri-la for liveable communities, but I think its way better than a lot of what has been done in the past, I think its way better. If you look at the plan it certainly has that scope of looking at a larger piece of land and saying how is this area going to develop and I have to admit if I had been the person who had any influence on the way south St. Vital developed over the course of the last 20 years I would have loved to have had that piece implemented, it just obviously didn't happen, very difficult to make it happen today, Mr. Speaker, and as Councillor Swandel reminded me we have just hooked that up or tried to hook that up through some significant funding through our community committee with Janice Lukes and the trail folks to try to bring that into the fray, so there is some work going on there.

I know that Councillor Clement has done some work on the north side to try to connect it all the way down to Ft. Whyte and then up to the Assiniboine Forest and then up to Assiniboine Park, so some positives, and I'll finish, Mr. Speaker, by acknowledging the issue of density.

Density in this area is very difficult to get a handle on. And the reason it's very, very difficult is because as these areas develop, I mean we talk about densities, five people per acre on a full rollout. We did the same thing at Sage Creek, but when you start breaking it down as to where are they going to start. Are they going to start with some of the multiple family stuff, are they going to start with some of the stand-alone, some of the commercial. I mean, it's going to ebb and flow I guess over the course of the development and how it rolls out, and I think it behoves all of us as the neighbourhood plans come forward and the additional planning components come forward to try and keep an eye on that, but I would flag the Council right now not only for this development but for

developments like Sage Creek and other developments.

It is exceedingly hard to do that and we've been trying to talk to our Property and Development Department as to how do we exactly watch that because it's all very well and good to say we expect the density of five people per acre, but, again, as the developments roll out, it's difficult to kind of watch that on a month-by-month basis and say are we there yet. That's some of the challenge. So I acknowledge some of the concerns. I would just say, Mr. Speaker that I don't think it's quite as bad as is being made out here. There are some real positive things in this report.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Any further debate on the clause? Councillor De Smedt, closing debate.

Councillor De Smedt: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Colleagues, you've all made some very interesting points. Mr. Speaker, it is always disappointing when we are entering a new paradigm and planning to find some that really want to stay back in the old model, and I'm not saying that, Mr. Speaker, in a contradictory or pejorative way, but in fact this is not the 1950's. Welcome to the new paradigm of planning. There is a partnership here.

The partnership was our Planning and Property Department, the landowners, private consultants to try and look to the future and create a model that will be not only sustainable but will be attractive and well balanced.

It isn't a perfect plan. There's no such thing in the world as a perfect plan. Somebody has already addressed that issue. It's not all that bad. I would rather that Councillor Steeves, Mr. Speaker, sort of change the words around a little bit. It's pretty darn good.

I don't think there are any bad elements in it because there is a foundation for the future. Councillor Gerbasi talked about concerns about the profits as well as Councillor Smith being diverted to this project. The fact is the profits come after the infrastructure is created. These infrastructure needs were required, and maybe it's probably wrong to focus on that, the profits will be shared or the profits will go to inner city housing from this project, it might be minimized. You note the obligation of the province, forget about the (in audible), they're just the agent of the province. Don't worry about the province.

General revenue from the province can go wherever they want it to go. They happen to have another revenue line here today for the next 25 years or how long, probably 15 to build out their neighbourhoods in the (in audible). It's a revenue line and what they have acknowledged is a very important commitment to all of Winnipeg, to all the citizens of Winnipeg, to all our taxpayers, that they recognize that they not only as a developer but as a province have an obligation to make sure that our future is founded on good economic development protocols.

And one of the ones that have been lacking in this city forever, and I think we're just on the cusp of starting it, is a proper transportation plan. Now why I said welcome to the new paradigm of planning is because we have departed from the model where you have a developer comes in with an applicant, works with the department. You get a whole bunch of comments and then you come with a plan. The department not only is academics and professionals and planning and transportation from public works, from community services and recreation and trails and parks, from water and waste and innovative land drainage, came together with a private sector to create a plan.

And I would signal to you that in the future, Mr. speaker, what we're going to see in this city, and we should see and maybe as the first city in the country, to establish what I would say are P-3's, public-private partnerships as a perpetual process for planning, for city planning, think of it, not that you eliminate your planning department, you may modify it a bit, as you enter into contractual obligations with the professionals in the community, not only in your own

department, not just at the University of Manitoba and Winnipeg and their planning departments and urban design, but with those people that are involved in investing in your community on a day-to-day basis and trying to create wealth, and they don't do it just to create wealth for themselves. They have to think of the future because they have to come back to the table and keep growing and the city is going to keep growing.

When you think about our model here in the City of Winnipeg that it is essential that we continue to create the environment that people who move in for education purposes and decide to stay for careers and create families like this community and want to stay here, and they're not into East St. Paul's number three, 38 kilometres to the north.

I mean, that's way beyond 50 years. We have the opportunity within the city of Winnipeg and our immediate boundaries to create a model for sustainable growth. Yes, it will take into account transit. Councillor Wyatt rightly pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that this will spur phase one of our southwest transit corridor. It's already, we know the model, it was a funding issue. We're going to be carving down into that district right to Waverley West and those ideas and thoughts and Mr. Speaker, I appreciate just a few more moments, can I have an extension just to conclude with your forbearance, thank you. We will create that opportunity to have transit go there in the years ahead.

We talk about density. Plan Winnipeg just doesn't say compact urban forum. Plan Winnipeg says an awful lot about balance, about growing our community. It does say something about compact urban forum, and in this area structure plan and while academically people would have liked to have had it within the area structure plan that there's got to be a trump card by somebody somewhere in the administration or some place to override the developer on a plan, that's why it was taken out so that we could have balance, so that you could have a plan come forward and the developers are cognizant of what makes the market work, so I think it is balanced.

It provides choice to people to want to continue to live in this great city and to continue to develop it both the inner city models as well as suburban models. It's too bad we have this, these two camps. You know, if this city got recreated again to start, we wouldn't build the grid system with a back alley everywhere in the west end. I know we wouldn't. It just doesn't make sense. You have a lot of problems with that. We could have created, though that kind of density in a newer context and I think that was part of the vision in Waverley West.

So Mr. Speaker, I think on balance we have a very good plan. We are maintaining the integrity of what we see and Mr. Speaker, it's not as Councillor Steeves had indicated as an expressway freeway. An expressway is not a freeway. It does have some interveil stops and the only change we made in map three is the flyovers are now an intersection, but the integrity of the expressway exists. I know I'm going on but you know this has been such an important issue and everybody else has spoken. That's fine. Can you jump up and down, Councillor Gerbasi. I've heard you speak here now for eight years. It's my turn to conclude and I will.

Mr. Speaker: Please do that.

Councillor De Smedt: I am. I'm going to sum up. I've done it. I think we've been very fortunate that we've had the ability to work together with many partners, with the province that's come on board and I think I would like to now at this point in time ask that we come together. I would appreciate unanimity for a well-balanced area structure plan for Waverley West.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor, debate is closed on the clause.

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote please.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry?

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote please.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. We'll take a record vote on the clause. All in favour of clause one, 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, Swandel, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Eadie.

Nays

Councillors Benham, Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas.

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

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried. We move to, there's a couple of motions here. No, there aren't. Sorry. There aren't any. Bylaws, Councillor De Smedt.

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

Councillor De Smedt: Yes, the first one Mr. Speaker would be on Waverley West, so I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 10/2006, by-law to adopt the secondary plan for Waverley West be read a second time as amended.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That's carried.

Clerk: By-law 10/2006.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 10/2006 be read a third time and the same passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That is carried. Other By-laws, Councillor.

Councillor De Smedt: I would like to move By-laws No. 183/2006, 184/2006, 185/2006, 186/2006, 187/2006, 188/2006, 189/2006, 190/2006, 191/2006, 192/2006, 196/2006, 197/2006, 198/2006, 199/2006, 201/2006 and 202/2006 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 183/2006, 184/2006, 185/2006, 186/2006, 187/2006, 188/2006, 189/2006, 190/2006, 191/2006, 192/2006, 196/2006, 197/2006, 198/2006, 199/2006, 201/2006 and 202/2006.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that Bylaws No. 183/2006 to 192/2006 both inclusive and 196/2006 to 199/2006 both inclusive and 201/2006 and 202/2006 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 183/2006 to 192/2006 both inclusive and 196/2006 to 199/2006 both inclusive and 201/2006 and 202/2006.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 183/2006 to 192/2006 both inclusive and 196/2006 to 199/2006 both inclusive and 201/2006 and 202/2006 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That's carried. Any questions for Property and Development? Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED APRIL 10, 2006

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker regarding the report of April 10, 2006, I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items number 2.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd like to stand that down please.

Mr. Speaker: Can you just, yeah. I've just been advised according to our procedure there's an Executive Policy Committee recommendation which is not an amendment but if the Standing Committee recommendation was not approved then the Executive Committee recommendation could be moved in its place but right now we're only dealing with the Standing Committee recommendation from the community. You know our procedures so, E.P.C. can't amend the clause.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order Mr. Speaker. I thought we usually debate the Executive Policy Committee recommendation on a Standing Committee report.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I seem to recall that it was ruled at one point that Executive Committee can't amend a recommendation from a Standing Committee, but that it would be considered as a, if the main recommendation of the Standing Committee was not approved then the E.P.C. recommendation would be moved in its place, Councillor O'Shaughnessy on this.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: The precedent I believe Mr. Speaker, is just that, that there's no second debating of the E.P.C. motion. If anyone wants to mention the merits or lack thereof of the E.P.C. opinion they do it during their one speaking time. You don't start the whole procedure over again on the second recommendation if the first one fails.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I must have missed that. I didn't, wasn't, are you saying that the Executive Policy Committee motion was already passed.

Mr. Speaker: No. It's not.

Councillor Gerbasi: So, we haven't yet debated anything.

Mr. Speaker: No. The main debate, the motion, the, there's been a bit of a change in the way we do things here but the motion that we're actually dealing with is the recommendation of the Standing Committee, but Executive Committee has made a different recommendation which I'll accept the advice of my predecessor and we can talk about during the discussion. If the Standing Committee's recommendation was not approved, then the Executive Committee recommendation could be moved in its place, but right now we're only dealing with the Standing Committee recommendation which we will have to vote on.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Could we support both because actually they do two totally different things? I'm really confused now.

Mr. Speaker: We'll deal with the report of the Standing Committee and the recommendation of the Standing Committee of Property and Development, sorry, of Protection and Community Services. That's the voteable item right at this moment.

Councillor Steeves: Just so we're clear Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, at the end of everyone's speeches, we'll be voting firstly on the P.C.S. recommendations and if it fails then we vote on the E.P.C. recommendation?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: We're still discussing both items.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I'm sorry if I didn't make that clear. Even I get confused on occasion.

Councillor Steeves: Let me just begin by

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves introducing the clause.

Councillor Steeves: Let me just begin by saying jiminy crickets, Mr. Speaker. This doesn't feel familiar and in any event, I'll try to lay this out as plainly as possible. This issue has some of its genesis, maybe not all of its genesis but some of its genesis in the, in the panhandling debate I think in recent history in any event and I should say the panhandling debate seems to be one of those debates

that surfaces innumerable times at a variety of different context depending on the, depending upon the issue. That's distracting.
The Protection and Community Services Committee had embarked I guess with administration on a original plan which wasn't a bad plan in my estimation to work with the province and the Social Planning Council to I guess and the motion is, the recommendation at that time is fairly self-explanatory, to work with the Social Planning Council to identify key stakeholders and commence discussions regarding the identification of inner sect oral process and implementation plan for the purpose of returning a collaborative comprehensive community property reduction strategy for Winnipeg and then to report back.

We were to I guess; appoint political representation to engage in that inner sect oral process which would determine a comprehensive property reduction strategy.

The, that I guess left at some point our committee and wound up on the agenda of the Executive Policy Committee as per the normal course, Mr. Speaker, and for better or for worse, and I guess we're going to hear folks' opinion on this today, it evolved into something that is different, but I'm not exactly sure that it's, it's substantially different in the eventual intent I suppose is about as near as I can place it.

The Executive Policy recommendation which incidentally is the recommendation that I would hope that Council would be supporting at this chamber today, talks at its core to engage in a process that is already under way, Mr. Speaker. Part of the issue, as everyone here understands and has understood for many years on City Council is that while everybody in this chamber appreciates that poverty is an important issue to us as Councillors and to the citizens that we represent, it is I think probably based on our administrative structure one of the more difficult areas, clearly an exciting speech I'm giving here, Mr. Speaker, that it's one of the more difficult issues that is, that is, it is one of the more difficult issues that a city has an ability to address I suppose and the reasons for that is because I guess at some point prior to in the recent history of the city, a lot of our, I guess a lot of our administrative capacity from a social perspective was uploaded to the provincial government and I think if you combine that reality with a more recent reality of our contraction of our administrative forces there might be a sense that this indeed is from a civic perspective alone a very, very difficult issue to tackle, and I think that the sense coming out of our administration, coming from some Councillors, maybe not all, is that this is the type of issue where we desperately need partners.

We desperately need partners in this type of issue. So the new recommendation from the Executive Policy Committee I guess leans in the direction of fortuitously hooking on to the poverty reduction council which has been started by the United Way of Winnipeg and that we provide some funding to a maximum of 45,000 dollars from our existing operating budget and that we direct our administration to work with the United Way of Winnipeg given that a cross sect oral approach is in keeping with the approach the city of Winnipeg considers the most effective in addressing the effects of poverty.

Now I can tell you that I've got some information on this process of the United Way and this is the information I have. The United Way of Winnipeg is investing 2 million dollars in addressing poverty in its core through things like neighbourhood development, strengthening communities by supporting local community economic initiatives, some of the things we've heard about today, funding money management and asset building programmes, supporting social service enterprises and working with policy makers to remove barriers and this has been done by learning from neighbourhood groups such as the Marlene Street Tenants Association, I know very well in St. Vital, the Greenway Resident's Association and additionally the United Way I understand has hired people with a background with experience in community economic development as well as with

knowledgeable volunteers to advise and work with the United Way on poverty reduction strategies.

And thirdly the United Way convenes annual community economic development conference that brings practitioners together and provides a forum that enables them to identify areas where action is needed.

The needs identify that the gathering or followed up by steering committee which reports back on action taken in subsequent forums which offers opportunities for network and learning collection action about further economic, community economic development in Winnipeg.

So, this process is happening Mr. Speaker, it's not something we did. It's not something that we've initiated. It's happening and it's going ahead and it looks quite credible, I have to say from where we're standing. So, rather than go with the original Standing Committee recommendation, which states that the Social Planning Council be requested to do essentially probably the exact same work that we hook onto this process which I'm certain would probably include the Social Planning Council and then we can all to a larger extent work together on this very, very important issue. I mean at its core, we're either going to have this process going ahead or we're going to have this process going ahead and our other process going ahead at the same time. And I guess that's the fundamental choice that we as a Council will have to make or decide on what recommendation we want to support.

My suggestion would be that we get involved in the process that's already moving along and already happening and is I guess quarterbacked by the United Way which I think we all agree is a very, very credible organization. So, I guess with that Mr. Speaker, I'll wait to hear concerns from folks, I acknowledge that it's been a difficult process but I hope folks acknowledge back that from an administrative standpoint these are difficult ones to manage because there's no clear nexus in our administration with respect to poverty reduction and who exactly do you call on and how do you stir the forces.

The beautiful thing about this process I would think is I would imagine there's a larger process that's going to exist, there's a greater brain trust, there's going to be a greater conglomeration of people and they'll know exactly what they need to access from the city of Winnipeg and we are going to be directing by vote number three, we're going to be directing our, in number four, directing our administration to fall into step with that. So, there's a big city process going on right now. It looks like a credible process; it looks like a process with some, with some real backing both from a human resource standpoint and a financial standpoint.

Our suggestion is, let's get on board. Let's offer whatever we can offer as a civic administration and lets help out and at the end of the day we might have a process that involves everybody including the Social Planning Council and I'll conclude by saying, I want to thank the Social Planning Council for the work that they did in leading up to this point. I mean it should be acknowledged that I guess as a standard give and take in too and fro of civic politics sometimes we ask people to do work, they do work in good faith and we don't always use all that work that may well be one of these cases and for that, I sincerely apologize on behalf of all of that.

But I hope that now we can all kind of get together and say this looks like a good process, this looks like a good direction, there is not a king's ransom but some funding that we're putting behind it. It shows good faith on behalf of all of Council. I trust we can some have some support Mr. Speaker; I'll stand down and listen for comments and questions.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Thomas you have a point of order.

Councillor Thomas: Yes, I wish to rise on a point of order Mr. Speaker because the recommendations of Executive Policy Committee are quite different from the

recommendations of the Standing Policy Committee and I want neither of those to be lost, I would like it to be considered a separate question under Rule 46 of our procedures so that we do not lose the intention of either of the committees. So under number 46, I wish for purposes of debate for these to be regarded as separate questions so we can debate both.

Mr. Speaker: Well Councillor, Council has already agreed to deal with them in a package the way, that's how we're proceeding right now and asked for the advice of Council and that's what I got back. So, I do thank you for pointing that out to me, but I'm proceeding now on the basis of what I had some general agreement. So, let's just go with that. Councillor Gerbasi please.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was a bit thrown off by the procedural changes that don't make any sense to me and still don't but I'll take your word for it but it does create a new twist and a new possibility on what we can do as a Council because you know I didn't have any problem with giving a 45,000 dollar donation to the United Way, I think that's great that we can come up with 45,000 dollars for United Way. I'm happy to support the process that they're working on and then we can also still support the Standing Committee effort which was very different than what the United Way is doing because the Standing Committee process that we've been recommending has to do with looking at what the city does specifically in terms of city services, transit, recreation, all those kinds of things like what we did with the Municipal Aboriginal Pathways Strategy.

So, if that's what E.P.C. was thinking that we can also help the United Way in their effort and we can even go further with both efforts you know, I've got no problem with that. However, I'm not sure the world is so far of love, trust and pixie dusts because I don't really believe that was the intent of any of this.

However, I would first like to say that if the intent of E.P.C. is to stop the process that the Standing Policy Committee was bringing forward which I believe it is based on the comments from Councillor Steeves, I think that's a very approach, I have a lot of problems with because that approach does show a great deal of disrespect to the grassroots organizations, such as the Social Planning Council, in spite of Councillor Steeves very kind words today.

The fact of the matter is that the Standing Committee worked on this issue for months and months, heard delegations, came to a conclusion of an appropriate approach, worked with the administration, came to a conclusion that we should take an approach similar to the Municipal Aboriginal Pathways Strategy, work with the province, get the province really involved and look at what is the city does in relation to poverty and basically E.P.C. is really asking us today, not to support both initiatives, but to dismiss the Standing Policy Committee's approach.

So, I really think that's what's really going on here and I'm not going to be fooled by this kind of game playing that's going on. I've lost track of how many meetings the Standing Committee spent listening to the public, coming up, doing this work and coming up with these suggestions.

So I hope that people will continue to support that. And I would ask if Councillor Steeves in fact had so much respect for the Social Planning Council and so much respect for the members of his committee. Why did he not mention to any of us in the months and months and months we've been waiting to get a political decision, because this isn't a administrative report, or an administrative decision, it was laid over for months at E.P.C. waiting for a political decision, why did he not tell us that they were discussing things with the United Way and you know why even have a Standing Policy Committee that is making, doing all this work when E.P.C. already has the answers.

I mean that's not treating the Standing Policy Committee or the Social Planning Council with respect. We might as well be invisible, so, I mean its nice words today, but actions speak louder than words and I

don't find a, the way the chair of the committee has treated his committee or the public that came to speak to his committee, to be respectful.

Okay, excuse me a moment, I had to completely rewrite my speech, I almost think someone read in my computer and knew what I said because they sure found a good way to make me have to rewrite it without changing any of the facts of the matter.

One wonders why, if the Mayor and E.P.C., if they aren't interested in supporting the work of their Standing Policy Committee, if they don't respect the process of having citizens come forward, have community groups come forward and have those people put together a plan and bring that forward, if they just want to replace that at the last minute with an election hearing kind of grant that's good news for everybody, that came from no where.

You know maybe then we shouldn't have Standing Policy Committees and maybe they should be changing the Charter because you know I'm, I think we're all getting tired of all this b.s.

And what really bothers me, Mr. Speaker, what really bothers me Mr. Speaker is the way the Social Planning Council has been treated in this, the Social Planning Council is a group that has provided excellent research and advocacy about these issues that affect the most vulnerable of our society for years and they didn't know what was happening, they sat there at the E.P.C. meeting and were totally surprised by this motion as much as we all were.

So, and again I reiterate, I'm very pleased to support and I will be voting to give the 45,000 dollar grant to the United Way but I would like to ask some questions that perhaps the chair can answer when he closes debate. Where in the current operating budget is the 45,000 dollars going to come from, number one. Two, why is there suddenly money available during an election campaign to do a quick fix to make this poverty issue go away which is what I really believe this is about, although, you know it will certainly help people to spend that money. And where is the accountability, will there be a process or mechanism for the United Way to report back to Council and let us know how this strategy affects us, you know, how is this connected to Council of the future and I think that needs to be clarified and answered by the chair. So, I would appreciate that very much.

But, my biggest concern if we only pass the grant to the United Way and not the Standing Policy motion is that, what are we really doing about poverty. The piece that's missing in the United Way and their process is very, very valid. They are service organization, they are going to be providing more services, they're going to be determining gaps and services that the community can provide which is very, very valuable and I'm supporting giving them more money. But the idea of creating a municipal poverty action committee was to look specifically at the City of Winnipeg's role in areas that affect lower income people and city services like recreation, transit, housing and policing issues.

For example, when Winnipeg became the first city in Canada to establish a Municipal Aboriginal Strategy, the idea was to establish some city policy around municipal activities that affect aboriginal people. Aboriginal issues are also multi sect oral issues, but with that focus on the municipal part of the picture, a lot was accomplished and the MAPS strategy was fully endorsed and accepted by Council and has been implemented as positive things have happened in a complex issue that inter sect oral and involves other levels of government because the city focus on what the city does and that's what we need a poverty action committee to do.

So, in closing I'm sure the United Way will do an excellent job. I'm happy to support giving them an additional grant. I would like to know some more details about where it's coming from and how the accountability process will flow on that. But I would ask the question, once the election is over, how much of a priority will this Council continue to put on this issue. I would point out that for citizens of

Winnipeg, the issue of poverty and social equity is a hugely important issue. It's not at the bottom of the list, its high on the list for citizens. They are concerned about this.

And I really am disappointed with the shenanigans of the chair of our committee by pulling out some new motion out of a hat, a week before Council, dismissing the work of its own committee without giving us a heads up, without giving the committee groups a heads up that was in the works. This is all politics, it's not an administrative report, the administration has done nothing wrong here.

But in closing I will be supporting the United Way grant and I will also be supporting the Standing Policy Committee recommendation so that we can actually get moving and have a poverty reduction strategy for our city that makes some sense and causes some action. So, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham on the clause please.

Councillor Benham: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and I certainly agree with the comments by Councillor Gerbasi and echo her comments that I'm quite disappointed in the chair of our committee in some of the things he said, we need partners, well the initial motion that he should support the initial motion that came from that committee because that's what talks about partnership. The motion as originally passed talked about, in fact its been altered somewhat, I'd like to go back to the original motion that we passed and partly in response to Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee in which we proposed to establishing a poverty action committee under the leadership of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg.

So they are part of that process, they've been doing this across Canada with other social planning councils, they were very generous about their time and their support, they came to us and what's the response Mr. Speaker, it's a slap across the face. It's quite disingenuous of Councillor Steeves to thank the Social Planning Council for everything they've done.

What kind of thanks have we given them. Well we've diddled them twice Mr. Speaker, it came before us in committee and Councillor Steeves as chair of the committee was there and we heard from the Social Planning Council they had been told the report, the administration report would make a certain recommendation and in the week between the time they were consulted in the report was published, the report was changed, the Social Planning Council wasn't informed and so they were put on the report as having been consulted and having concurred in a recommendation that they didn't.

So, the relationship between this City Council and the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg is, has been put in real jeopardy, in real jeopardy by the actions of Councillor Steeves, the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee.

The original motion called for representatives of poverty action committee and you'll note that we're talking about action, although reduction is also a good goal would have included representatives from the Social Planning Council, other organizations involved in poverty and social issues, that could easily include the United Way of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, and no, I'm not going to fall into the trap of somehow back handily attacking the United Way of Winnipeg, I have tremendous respect for the United Way and I've been a volunteer for the United Way.

It would have included at least two Councillors, one of whom on Executive Policy Committee and one of whom not. What is the proposal here, the Executive Policy Committee, no mention of Council representation, no direct involvement by elected leaders in the issue of poverty. That was part of the original idea, that's been lost.

At least one representative of the provincial government, where is the province in all of this. We hear consistently from members of the E.P.C.

whenever it comes to anything, oh, it's the province's responsibility, it's the province's responsibility and particularly if it has anything to do with social issues, Mr. Speaker and now we don't even include the province in this. Maybe the province will be a member of the poverty reduction council, maybe it won't be, but that will be up to the United Way of Winnipeg Mr. Speaker, our opportunity to reach a hand out to the province and to work together with our provincial colleagues and provincial government representatives has been lost and less, while in fact it's been lost a long way of these other motions.

But, I would say the original motion was better. It would have had a least one Winnipeg Police Service officer because the original motion was to do with panhandling, the very strict enforcement approach we were taking to panhandling and the notion that some of us on City Council had, that there are social causes of poverty, that there are things that go wrong and that we as City Councillors should understand that and be part of the solution and we know that there are police issues involved. It's not solely a police issue, not by any means but it is good to have them involved and then other members would have been agreed upon by City Council and the Social Planning Council.

Well, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker the, Councillor Steeves again in a very disingenuous way talks about how there's no clear nexus in the original motion, there's no clear nexus into the administration, well in fact Mr. Speaker there was, because the City of Winnipeg would have been establishing the poverty action committee. With this motion, with the E.P.C. motion, the poverty reduction strategy, we have no interface with city of Winnipeg bureaucrats at all. Our public servants are completely shut out of the process.

So, Councillor Steeves while standing up and claiming that he hears about this issue and wants to take action, has in fact completely had a part, the very valuable work of our committee, the very valuable work we did at listening to the community, the very valuable work that was done by the Social Planning Council, which has been slapped in the face, not once but twice by Councillor Steeves, the Mayor and E.P.C. and I say Mr. Speaker, that I'm happy that our procedures shows that we can have, our procedure allows us to vote for the motion.

I'd like to go back to the original motion that actually had members of the poverty action committee but as a second best I will take the motion that came out of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services over the E.P.C. motion any day as I agreed if we want to give 45,000 dollars to the United Way, that's just fine by me, Mr. Speaker, but lets not pretend that's its anything like the poverty action committee that we originally envisioned.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for the original motion as passed by the Standing Policy Committee, or the second motion as been passed by the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I feel like Alice in Wonderland today and I feel this is a very serious blunder. The Red River Basin Commission of which the city is a member, of which the city provided funding for and sends a Council representative to, does not mean we do not have a Riverbank Management Committee.

We do not advocate the city's responsibility in order to support another initiative and this could have been a serious second step forward for our MAPS proposal.

As it was said in the MAP document, that there is a significant number of aboriginal people living within our city that are living within poverty and it's a serious issue that we have to address in order to move forward on economic development initiatives, on the education initiatives, on so many initiatives that were in that level and I applaud the committee of Protection and Community Services for their hard work on that and I am frustrated at some

of the rulings that have been occurring here today because to say that we need one or the other, its like saying, you can walk, but you're only allowed one shoe. The other foot does not come on (in audible), that's pretty silly.

And, I'm not going to accept the dichotomy that has been proposed for us here today because I'm not going to go hobbling along on one foot. I believe in the importance of yes, and I can really speak to that because I've had an opportunity to hobble around on one foot, it's not very nice, you need crutches. So why would we, why would we hobble around on one foot when, and look for some sort of crutches when we really should provide our self with the appropriate support internally.

That does not mean we don't send financial support or that we don't become involved in the United Way's efforts, I laud that but to say that we do that instead of looking at these issues, it's a crisis, we are the leaders of this city. Let's not be the followers of the city. Let's step forward and actually be the leaders of the city and lead in an initiative.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith, please.

Councillor Smith: Yes, I'd like to urge all my colleagues to support this feeble effort of the Executive Policy Committee. It is feeble, really feeble. 45,000 dollars is what we're going to do to cure the poverty situation in Winnipeg. That's, that's insane. In effect we're saying we're doing nothing or almost nothing. You know, 45,000, what is that going to do.

There are many things that we can do to deal with poverty in Winnipeg, recreational services. You know, you have to write a letter to get a reduction in a fee for one of our recreational facilities and Mr. Mirecki goes over these, eh, right. There was supposed to be by the way a report from him about a new procedure and we still haven't have it a year later.

What I'm saying here is this, we can do a lot of things to deal with people with poverty in this city to ease their burden and this is sort of like, as I say almost doing nothing. But let's support the feeble effort of the Executive Policy Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel on the clause, please.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether I'm supposed to yell loud, take my shoe off or what am I suppose to do to make a point in this chamber, but, yes I believe in this chamber we actually should be a poverty action committee.

The fact that we have to stand here and say that we need a poverty action committee to me is ridiculous. We, on every given day, whether it be at committee or here in the chamber, we do things to address poverty. The best example recently was the bringing forward of monies for our community centres where we very deliberately and specifically identified the inner city as a place to spend more money because of the need there. We do it with transit; we do it with free days at the zoo. We do it all over the place. We try to address poverty on a regular basis.

You know, I'm certainly supportive of giving the United Way more money. I'm also supportive of the recommendation that came out of Protection and Community Services. I actually think the two kind of dovetail and what I would do I would be moving the money forward to the United Way, maybe going back to Community Services to see if you can make the two pieces dovetail a little bit more rather than just abandoning one. But, you know, in the name of all that's decent let's recognize ourselves as a poverty action committee and stand up and know that we should be a poverty action committee on any given day and just get this thing moving forward.

Create the United Way committee and take the intent and spirit of what was done at Protection and Community Services and try and bring it together in a way that works with this as opposed to maybe standing up and destroying it today and I don't know that that's what's going to happen, but I think maybe referring that piece back to have it

dovetail more with the monies in the committee that's being created through the United Way might be a better way to go.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not going to speak today, but I just have to because of what is happening I think were just getting carried away. Members of Council, some of you should be ashamed.

We are talking about poverty in the city of Winnipeg. Both of these concerns address the issue of poverty. Regardless who, whether the Social Planning Council or the United Way or we as the administrators that we have in place now, will be dealing with the recommendations that come from the Executive Policy Committee. This motion that's before us now, the clause, originated from the Community Committee of Lord Selkirk - West Kildonan. Last year, that motion was introduced by the Community Committee, Councillor Pagtakhan was the mover of that motion at the Community Committee, which I supported. Now what has happened here? Council's going to take their shoes off.

I would like some Councillor to take their pants down too, at the same time. So, you do it, you're younger. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, and you're more handsome. You're more handsome and you have a nicer body. Mr. Speaker, what has to happen here is we have to proceed and go in the direction, regardless who, the problem will not go away if we start bickering back and forth, back and forth.

We can grand stand here all we want, poverty is there. And whether it's the Social Planning Council, they understand this, United Way understands this, they will talk, communicate with the interested people that are concerned about poverty in the City of Winnipeg.

Whether it's the Standing Committee's recommendation, I support and I support also the Executive Policy Committee's recommendation. To me it doesn't make a difference. We're trying to address the issue of poverty in Winnipeg. If we have given directions to our administrators to proceed, is what E.P.C. is recommending, they will do so. If it means they have to go talk with the Social Planning Council, they will do so. If they have to talk with, continue talking and holding table talks with other interested, they will do so. We give directions, 45,000 dollars is a start.

If the Community Committee of Lord Selkirk - West Kildonan would have proceeded with this, this would not be on the issue here today. Which Members of Council would have moved that as a motion. When I hear and I have to go back to this again, comments being made, some of them are just ridiculous comments by Members of Council, I'll do this, I'll do this, what do I have to do, this is not the way to go, the direction should be going. Our chairperson of the Standing Committee is correct. You can go ahead and cut in between the corners, cut between the lines that the chair has talked about but it's all, leads to one thing, poverty.

Address the issue of poverty in the City of Winnipeg and Winnipeg is not the only one. Selkirk, Manitoba has the problem. Brandon has, Portage La Prairie has the same problem. There is poverty at all times. There's poverty we have in the City of Winnipeg that we don't even hear of. How many seniors have you got now that are well over the 70 years or close to 80 years of age are living in a house all by themselves. They get their Meals on Wheels delivered to them daily.

And I went one time, and I saw some of the people who were high profile, one member, former Member of Council was getting that service Mr. Speaker, because the person ended being all alone, had no one, no family member to help and we were providing that help.

So when you talk about people that are poverty, it's not when you take a look down Main Street or Portage Avenue, go down some of the other areas especially in the north end. Sure you see poverty, but the poverty you see is visible, what about the poverty that you don't see, that are shut-ins. They cannot get outside. They depend on help from various

agencies such as United Way is there. Salvation Army is there. Social Planning Council is there. So what the hell are we talking about, trying to bicker back and forth to decide which is better, which one is not. Which I.D. is better, which I.D. is not better.

The one thing that we have to do is address the issue and this is going in the right direction. Whether it is the Standing Committee's recommendation or the Executive Policy Committee, I'm supporting both, because I have no alternative, because the first one is the recommendation to come from our Community Committee, but failing to get that I'll be supporting the Executive Policy Committee's recommendation. And I want to thank every Member of Council that participated in this problem we have, that we've taken a lead role to say we have to get on with this. Let's get on with it now, not to keep waiting and waiting until September, waiting until November, wait until next year, wait until the next election and election after that.

This is what has been happening in these chambers, Mr. Speaker. Of all the years that I've been here, Councillor O'Shaughnessy is another one back here in the 70's, we had the same problem. Every time the problem was supposed to be addressed there was always someone standing up and ridiculing or condemning it or saying this is not right.

Let's work together for a change. Let's work together, stay on one wave length on this issue. There is a problem out there. It's easy to say some people who are making a 100,000 dollars a year, they don't have no problems. There's some making $50,000 a year, you'd think they don't have no problems but sometimes they do. It all depends what their lifestyle is like. Depends on the sickness that may be in that family, may have a sick child or a sick husband or wife or sick mother and father, all that costs money with the high costs of medication now.

These are the things we have to look at. United way are capable of addressing the issue. Social Planning Council also qualified to look at these issues and come in with a positive recommendation that they can talk to the provincial government, also to the federal government. They have a responsibility, shouldn't be only to the City of Winnipeg. Where is the province and the federal government when you talk about health issues, when you talk about poverty. They concentrate on one thing, the person who is making 200,000 dollars a year, therefore they will be paying about 80,000 dollars a year in taxes, I mean in personal income tax, which I have said before, for every 50 dollars that that person pays into the personal income tax, 30 dollars goes to the feds, 20 dollars goes to the province and the City of Winnipeg gets a lousy 44 cents.

Therefore, where is the equality? Where's to say that we're on a level playing field with the other two levels of government and then when it come in to such an issue as poverty they say City of Winnipeg, do something now. Act on it right now and don't wait until later on. But we need that threshold, Mr. Speaker that will go on, that'll start now. That it'll go whether to the United Way or whether it's, whether it's the Social Planning Council.

We'll take that lead role and hold table talks with the other two levels of government. Hold table talks with the other stake holders. There's a lot of wealthy people in the province of Manitoba especially in Winnipeg that would be willing, more than willing to participate with this situation that we have now, the problem.

Get a program. Get a program in place that everyone will qualify, whether it's the young, old or those who are using this game as being poor, I need 25 cents or need a dollar because I need to go and get something. You give them food they say no I want money.

I was in Ukraine, Mr. Speaker, and all I saw there, you have those gypsies. Gypsies, the beggars, they would be there and they'd say give me money, give me money. I said I'll give you something to eat. They threw it down, don't want that. The child was not crying but when I said the child is not crying, I didn't need

the blanket that the child was covered with they took their pinkie toes, twisted a toe until the baby started to cry and screaming and said, my baby is hungry, give me food. These are the kind of people you have to deal with. These people are not what you call poverty. They are working like prostitutes. The pimp sits there and he's collecting the money when they come in, they take another baby to go out on the street to pedal themselves.

Now, this is not what you call poverty. That's being, abusing a human life, exploitation of children. We've got that here. Every other country has the same problem. So Mr. Speaker, I want Council to get on with this, what we have and let's not bicker back and forth what this one can do and what this one can say. I support the chair of the committee and I'll support the Executive Policy Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lubosch on the clause, please.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting that in my eleven years here we haven't had so much debate about poverty, and it hasn't become a focal point at all really, up until now and I'm looking at this from a positive perspective. I think it's healthy to have this debate and I think while we're having this debate, we also need to be very mindful of the fact that when we're talking about people and their situations in life, that people that don't have a lot, in particular, in my experience, children, with my work at Knowles Centre, who come into this world not asking to be born into poverty or thrust into it by their circumstances and end up there, I think we need to be mindful that we don't make political pawns out of these people who are largely anonymous to us because of the very nature of poverty.

The very nature of poverty is that it's a very personal issue to people who are poor, ultimately, and not one that concerns a lot of people who are not poor. Most people don't spend a lot of time thinking about those people who don't have enough to eat or don't have a place to live, or can't find work and we go about our daily lives, some of us appreciating our lives and our situation in life, more than others. But ultimately, poor people, whether they're kids or whether they're adults, don't tend to register on the political radar, whether it's municipal, provincial or federal, until things get really bad, or until somehow the issue comes into being both.

And I think we need to be careful that we don't, we don't politic with this issue but that we continue to remain sincere in our efforts to try to make Winnipeg not one of the have not cities where abject poverty is becoming more and more visible but one of the cities where we ultimately follow the motto that we have in our city plan and that is that we want to be a vibrant and healthy city that includes everybody and gives everybody an opportunity and I know that the Mayor in particular, every time I've heard him speak very eloquently and very sincerely, whether it's at a function before he was Mayor or whether it was as Mayor, he references his roots and the fact that he and his family came here with modest beginnings and worked hard and elevated their position, both in terms of their social status and ultimately, where they are today. And I think that could be said for many people who came to this country and everybody should have that opportunity.

I'm going to be supporting this clause because I'm encouraged that even though it's not a lot of money, even though it's not an ultimate solution, there is no ultimate solution. There needs to be many more initiatives like this and we need to build on this initiative and we need to grow from this initiative and we need to show leadership and set examples for other levels of government with this initiative because ultimately, this problem is not going to go away by itself and it's going to take many small initiatives like this one and the cumulative growth of these initiatives and momentum of these initiatives in order to ultimately get this very serious challenge not just under control but eradicated.

I have read about other cities, Vancouver and Toronto, which have tried various programs in the areas of drug addiction

and homelessness and child welfare, and to a significant extent these programs have been successful. And they had their Genesis just like this, politicians started talking about them and taking them seriously, and ultimately, that gets the creative juices flowing and eventually, we'll find our niche and we'll get better and better at addressing the issue and ultimately resolve it and Winnipeg will become the better place and hopefully the best place in the country to live.

I'm hoping that the rest of you will also support this initiative even though it may not be entirely your idea even though the evolution of the clause may not have been entirely perfect. It's a challenging issue and we need to ultimately put our differences and to some extent our egos aside and ultimately get to work in helping this city rebuild.

We've got an election on the horizon. I'm hoping that issues like this will become defined more sharply during the campaigns that all of us or most of us are going to be working on, and I'm hoping that the next Council will continue the good work that previous Councils have attempted to get kick started, and that we're going to get this and many of our other challenges under control.

And so with that I'm going to close debate. I know that the Social Planning Council and the other nonprofit organizations are looking with keen interest to see what we're going to do with this. Even though this might not be their ultimate solution either, but at least it's a step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker and it gets the door opened. It's the first time we've even had this debate on this level and we need to move forward and get on with the business of healing our city. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Katz on the clause.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's anybody on the floor of Council who believes that poverty is not an issue and housing is not an issue and regardless of which level of government may have the primary responsibility, I'd like to believe we all acknowledge, and I know I certainly have on many occasions, that the City of Winnipeg has a role to play.

And, you know, it's, this might have been an opportunity for us to come together with a plan that makes sense and I certainly agree this doesn't have to be one verses the other. But I mean I certainly support the United Way initiative. I'm convinced by listening today what some Councillors have said I don't believe they really know how much work and for how long a period of time that United Way has been working and been proactive on the issue of poverty.

As many of us may recall, the Social Planning Council came forward and asked for 50,000 dollars so they could do some work on this and for some of you who haven't maybe read it thoroughly, this initiative from United Way actually calls for 90,000 dollars and they're going to the province for the other half and as Councillor Smith suggested, giving more money, be happy to give more money but by the same token I think we all want to see the province play its part as well.

But, I think what we're all forgetting here, Mr. Speaker, is that, and unfortunately, I can understand why some of the comments have been made because quite often, when you don't know all the details, some of us do get suspicious and assume the worst. I believe this is too serious a subject for anybody, an elected official to play games with. I have no doubt in my mind that the United Way will have input/representation from the Social Planning Council or Harvest, or the other organizations that should be played. But when you can bring those organizations together with a very credible organization, that basically is only there to solve a problem, has no other agenda whatsoever and can also, and you know you can talk about government all you want, but don't think for a moment that the private sector doesn't have a role to play in solving poverty as well, just as it does with housing. When you can bring all those together, it's a great formula for success and you know what, it's funny, I have not been here as long as some esteemed Councillors here whether it's

been 30 years or 11 years, but it sounds to me like this has been an issue that's been around for a long time, and not a whole lot has been done.

Well, for the first time we have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to start with one very positive step. So let's just hope and see if all Council can work together because I believe everybody here knows there's a problem and let's start doing something about it and I think that the proposal that came forward, having the United Way lead this initiative is a very positive step. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to thank my colleagues for the words thus far especially Councillor Lubosch and Mr. Mayor. I think this definitely is a step in the right direction and I for one can certainly appreciate what it's like to live below the poverty line.

As a leader, supporter and donor of the United Way, I will be supporting the clause coming out of Executive Policy Committee. I think it's a good clause and I think the United Way being a very credible organization with a very broad support across the city. I think can really, I think can take a really good first stab at doing poverty reduction across the city. So, with that I'll just, I want it keep my comments brief in terms of supporting the clause coming out of Executive Policy Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves, closing debate.

Councillor Steeves: Thanks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is a philosophical battle raging on this Council right now and I think it has a lot to do with what we think we can reasonably do as a Council and this issue is front and centre, isn't it.

I listened to Councillor Thomas and Councillor Gerbasi speak about how we should be involved in all these things and we should be doing this and we should be doing that and we should set up this parallel process as well as going to the other process. I would remind those two Councillors of this, throughout the course of an 8/10 year period, they stewarded over a fiscal strategy whereby revenues coming into the City of Winnipeg and people we employ were slashed and cut at a rate, the likes of which we have never seen in the history of the City of Winnipeg. That is a reality and sometimes we forget that.

Over the course of the Murray administration which was spearheaded to the largest extent by Councillor Thomas and Councillor Gerbasi, two of the closest people to former Mayor Murray, the civic administrative staff moved from 11,000 to 8,000 people. Our administrative capacity was radically diminished during that time frame.

All of those cuts were rationalized and supported and brought forward, Mr. Speaker, by Councillor Jenny Gerbasi and Councillor Thomas, to one extent or another. And we can laugh and we can deny it but there is no denying both of those Councillors were members of the Executive Policy Committee throughout that time.

So, of course they are not the only Councillors. There was a decision that was made by Council, and I'm not exempting myself but you'll notice, you'll notice that I don't speak critically about those days nor do I try to say I wasn't a part of them. Because at its heart, Mr. Speaker, what's happening here is our administration is saying to us this is an important issue, we want to try to help, but, let's not over promise, Mr. Speaker.

Let's not over promise on what we can accomplish in this area right now. There is a unique opportunity that exists with the United Way. It looks amply funded. The process involves the provincial government. It involves all levels of government, all sectors of the community. It involves all of these concerns, a non-partisan organization, commitment from a group of senior Winnipeggers from all level of government, all levels of government, business, labour and the not for profit sector to participate on the Council.

That's what's being proposed here. Everybody is going to be at the same table, working at the same things. I don't think it's wise and I don't recommend voting for both, just so we're a hundred percent clear. Our suggestion is that since we don't have anything in place right now, Mr. Speaker, our first step should be to get on board with this grander United Way process that's going to include the provincial government and all other sectors of our community.

Of course we understand that people aren't going to support this because for some reason they suspect that the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee has something to do with it. Therefore, the United Way process gets kind lip service but it's not what we really want. We want our own committee to do our own thing. We want our Social Planning, we want the Social Planning Council to identify key stake holders, commence discussions regarding identification of an inner sect oral process and implementation plan for the purpose of determining the collaborative comprehensive community poverty reduction strategy. We want them to do essential the exact same thing the United Way is doing.

That makes no sense, Mr. Speaker and regardless of how you feel about your fellow Councillors or the Mayor sitting in this chamber, it is ridiculous in my estimation, to set up a process that mirrors almost exactly the United Way process that is beginning right now.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that Council acknowledge the evolution in this motion. It happens all the time. We move from Standing Committee to Executive Policy Committee to Council, and things change and that's what's happened here. I would ask you to support the Executive Policy Committee motion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Mr. Speaker, I'm rising under a point of privilege 41 with regard to the honours and rights and prerogatives of myself as an individual member, not only did the Council, Councillor who just spoke not direct most of his remarks to the clause, he accused me of bringing in items personally and I would challenge him to show me where I did and the document of which he was speaking, the CUFF report was in 1997 through 1998 and was passed before I became a member of the Executive Policy Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Point taken. Thank you. I believe we will probably do a recorded vote on the, well we have to vote on the Standing Committee recommendation. So that's what we're voting on now. All in favour of the Standing Committee recommendation please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The clause is lost and on the Executive Policy Committee motion, all in favour please rise.

I believe we can consider it unanimous. Unanimous. Okay. The report of July the 10th, Councillor Steeves and clause 1 is a similar process to what we've just dealt with so that'll be stood down. Clause 2 is not on the agenda and so you're really moving consent items 3 and 4. Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JULY 10, 2006

Councillor Steeves: All right.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, that's carried. Clause 1.

Item 1 - Neighbourhood Safety and Crime Prevention File GF-2

Mr. Speaker: I repeat a similar process to what we've just done, so there are two recommendations sitting there. We are dealing with the Standing Committee recommendations, Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This still feels a bit foreign to me this process but I guess that's the way it'll be. All right, and I say this because I'm not certain that there's any opposition or not to what's being proposed. So, the recommendation from Executive Policy Committee which has been brought forward is fairly self-explanatory and contained through items 1 through 7, essentially, talking about receiving the former report as information and that the administration is directed to implement and deploy the proposed Clean Sweep Crime Task Force and related crime analysis unit as soon as possible and then in the 2006, increase highway traffic act fine revenue collected by the city with respect to the recent announcement made by the province be dedicated as a funding source for expenses that will be incurred related to the Clean Sweep Task Force and the Crime Analysis Unit and that there be no further funding beyond that and they'll be a quarterly report concerning the financial status of the program and the administration will be asked to report back to the Executive Policy Committee and the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services which is of note.

On the following, how the permanent complement of officers will expand with the implementation of these above noted two units in addition to the officers hired over the past two years with casino revenues and how these new police officers impact the City's operating budget and what if any additional resources will be required to develop and implement a Comstat style management and accountability mechanism that will provide weekly updates to citizens amongst other informations and how the administration proposes to measure police service outcomes related to crime prevention and enhancement of neighbourhood safety.

I'm not going to speak or attempt to sell folks on the merits of the recommendation as I again, Mr. Speaker I'm unsure if there's any opposition. I will stand down and answer or respond.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the clause? If not then, we're dealing with the Standing Committee recommendation first and if that doesn't carry we'll deal with E.P.C. one. On the Standing Committee recommendation. All in favour, opposed? I think it's lost. On the Executive Policy Committee recommendation all in favour, opposed? That's carried. Okay, I believe we have a report dated July 17th. Yes, the report of July 17th, Councillor Steeves. It's Assiniboine Park, Governance of Assiniboine Park.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JULY 17, 2006

Councillor Steeves: I would move the item, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if anyone wishes to stand it down.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, Councillor Smith on the clause.

Item 1 - Governance of Assiniboine Park File PR-7.1

Councillor Smith: You know the Governance of Assiniboine Park came about because of lack of funds. Lack of this City Council supporting the development of Assiniboine Park, we've let it deteriorate.

You go to the zoo; it's absolutely embarrassing to see the conditions of the zoo. You know it's, we've let it deteriorate to such an extent that we now want to abandon it. And you know, setting up a new board, I supported it at the Standing Committee level because it's in principle. In other words it doesn't, it's not in concrete and we've added things to it, for example, the Millennium Library Project.

They raised millions for that project and yet we still run the library. We haven't given it over.

I want this park to be controlled by the City Council. I do not want to shelve it on to other groups. We may want to go ahead and solicit money from other groups but that's a different story.

So, Assiniboine Park is a jewel that has been tarnished because we've neglected it over these years. You know, what we got to do is say look it, we're going to pour some money into that park and we're willing to go ahead and solicit funds from the private sector in a big way. And that's what the Millennium Library Project did.

You know, the people that gave money to the Millennium Library Project don't run the library. So you know if we really want to, a park, we should be in control. It's a public park. It's our park and we shouldn't go ahead and toss it aside. But I don't think this clause does that. I think it goes out and seeks out more information that we can make a decision after, on. So I'm supportive of the clause. But remember this, it's in principle only.

Mr. Speaker: Any further discussion on the clause? Do you wish to close Councillor?

Councillor Steeves: Just one quick thing, I want to make one point and I kind of wanted to say this for awhile in this Council, Mr. Speaker. The Assiniboine Park and I completely support the recommendation and I trust you will as well, that's not the entirety of my submission, Councillor Smith is probably correct in terms of the funding and capital funding and how the park is stewarded and how much money is going in and that it's not enough.

But, I want to just remind Council of one thing that I find really interesting. We had a lot of discussion at committee about how this might be, have to do with condos in the park and that was or was not a good issue. And, well mostly how it wasn't to be honest with you, but at the time we brought that forward, Mr. Speaker and we discussed the idea of you know funding for condos in the park, there was a huge, hewn cry as to how you know we're just not doing enough for the park. We're not doing enough. We're not spending enough money. We're not putting enough assets in there; we're not up keeping it correctly. Do you know what, Mr. Speaker, do you know the entire operating budget process came and went and the entire capital budget process came and went and there was nary a peep about Assiniboine Park.

There was virtually nothing about Assiniboine Park because I hear people whispering but there was no motion to move a bunch of more funding into Assiniboine Park in either the operating or the capital budget process. And I don't say that to say I told you so because of Councillor Gerbasi says, that is cold comfort, but I just bring that up because these things they evolve as issues du jour and then we as a Council we have a tendency to forget them.

So, when we're here, trying to make tough decisions on revenue funding, it's easy to dismiss and it's easy to say we shouldn't, we shouldn't do that or this is too hard and what the Mayor is doing is wrong, what Executive Policy Committee is doing is wrong, we should pay for this, we should pay for that. But at the end of the day, people just forget and that's what happened with Assiniboine Park for the operating and the capital budget process.

The Councillors who stood up and argued most verspricsy against the idea of condos in the park because, oh well you know it's an infringement on the public trust. It shouldn't be done, it's wrong and we should just fund it out of general revenue or put more capital funding into it. The whole process as operating and capital came and went, not a peep, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Question on the clause all in favour, opposed? That's carried. We have two motions. Motion number 4 by Councillor Lazarenko and Councillor O'Shaughnessy taken as read.

Moved by Councillor Lazarenko
Seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy

WHEREAS on July 5, 2006, the Executive Policy Committee referred the June 20, 2006 request from the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee regarding the North End Ambassadors Project Proposal to the Administration with direction to meet with representatives from the Selkirk Avenue BIZ and the Mosaic Market BIZ to discuss this project proposal prior to the meeting of the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee on July 25, 2006;

AND WHEREAS on July 25, 2006, the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee recommended that the eligibility criteria for the Community Incentive Grant Program be waived and a Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $10,000.00 (funded from the Mynarski Ward Allocation) be approved for the North End Ambassador Project Proposal;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council concur in the recommendation of the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee, and adopt the following:

1. That the following eligibility criteria for the Community Incentive Grant Program be waived in this instance, namely:

A. The organization is to be a non-profit community recreation and sport organization or a non-profit organization offering recreational services.
B. The project is to make a significant contribution to the long-term benefit of the community-at-large in terms of improved facilities.
C. The project is to clearly articulate a plan of activities including projected work schedules, material, labour, equipment and other project requirements, and lead to the completion of a substantial physical product.

2. That a Community Incentive Grant, in the amount of 10,000.00, funded from the Mynarski Ward allocation, not to exceed a maximum of 50% of the total project cost be approved for the North End Ambassador Project Proposal, subject to the following conditions:

A. Confirmation of other funding sources.
B. Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the City of Winnipeg.
C. The applicant entering into a formal agreement with the City of Winnipeg.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? Carried. Motion number 6 by Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor O'Shaughnessy taken as read.

Moved by Deputy Mayor Pagtakhan
Seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy

WHEREAS on July 25, 2006, the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee recommended that the eligibility criteria for the Community Incentive Grant Program be waived and a Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $10,000.00 (funded from the Point Douglas Ward Allocation) be approved to the Sinclair Park Community Centre to assist with the cost of a feasibility study for the rebuilding project;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council concur in the recommendation of the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee, and adopt the following:

1. That the following eligibility criteria for the Community Incentive Grant Program be waived in this instance, namely:

A. The project is to make a significant contribution to the long-term benefit of the community-at-large in terms of improved facilities.
B. The project is to clearly articulate a plan of activities including projected work schedules, material, labour,

equipment and other project requirements, and lead to the completion of a substantial physical product.

2. That a Community Incentive Grant, in the amount of 10,000.00, funded from the Point Douglas Ward allocation, not to exceed a maximum of 50% of the total project cost be approved to the Sinclair Park Community Centre for the feasibility study for the rebuilding project, subject to the following conditions:

A. Confirmation of other funding sources.
B. Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the City of Winnipeg.
C. The applicant entering into a formal agreement with the City of Winnipeg.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That's carried. There are no By-laws, any questions for Protection and Community Services? We move onto the Alternate Service Delivery Committee, Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 17, 2006

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce the reports and move adoption of the consent agenda items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, opposed? That is carried. Councillor Magnifico moves that Council 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.

Council Adjourned at 4:57 P.M.