COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday December 6, 2006

The Council met at 9:33 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Clement.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Gerbasi, Leipsic, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you madam clerk. Pages, we have before us here today is Bryce Brousseau of Vincent Massey Collegiate who resides in St. Norbert Ward, Simone Jaman of Miles Macdonell Collegiate resides in Elmwood - East Kildonan Ward and also Allison Manchester who resides in Murdoch McKay Collegiate in the Transcona Ward. Welcome.

Welcome of guests, Mr. Clerk, none? Guests and announcements, I have here now Mr. Mayor would you come before the podium and introduce the Corps of Commissionaires.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed my pleasure this morning to introduce Mr. Art Sutton, the CEO of Commissionaires along with Pete Paterson, Manager of HR and Sue Kathler, Chairperson of the Board who are here today to make some very special presentations. So if they would come forward, please.

Sue Kathler: Good morning Mr. Speaker, Mayor and Council, it's a pleasure to be here this morning to recognize the commitment and dedication of two of our commissionaires. As you know, the commissionaires are in the business of providing meaningful employment for former members of the military and with all of the new veterans coming from Afghanistan; the role of the commissionaires is taking on an increasingly important role and I would like to thank the City of Winnipeg for being such a very important client of ours.

We have been working with the city since 1955 and we have upwards of 100 commissionaires faithfully serving our city in a variety of capacities. So I would like to begin by inviting Joe Mallet to come forward and receive his pin for five years of service with commissionaires. Joe.

You really surprised, oh excellent. I understand that Joe is a new grandfather and in addition to the pin we have a little monetary award that goes with that and he will be able to use that to spend lavishly on his new granddaughter at Christmas time.

I would now like to call upon Terry LeBlanc. Terry is being recognized for the commissionaire's long service medal and when we asked Terry how long have you been in uniform Terry, he said, well you know including my military time, that would be 44 years, and oh, I was a cadet before that. So he has 47 years in uniform serving our country in a variety of capacities. So Terry, thank you so much.

Terry actually gets a medal that he will add to his row of medals. There you are. Okay, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, congratulations. I'd like to recognize Mayor Sam Katz now. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I would like to make Council aware that today has been recognized by the parliament of Canada as the National Day of Remembrance in action on violence against women in Canada. It is unfortunate that in today's society, we still have to deal with violence that affects everyone. This day marks the tragic anniversary of 14 young women at Ecole Polytechnique, Montreal who were killed in 1989, simply because they were women.

Sometimes we think tragic events as these only happen in someone else's backyard, but we know that violence happens everywhere and although today provides us with an opportunity to reflect on this tragedy, it is also an opportunity for us to recognize that these problems still persist in our society and through educating our children, our youth, and our city, that violence against women is unacceptable and will not be tolerated. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a minute of silence in honour of today's National Day of Remembrance.

Mr. Speaker: Everyone please rise.

(Moment of silence)

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

MINUTES

Councillor Steeves moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on September 27, November 7 and November 8, 2006 be taken as read and confirmed. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: The, what I have here also is what's on your desk, a disk that has been prepared by our City Clerks, Mr. Richard Kachur and Marc Lemoine, this is the Inaugural Meeting we had of November the 7th. So it's on your desk and I would like also to thank Don Windsor and our camera crew here in Council for the efforts in putting this DVD together, very much appreciated. I' like to now get on with the, Councillor Steeves I understand wants to, firstly to give an announcement. Councillor Steeves you have the floor.

Councillor Steeves: Just, if I may Mr. Speaker. Thanks very much. I did want to say one thing. I think we all had a great time during and we're very proud of our citizens and the celebration we hosted for this year's Grey Cup for people coming all across Canada. But I did want to say specifically, Mr. Speaker, is looking back on that weekend, it was a remarkably problem-free weekend and I received personally several commendations for the men and women of our Winnipeg Police Service and I just want to publicly acknowledge the great work that they did in balancing tolerance verses discipline during what is sometimes a very difficult time to police, so I want to thank them publicly.

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

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Now we'll just get on with the meeting and just get this on the agenda here. The delegation, John Zonneveld in support of Executive Policy Committee recommendation, I understand that the delegation is here but he will, he will not speak as he is in support of a recommendation that's here now.

The next delegation is Gary Swanson, President of CUPE Local 500 in opposition to Item 8, the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 29, 2006 regarding Winnipeg Economic Opportunity Frameworks - City of Opportunity, Mr. Swanson, you'll have the ten minutes.

Gary Swanson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Your Worship and Councillors. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the document Winnipeg Economic Opportunity Framework - City of Opportunity. I would like to clarify that Local 500 is not totally opposed to the document as presented. In fact there are many points in the framework we support such as having an economic plan, rebuilding downtown, improving safety, being supportive and providing a good business environment. These benefit all citizens.

The findings of the recent community round table held last September also concur with some of the common points as quoted below. We all need to be building on the existing strengths. In Winnipeg's case this is seen as a network of close knit communities. We also need to be developing a publicly supported plan that Council will feel obliged to adhere to. And we all need to be focusing on development of the city's core.

Winnipeg's downtown has a lot of potential and the initiative is needed for people to live and work in the core area. Right now those who live in downtown are the lowest income or the highest income brackets. So, the two conferences, the summit and the community round table, both agree on these key points.

However, we would like to address some items from the report that are of concern. First, the report is weighted to the interests of the business sector of Winnipeg and in fact our direct references such as in section 4 where business groups will identify policing needs for the community. This business focus needs to be expanded because there are other sectors such as the public service and the non-profit sector that also help to generate and support economic activity.

Two, there is a focus also in the document on providing focused, accountable and cost effective civic public services. However, there's little detail into what is meant by these statements. Obviously, this is a concern to our members, as we've seen a steady reduction of services provided to the community over the last decade.

We think that this statement from the community round table should definitely be part of the decision-making process at City Hall when determining civic budgets in relationship to the economic framework document. And I quote; planning decisions should be made on the basis of a broad analysis that looks at social impacts, social responsibility, as well as short-term cost benefits. By focusing solely on costs, the city loses track of the importance of investing in community infrastructure, thereby creating a growing infrastructure deficit that affects safety, quality of life and the city's future economic viability. We must ensure there is a broad engagement at the individual level. This type of participation is necessary to ensure that all interests are being represented and considered.

This leads to our third concern. There are many neighbourhood groups working hard to address concerns of safety, community economic development, housing, image and recreation. And again, I quote from the community round table which references, usually, local developed community road maps are made to develop the whole. Many communities already have developed a vision for what is needed in their area of the city. These visions and plans can be incorporated into a broader plan for the city. The framework development should incorporate and respect these community economic initiatives and plans because they are developed by local citizens.

Section 3 speaks to P3's as one means to approach the City of Winnipeg's capital infrastructure problem. CUPE has done extensive research into P3 projects across Canada. Almost universally P3's are not in the public interest because this method of financing costs the public purse more dollars more because of the higher private sector financing costs. As well, public lease payments to P3 projects come from the municipal operating budget, not capital. This is like buying infrastructure with a credit card verses a mortgage.

The Charleswood bridge is an example of this type of financing. The P3 is costing the citizens of Winnipeg more dollars verses if it had been built solely from the public purse.

Our final concern relates to the public safety issue. The recent release of the State of the Inner City 2006 report speaks to a disconnect between the reactive services of the police department and the community desire for more proactive policing programming. Related to public safety is the lack of public investment, and the decline of support of proactive safety programs which are provided by other departments of civic government.

Public safety is not just about having more peace officers. It is also about having relevant neighbourhood recreation and sport programs, library services, local park amenities and local active public centres. Again, the past decade has seen numerous closures of public facilities and civic program reductions in the inner city which has added to the impact on public safety. We raise this issue with Council.

We think there is a danger in the economic framework because of the fixation with the business public safety interests.

We believe there will be continued emphasis on reactive policing in contradiction to what residents and citizens want. We as the city must address public safety with a holistic approach, employing all the relevant civic services in partnership with the various communities and groups in the inner city of Winnipeg. Thank you again for your time to allow us to speak to this important framework document and we hope you will consider our concerns.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor, any questions of the delegation? If not thank you Mr. Swanson. Thank you. Now we get on to the reports, report of November the 15th of Executive Policy Committee, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 15, 2006**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Report of Executive Policy Committee dated November 29, 2006 Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2006**

Mayor Katz: I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 to 18.

Councillor Thomas: I'd like 8 pulled off please.

Mr. Speaker: Number 8 Councillor Thomas. Any further? If not, all in favour of the consent agenda except number 8, all in favour, contrary? Carried.

Item 8 - Winnipeg Economic Opportunity Framework - City of Opportunity File GG-5

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker if I may, I would very much like to hear from Councillor Thomas and then I'd be happy to respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this motion here today. This motion dangerously asserts that the document before us today be approved and any Council decisions inconsistent with the forgoing be rescinded. This is neither appropriate nor warranted and is not what the Business Council, Chamber of Commerce nor Destination Winnipeg either anticipated or expected when they collaborated with the Mayor's office to produce this document.

On Monday during a closed door meeting promoting this document, at various times I heard it referred to as a tool, by which to delineate an economic framework for the city, an apparatus by which one could coalesce around priorities but never, never, never, did I hear it referred to as a document that was anticipated would supersede all other documents past or future into finding the city's direction.

As a matter of fact, what prompted me to ask the proponents of this document whether they had ever seen or read the motion coming before Council today was an offhanded response made to another questioner in answer to their query, it was stated, this is not meant to supersede any other document. Well Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the intention of the motion here today and Mr. Speaker, let me explain to you why this motion is falling most unwise and dangerous in the extreme.

Before us today, we have a document whose focus is specific, whose scope is limited and whose consultation was at best perfunctory, a document which attempts to steer the course and rewrite the history of other documents which

have come before it. The ill thought out phrase any Council decisions has far reaching consequences beyond the scope of this narrowly focused document. I will sight several examples of better Council policies which are being relegated to the rear by this proposal. This motion is a serious misstep in undermining the lengthy and inclusive approach which was used with the aboriginal community in developing the Municipal Aboriginal Pathways. The MAP document was created after two years of hard work, six town halls, many small group consultations with stake holders, before finally being passed by City Council in 2003. Yet, it has been put forward that the document here today shall supersede it.

Why, was the aboriginal community consulted on this most recent document? No. Have they concurred that this tool take precedence over the one which they helped create? No, they have not. We have heard some of the business sector say that the proposal here today is consistent with the tenor and the tone of the one day economic summit held earlier this year, attended by a chosen few. What about the two years worth of consultation with the aboriginal community? Is their input up in smoke? There are many unresolved contradiction between MAP and this document. The economic development pathway in MAP has been compromised by this new tool.

But now, with the stroke of a pen, it has been decided that the contribution of the aboriginal community to the city's MAP plan created for encouraging and promoting their community and their personally developed economic strategy, has been summarily superseded by a document which has neither included them or anticipated their input. What an unprecedented snub. Mr. Speaker, this is not good enough and it is folie of the highest order.

This is only the beginning of my concerns. Up till now, Plan Winnipeg has been the benchmark by which all other documents have been assessed. Plan Winnipeg was not a one day flash in the pan, quick fix. It has been developed over years of consultation with many community groups, each revision carefully reconstructed with input from every part of the community, not just the business sector. How do these community leaders feel about having their contribution to civic policy document reduced to a footnote, when it may conflict with this narrow focus, limited, collaborative tool. I don't know. Do you, no, because they haven't been asked.

This document arrived here today without sufficient scrutiny by the community at large as to its ramification to in any way justify that it supersede any other document let alone Plan Winnipeg and my fellow colleagues in a behind-door session on Monday, the Business Council, Chamber of Commerce and Destination Winnipeg made it clear that was never their intention. May I also caution you, fellow Councillors, that this little piece of punditry has not been scrutinized by the province. How do they feel about having a document which now forms part of the provincial legislation, Plan Winnipeg and has set out the economic direction for our community in consultation with and collaboration with the province, to be superseded by a plan that they have not seen let alone endorsed. Impressed? Not too likely. Shocked is more the tone I can hear ringing throughout the legislative halls.

Mr. Speaker, there are many documents over the years which I can delineate on how their recommendations and their processes have been undermined by vaulting this document into prominence and reducing other Council decisions to mere backdrops to this tool. But, at this point Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that I delineate my concerns for the specifics of this document which convinces me that it is not ready for prime time.

Mr. Speaker, we have a document here which is contradictory within itself and whose direction is at best vague to the point that it appears as if it was written by four different people in four different rooms not communicating with one another.

On page five the document brags that Winnipeg has among the lowest overall business input costs of any major North American, of many major North American cities driven by competitive labour, relatively low-cost utility rate and affordable industrial office and commercial real estate. But then on page eleven it muses that Manitoban's tax competitiveness is lacking compared to surrounding jurisdictions. Huh. How? What? Where? And what is the proposed solution on page twelve, one of the most important things that government can do, most important, is get out of the way of the private sector.

I am sure that the proponents of the Oly-Opps group would disagree strongly with that statement and would say that it was the laissez-faire attitude of City Council and its concerted attempt to disregard the concerns of both the affected immediate businesses around the location of the new pig plant and the wider citizenry which was the problem, not the solution to undesirable development.

This has led to the province taking steps that should have been taken by this Council to control the agenda, meet, thank you, to control the agenda, meet the concerns of its people and to manage the stink of it's abdication of responsibility.

No Mr. Speaker, this does not facilitate the business community; it shrugs its shoulders at controversy and leaves the hard decisions of jurisprudence to others. This is not what is either anticipated or expected by those who have elected us to make decisions in these chambers. Getting out of the way is exactly what this Council should not do.

It abdicates civic direction to the bully. It leaves a political void where consultation, arbitration and consideration should be. It runs scared from controversy and sticks its head in the sand at conflict. It is not governance fellow colleagues, it is anarchy and it is chaos.

Why is there a need for local government if it shies away from issues and refuses to protect its vulnerable citizens when bullies come a calling. I found section four of this document to be particularly disturbing when it came to contradictory platitude and confused direction, from the start of this section with its get out of the way attitude, to its misunderstanding of how to best improve customer service to its inadequately developed consultation strategy, the tools for change seem to be a series of unsupported ideological rhetoric that is both illogical and undocumented by any type of statistically significant data. At its best it is an off end piece designed for the letter to the editor's page. At worst it is revelry with little connection to reality. This section has been entitled tools for change but the package found within could not help a six year old build a Lego bridge. To say that this is the weakest part of the document is too kind.

In closing I would just like to reiterate that this document has not had the level of consultation that would warrant it being declared to be the premier document by which all others will be measured. The vaulting of this document to prominence would have it supersede Plan Winnipeg, MAP's.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor.

Councillor Thomas: and it is not, a last sentence Mr. Speaker. It is not as encompassing as Plan Winnipeg. It does not have the legislative command to allow it this prominent position and finally, the document has many serious flaws which a more in-depth consultative process would have surely discovered. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I will also be speaking against supporting this economic strategy document and I would like to say that I would much prefer to be able to support it. I truly believe it would be better if Council could work together towards a strategy to reach the common goal that I know we all share which is building a better Winnipeg.

However, this document has some serious flaws and although it is consistent

with what the Mayor promised in the recent election, there is a significant minority in this city whose voices are not being heard.

This document was written with input only from a narrow group of humongous voices and does not represent the diversity of views on this Council or in this city. People may have elected the Mayor but that doesn't mean that all citizens agreed with every aspect of his agenda. Many issues still need to be debated in this democratic forum.

This document under Sam Katz's lead takes the city into a new direction. A direction that I see is a dangerous road to go down. There's been a long period over the last decade of property tax cuts and tax freezes which have resulted in serious strains on city services and those of us who have been on Council made that choice to work, to keep property taxes in check and our property taxes are now in the mid range when you compare to other cities in Canada.

Our debt has also been significantly reduced, but at a certain point a wall is reached when you cannot keep losing revenue without the impact being too harmful. There's a reason the business tax was not eliminated in the past. We need the 60 million dollars in revenue it brings in or a plan to replace it.

In spite of very good fiscal management over the last decade we still face many financial challenges. The question is, is the document before us today the best approach to those problems and how much more revenue can we lose and still be able to provide the services we need to keep our city healthy and the quality place that people want to live in.

Mayor Katz's document represents a narrow ideological view that by giving tax cuts to business, and then simply getting out of the way, a chicken will appear in every pot and money and jobs will rain down on Winnipeg. Even though this trickle down theory of economics has never been proven effective for those being trickled down upon, it is continually espoused by certain politicians and their advisors.

There is also the continual drone from the taxpayer's federation and other lobby groups, the endless thirst for tax cuts, a thirst that will never be clenched no matter how much we cut. The difference now, between now and previous Councils is that this Mayor and Council are prepared to listen to this one lobby group above all others. I guess it comes down to a fundamental difference in belief in how economies really work.

The Mayor's document simply pledges to phase out the business tax. It doesn't give any evidence that these tax cuts will produce enough jobs and wealth to make up for the lost revenue. Why, because there is little evidence that this approach will work. Will the tax burden get shifted from businesses to residence or will there be major cuts to services and the elimination of decent city jobs.

It's hard to know because there is no discussion in the document of how to replace the 60 million dollars of annual revenue that we get from the business tax. This is a serious oversight that is, an oversight at best and irresponsible at worst. This document espouses an ideology that aims to reduce the role of government and its access to revenues which will result in a lack of capacity to deal with community problems and provide adequate public services.

There are economic consequences to this. If we don't invest in the city services that create neighbourhood safety, activities for youth, housing and all the things that create healthy communities, the inner city will decline and there will be serious negative economic impacts.

A proper economic strategy and framework would consider much more than only business tax cuts and private partnerships. Perhaps if those who have drafted the document had talked to a wider range of people than only the business lobby, they might have come up with a more comprehensive strategy and it's very interesting to compare this new economic strategy with the home grown

economic development strategy that Council passed in 2001 under former Mayor Glen Murray, a policy that will be replaced by this new policy.

Today's economic strategy document was brought forward without consultation with anyone other than the narrow group of people representing business interests. The document was printed up, distributed, and passed at Executive Policy Committee before the public even knew it existed and a Council seminar was held after it was already approved at Executive Policy Committee, so Councillors, not on E.P.C. weren't even consulted. Compare that to the home grown strategy of 2001 which arose from a broad public consultation process that included business, labour, the Social Planning Council, non-profit groups, aboriginal and other community stake holders. That policy was passed unanimously by Council. A Council made up like today's Council of members from all political persuasions.

There's something to be said for an approach that can embrace a diversity of views. Being united in spite of that diversity, made us all stronger, as a Council and as a city. The action steps in this new document call for business tax cuts, private partnerships and fixing roads and bridges and that is basically it. In contrast, the Home Grown Economic Strategy of 2001 contained a balanced and broader focus on building the local economy and competitiveness.

It included strategic partnerships with the aboriginal community. It focused on ecological decision making and sustainable development. It dealt with issues of immigration and skill development. This was a framework that included the interests of all citizens of Winnipeg.

An economic strategy is more than just tax cuts. In this day and age it must be proactive, deal with sustainability, social and environmental concerns. If the inner core of the city is crumbling because of continued sprawling of the city and poor planning and the assessment base collapses in the core as we saw a few years ago, that is a disastrous for the economy of our city.

I realize that this document cannot be all things to all people and solve every problem. However, if it's going to be considered a reigning economic policy document it should have a lot more depth and have been vetted through a wider group of people.

Mr. Speaker, I fully expect that this document will receive enough support to pass today and I urge the Mayor and Council as we go forward, to remember that this document does not have unanimous support of this Council and I urge you to remember that while there were a large number of voters represented, that there are a large number of voters represented here today, even if they are a minority, who fundamentally disagree with the direction that this Council is heading, and as this moves forward I hope that all Winnipeggers and all Members of Council will be listened to and will have a say in our future. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think this is an excellent document as a public relations effort. You know, let us look at what it means. It says here, that the economic opportunity framework titled Winnipeg, a City of Opportunity as outlined in Appendix A be approved and any Council decisions, including the 2001 Home Grown Economic Development strategy, inconsistent with the forgoing, be rescinded.

Now I'd like to know what's being rescinded. I mean why can't they point out exactly the sections in the Home Grown, I mean who's going to decide if it's inconsistent. You know it just seems to me that this is ludicrous saying everything is inconsistent will be removed. But like who's going to judge that? Who's going to decide that? It doesn't make any sense at all.

This is the heart of the matter and this is why I'm opposing this. It's not a very clear; I mean the other two speakers mention many things that I could have echoed, aboriginal policy, et cetera. But the fact is, you know, if our neighbourhoods are falling part, it doesn't talk about the need of a nice neighbourhood for investment. You know, this is a crazy, this is just a beautiful PR document and it was a waste of money printing it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. No further speakers? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, you know I'm rising to support this document. I see it as a strong statement moving forward from, a strong statement was made by the voters of the City of Winnipeg you know to suggest that organizations like the city's Chamber of Commerce and the Business Council or Destination Winnipeg are not valid in a process for driving a vision of economic growth forward for a city is poppycock Mr. Speaker. You know this document repairs the anarchy and the chaos that we've lived under in the last ten years.

The previous documents have led us into these whirlpools, these quagmires of constant discussion of why we can't do anything because of this particular policy or that particular policy. This is a clear vision for the City of Winnipeg, a clear vision that drives us forward on the path of economic growth that we are on Mr. Speaker.

This is not some antisocial agenda document as its being presented. This has got teeth, it's got substance and it will move this city forward as other cities are moving forward throughout North America. This is symbolic of the growth and the greatness that is happening across our nation and it will drive us forward into further prosperity and much greater capacity as a city. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I'd like to rise and agree with my Councillor from St. Norbert. I'd like to, for many years I think the business community, people like the general public have had the feeling that there wasn't a strong economic vision for the City of Winnipeg per se. So I believe this document is the first start of this and it's a great process.

I believe the document is comprehensive, it's balanced, it's one that builds on the strength of the city and offers some guidelines for the long term vision for the city. But to do that, we need to make, implementing such things as recommendations of the Red Tape, cutting the business tax is a key priority for the City of Winnipeg. Winnipeg needs to become more business friendly. We need not to forget that it's the medium and small-sized businesses are the ones that are growing and I believe this document really incorporates this element of things.

If we're going to keep our young people here and attract investment into the local area we really need to roll up the red carpet to businesses to come here and to have a productive business climate for it. So I am very much in supportive of it and as the framework indicates we need some better co-operation with the provincial government. I encourage the provincial government to take a look at the guiding principles of this and incorporate that. I look forward to working with Council in terms of some of the priorities and incorporating this in some of the decisions that are being made up. So, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Fielding. No further speakers? Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's great to be back in these Council chambers to talk about the issues, the policies, the practices that are going to drive our city forward. It's our first Council meeting. We've all been elected from our wards, were all leaders of our wards except for the Mayor who is the leader of our city and I look forward to the next four years.

Mr. Speaker, there was nothing that would please me more than to be able to

rise this morning and say that, I would be part of an unanimous support for a document that charts the economic future of our city because there is much in this document that I agree with. But when it gets towards the end to the actual meat of the document, there is several issues that I cannot agree with. But more important than that, my constituents cannot agree with.

Let me begin with the positive. Section two of the document, I believe, is bang on. It accurately describes our strengths and our assets. And the theme I want to talk about is diversification because that is our strength and our assets, the diversification of economy and diversification of people.

Whether you're talking about the transportation sector, the life sciences sector, the financial sector, our emerging tourism sector, I was going to say our Agri business sector but I'll keep that out for now. We are positioned to grow from within and we are able because of our diversification, to absorb those hits from outside that sometimes you just simply can't see coming and that happens to everyone.

The document also refers to our one hundred different languages spoken in the City of Winnipeg as an asset in section two. It talks about the fact that we have the largest francophone population of any city west of Ottawa. That is an asset. It talks about the fact that we have an emerging young aboriginal population which is a huge opportunity but also presents huge challenges and we know that economic development is a means to an end. And we know that end is quality of life and I believe that's accurately reflected in section two and three of this document.

Page eleven actually says, let me quote on page eleven that most economic partnership from any city comes from within, from the people in the companies who are already committed to this place, a home-grown strategy.

Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest and strongest statements about our assets and let me quote directly from the document, Winnipeg has amongst the lowest overall business input cost of any major North American city driven by competitive labour, relatively low cost utility rates and affordable industrial office and commercial real estate.

Now let me repeat that, amongst the lowest business costs of any major North American city. That is why when we turn to page twelve of the document which I actually consider the real meat of the document, the tools for policy change, tools for change and taxation policies I find our main taxation policy puzzling and that's quite clear, first of all, to phase out the business tax.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the last four months I have spoken to thousands of citizens throughout my ward. I've gone to coffee parties, I've knocked on doors, I've been to public meetings, I've been on radio shows and the message that my constituents have sent me, approximately 10,000 of them in the last election is that relative to taxation before you phase out the business tax, cut the property tax.

Our property taxes are simply too high and before you phase out the business tax; you need to cut the property tax. And I believe that property tax reduction for every property owner in the City of Winnipeg is more economically beneficial for our city than a business tax cut. Why do I say that, because the senior citizens in East St. Boniface, who are on fixed incomes, receive the benefit. The young couple who own a 250,000 dollar home in Royalwood receive the benefit. The business owner who owns their own building in our city receives the benefit. The business owner who rents receives the benefit. And it's well researched and it's well documented that our property taxes are amongst the highest in Canada, the highest in North America and it needs to be addressed as a taxation policy.

We need to address that and in the last eight years in this Council we have cut the business tax six percent and we have held the line when there was no tax cuts; there was no increases and look at our city. It's benefiting. There is a momentum growing. GDP has never been stronger, housing costs have never; housing values

have never been higher. Building permits are up. You look at the pictures in this document, you see Esplanade Riel something that was done a few years ago. You see the MTS Centre, one of the busiest centres in all of North America. You see a 50 million dollar expansion at the airport. You look at the exchange district where Red River Community College is thriving. There is a momentum growing in the city and we have to make sure it continues.

I want to get back to diversification. Revenue diversification. It's something that is not addressed whatsoever in this policy. We need a plan which at the very least, at the very least, mentions the possibilities or the potential of Winnipeg acquiring a share of consumption tax revenue from other governments. It's not mentioned in here. We need a plan which captures revenues from our tourists who come to visit our city so when people come to the Museum of Human Rights and then go to the Forks and people who have a burger at Esplanade Riel, are leaving a percentage of their money that's going to benefit directly the City of Winnipeg. It's not mentioned in this document.

We need a plan where we as a city are financially benefiting along with the other levels of government in the promotion and the marketing of Winnipeg all over the world. Right now we are simply too dependent on our property tax. We need diversification, we're too dependent on our property tax, we're committing in this document to eliminate the business tax, so what's the, what's going to happen? Are our property taxes going to rise? As we cut business tax is there anybody here that's going to vote for that? Are, we depend on land sales, we depend on water sales, let me give you a real-time example in today's agenda.

We're increasing water rates by ten, twelve percent. Later on in the agenda and in the 2007 budget there is an increase of 4.2 million dollars of those water rates going to the general revenue fund from last year. I need somebody to explain to me why that is. Is that a down payment for a business tax cut for next year?

Mr. Speaker: Extension of two minutes, all in favour, contrary? Carried.

Councillor Smith: We need rational; we need an explanation on the diversification of our revenue. We're too reliant on property taxes; we're tying our hands here on business tax reduction without an explanation on how we're going to replace that money and there's no way in heck, I don't think anyone here wants to put more focus, more pressure on our property tax owners, the people that pay the bill.

I don't see those answers in this document. I think a strong taxation policy is essential for any competitive city. No one's arguing against that, I'm not arguing against that. I just think relative to taxation; let's focus on property tax reduction first. That's the message I got from 10,000 citizens who elected me a month ago and that's the message I'm bringing forward. Thank you.

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

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to extend my congratulations; this is our first meeting back I suppose where we have a chance to discuss some issues, my sincere congratulations to all my Council colleagues and the Mayor for the re-election, special congratulations Mr. Speaker to our colleagues who are joining us for the first time. A very special day and it's very, very nice to be joined by your new faces. It's refreshing I think to see some new faces around the table and have a chance to hear some new ideas, that's always a very, very positive thing and it seems to me the citizens of the City of Winnipeg made some very, very wise choices.

Commenting on the report as it appears, I have to say that it seems to have inspired a lot of emotion from our colleagues which is I guess not perhaps entirely a surprise in this chamber. This is how I took it Mr. Speaker, for what it's worth. I saw this motion and this document

coming forward to a large extent as the division of a person who wants to make changes, who wants to do something, who wants to accomplish something with the position that they hold.

I think there might be a tendency Mr. Speaker for people to be threatened by that reality or people to be concerned by that reality. I just want to say publicly that I'm not. As far as I'm concerned every single person sitting around this chamber probably has a lot of things that they want to accomplish. So how would a person accomplish those things Mr. Speaker. I would think that probably what they would do is in the quiets of their office or their home or wherever it happens to be, they would sit down and put down the ideas and the references that are important to them and put them forward, as ideas, and as broad policy strokes, and that's how I take this document.

I'm not threatened by it and it doesn't concern me. I see it as a bona fide attempt to come forward with new ideas and try to change a direction which admittedly, admittedly over the past several years, the City of Winnipeg has been a little questionable because of a lot of complicated things not the least of which are some things that Councillor Vandal alluded to, our revenue framework, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

But we've seen this before and I would remind Council it's not always the disaster that it's been made out to be. I recall when I was first a Councillor, it was six years ago it seems like yesterday but it's already been six years, the then Mayor, Glen Murray came out with a document that was called I don't remember Green Winnipeg, I'm not exactly sure what it was, but what it was one person's ideas on sustainability for a city. There really wasn't, absolutely I did support it, there really wasn't a bunch of consultation. There certainly wasn't any consultation with me.

The document came forward and it was much the same size as this document. It was a, kind of a broader, higher level document that talked about, these are some of the things that I would like to accomplish. And what happened with that document, I mean there was discussion about it and people were concerned about this or about that, you may recall, Mr. Speaker, it came out at about the exact same time as the infamous garbage debate we had in this chamber which I don't think anybody wants to really talk about or remember but that was about the time. It was very controversial; it was wrapped up in that.

But from that we began to work and the C.E.C. committee was struck and there was a bunch of discussion about sustainability and eventually, eventually we came out with a broader policy and more ideas came out on the table and it got the discussion going. That's exactly what happened. And that's what I see happening here. I see this as the beginning of a discussion.

I mean if you read the document as many people have alluded to, opponents and supporters alike, there's a lot of a great ideas in here. There's a lot of very, very supportable ideas by everybody. Clearly there are some things that people are concerned about but that's to be expected in this chamber and there's no problem with that.

For a person to put forward their ideas and have some of them supportable, some of them not supportable by different people is not the end of the world. I think there's still lots of room for us to take the broad ideas in this document and move together as a group forward on this because there's a lot of important things that have to be discussed. And my learnt friend Councillor Gerbasi from Fort Rouge whom I love more than my own life has mentioned expressly the issue of revenue and how we're going to deal with revenue problems and I share some of those concerns Mr. Speaker frankly I do share some of those concerns and, but we have this debate often in my office when Councillor Gerbasi chooses to visit me.

We talk about the history of tax cuts and where we've gone over the course of the past six, eight, ten years and the truth is, as a Council, regardless of whether we're talking about business tax or property tax

or whatever we're talking about there has been a conscious effort by this Council to really restrict revenue that's been coming into the city.

I do have to say this; I think it is a bit unfair to point the finger at one single person. In this instance it happens to be the Mayor and say, you are the perpetrator of all this loss in revenue. That's not fair and clearly history and the facts don't support that. We have been doing that as, reducing revenue, we've been doing that as a Council for the past eight years and if memory serves, the Mayor was not here for most of those eight years, this is the choice that we've made. If we want to change that fact, if we want to go in a different direction, clearly as a group that decision is going to have to be made. But I think that's a discussion that really doesn't have a heck of a lot to do with this document in particular.

The Mayor has said quite clearly to the people during the election he wants to work on reducing and phasing out the business tax. That is something that people seem to really support. I can tell you in my ward he was overwhelmingly supported, I mean I was fortunate to have my share of support as well but I think you have to remember Councillors that you're not only talking on behalf of your constituents as kind of a unit that only you represent, we have an obligation I think not only to work together but to work with the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and some of the ideas that he put forward because that's the way it works.

He is the Mayor of the entire city and that's why I'm choosing to support him and the ideas that I think he has plainly, frankly and in a really bona fide way put forward, I don't think there was any attempt to hide any of these ideas.

With respect to the document itself, if I could make some comments that I think are very, very important from my perspective and Councillor Vandal alluded to some of them, they have to do with revenue. Section four of the document talks about taxation policies and as far as I'm concerned Mr. Speaker, that is the place where as a city we are really, really lacking and that is the place where if we are ever going to truly change the way we do business as a Council and the way this city operates in perpetuity, the best thing that we could accomplish for our citizens is to try and change the revenue framework that we have with respect to our relationship with the province of Manitoba.

I am talking about things like consumption-based taxes. Those are things that unite all of us. We've talked about having a more entrepreneurial administration. That is the type of thing that would unite our administration instead of them focusing only on expansion of growth in a real sense in terms of real property, would get them acting in a more entrepreneurial way so that they could be attracting new things to the City of Winnipeg, working on tourism because right now as we all know, there is not enough revenue incentive built into.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan moves extension of two minutes, all in favour, contrary? Carried.

Councillor Steeves: There is not enough revenue incentive built into our revenue stream to encourage our administration to pursue those types of goals that have nothing to do with expanding the property tax base. If we could establish that one thing in the course of our tenure as a City Council I believe we will have done our citizens a bigger favour than I dare say has ever been done for the citizens of this city.

The other issue of course as has been alluded to by my good friend from Transcona is the issue of school taxes. If we look at the numbers across Canada, there are out of the thirteen provinces and territories, there are fully five that don't even involve school taxes as a component of the realty property tax roles. Only two, Manitoba and Saskatchewan are dancing it around the level of half. The rest of the provinces and they are all provinces in this instance are hovering at around 25 percent.

Already the Province of Manitoba over the course of the last few years has made

movements of taking school taxes off property tax rolls in rural Manitoba. If this document could be leveraged in some way, shape or form to encourage the province to bring that policy from outside of the perimeter to inside the perimeter, that could change our entire competitive structure vis-à-vis, all the cities across Canada where in fact we are competing with and that could go a long way towards solving some of the challenges that Councillor Vandal sees on the horizon.

I would ask Councillors although I probably imagined I won't be successful at doing this to maybe look at the goodness document that you've all alluded to and maybe we could, arm in arm, take this one step, continue this battle and maybe recognize that the enemy isn't necessarily sitting around this table. Maybe the people are not the enemy, that's the wrong term. Maybe the people that we have to convince or whose ideas we have to evolve are sitting in a different chamber in this city.

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

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just to cut the suspense I'll say very directly right off the bat, I'm supporting the document. You know I was in a seminar the other day, I wasn't there for the whole seminar but I was there for a fair bit of it and I heard most of the dialogue. The part that involved Councillors speaking to the document anyways and I, some of the comments that have been made here today are consistent with some of the shorter comments that were made that day.

But the bottom line is that the answers to many of the things that were raised here today were actually answered by the Mayor in that meeting and others, and I appreciate there was no TV camera in that meeting, so you know people want to get their points across in a little different and more lively way but the fact of the matter is that, this document and I've been here for awhile, none of the documents that have come forward are perfect in 100 percent of the way but there is no intent to disregard other sectors of the city, because they're not directly mentioned in the document and that was very clearly explained. There's also been some comments made here today about many other things and I'd like to talk about them for a bit.

It's true, that citizens are concerned about taxes. I've heard that for years. I've championed that cause. Everybody knows that we haven't had a tax increase for a number of years, in fact we've only had one in the last ten and we in fact cut taxes six percent during that time frame, Mr. Speaker. The 4.2 million dollars that was raised a short while ago actually is in the sewer rates which aren't in front of us today; it's not in the water rates which are before us and that's one of the reasons why the sewer rates aren't here today.

And part of the reason for that is because we've had a ruling, three or four years ago by the Clean Environment Commission about doing a lot of Clean Environment Commission work dealing with the Red River and Lake Winnipeg, and dealing with our sewage treatment plants in particular with phosphates and nutrients and the fact of the matter is that document suggested that the costs of this initiative should be born by all three levels of government. So what have we got?

We've got licences from the current provincial government that are so tight that it's driven the costs up to something like 1.3 billion dollars but they haven't sent any cheques. Well, pardon me they announced 29 months ago that they were going to give us 26 million dollars and we haven't received it yet.

And then I heard the comment and by the way our taxation situation right now, when we started dealing with our tax, the property tax issue, about nine or ten years ago, we were 18th out of the top or largest 22 cities in Canada and today we're 4th or 4th lowest behind only Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver. So we've done pretty good with that and I'm still on board, Mr. Speaker for holding the line on taxes and holding the line on borrowing. I haven't changed that but at the same time I think we have to state what's accurate in that regard as well.

The other thing that I'd like to mention about this 4.2 million dollars that was raised a few minutes ago, our utility buildings throughout the city are not taxed and there is a fee in fact that is transferred to general revenues, there's a policy on that. That policy was approved by this Council, not this specific one, but it was done in this chamber and if people want to change it they can certainly bring that type of policy change forward but the fact of the matter is that we've had a fee built into our rates for many, many years that flows to general revenues and it's no different. In fact if the utility was owned by the private sector they'd pay taxes.

Well the utility isn't owned by the private sector but it should contribute and it's the same type of thinking frankly that we have at the provincial government. Just a couple of days ago I read that they increased liquor rates last year so that it would actually increase the provincial coffers by ten million dollars and they get seven percent on everything including that ten million.

So, you know photo radar tickets, when that started back a number of years ago, the lowest ticket was 90 dollars and I think we got 52 dollars out of that 90 dollars, then it got raised to 130, we still get 52 bucks. Now there're 170 dollars and we still get 52 dollars. Who gets the difference? You know, I mean there's all kinds of initiatives for flowing money to government that doesn't jump out and, other than when you have to physically pay it and it goes on and on like that so I wouldn't be too critical of the 4.2 million dollars that's in the sewer rates. That actually wasn't the reason or the main reason why it was not dealt with at Public Works or not recommended to come forward at this time.

The recommendation actually dealt with the Clean Environment Commission initiatives and the fact that we have to get the provincial government's attention on this. In fact I don't believe for one second that Premier Doer has any idea in fact what those licences have cost and how much that they're really costing. I honestly don't believe that he has any idea what the bureaucracy of the province is fostering on the City of Winnipeg in that regard.

In any case, this document is about moving us forward. It's dealing with a lot of the initiatives that the people within our city want us to deal with and it has not in anyway suggested that we're not going to continue on the path with many of the other issues and frankly Mr. Speaker, I think people are chasing ghosts. Thank you.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When you look at broad policy statements and policy documents they are just that, they're very broad documents and visions that offer an idea of where we want to go as a city and I think it's crucial to keep that in mind. When it comes to a broad policy statement such as this one as was said by the presenters at the Council seminar the other day, this is a start and this gives us an idea of the direction that we can go in.

The fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, when it comes to broad policy document, broad policy statements there are things that people like and there's things that people don't like and the fact of the matter is, the question you have to decide is whether the majority of what you see in the document is good. The vast majority is good and positive. It's no different than when it comes to joining a political party.

I'm sure there's policies in a political party that you may not like but the fact of the matter is the majority of them you will support, you just don't abandon the political party because of the fact fifteen or ten percent you don't agree with. And same goes with religion. If you have a religion and a faith and you disagree with ten or fifteen or twenty percent of the values or the ideas espoused from that religion, does that mean now the eighty percent you agree with you abandon that religion, absolutely not.

The same goes when it comes to politics and when it comes to debating policy. I

read this document Mr. Speaker and I can cite a number of extremely strong policy statements in this document and why this document is an excellent start and I'll start off on page ten and maybe it's because of my fondness for the downtown.

While improving the downtown Winnipeggers know that downtown revitalization has a long way to go. I think everybody in this chamber would agree with that. We need to focus developments improving Portage Avenue, Main Street to the University of Winnipeg, expanding our arts, entertainment districts and continuing the variety of office, shopping, housing and night life options in our unique exchange district.

We need downtown housing and a lot more people living downtown, a very broad statement. I think everybody in this chamber would agree. I would be hard pressed to find one person in this chamber who would disagree with this statement.

I'll go on, I could read, I could continue reading all day but the city will continue to look for new ways and new partnerships to address issues such as crime and safety, infrastructure, tax harmonization, regulatory overlap and regional economical development. This is being spoken about in the context of the other levels of government.

That and that's not by the way in section four which is been widely quoted. That to me makes a lot of sense and it is consistent with what we've been saying in this Council chamber for years but it's good that we're saying it again and it's something new that has been said but really has been missed and this document is refocusing. The city has the ability to pursue tax increment financing. The city will develop policy on the eligibility and appropriate use of taxing, financing and collaboration with provincial incentives in designated areas of the city warranting development.

Very progressive, considering what some other cities have done and how they've moved tax increment financing to encourage economic development and community and neighbourhood revitalization, very progressive.

This document does have a little bit of everything. It talks about education and the importance of education and the issue with regards to the shortage of workers which is real in today's economic work place folks here in the city and across the country but more in this city. It talks about that. But it also talks about entrepreneurship and the importance of entrepreneurship in small business and customer service and how that's important.

I come from a small business background and I've never seen it as us versus them. To me a small business person is the biggest social worker in the community in many ways. They're providing employment and a successful small business person is also providing more than just employment, is giving back to the community. Jack Welch a former CEO of General Electric says show me a business that's not successful and I'll show you a business that's not giving back to the community. Show me a business that's successful and prospering and I'll show you a business that is supporting the community, giving back and doing more than just running their business.

And that is so true. Eighty, eighty five percent of the businesses in this city is small business. This city owes it's origins to small business people and those who worked with them and for them. That is the driving force behind the economic development of the city, has been and it will be in the future.

But I've never seen it as a us verses them, business verses the worker environment. Maybe I'm missing something but I've never seen it that way. When it comes to public/private partnerships, you talk about the ten or fifteen or twenty five percent where I don't agree, there are parts of that where I will not agree and I've said it publicly before and I say it again, where I do not agree with privatizing or public privatizing, partnerships when it comes to our

services. To me that's just another form of contracting out.

But when it comes to our bricks and mortar, our infrastructure, we have a massive infrastructure deficit here folks and I'm going to look at all tools to try and find solutions when it comes to fixing our bridges and our roads including public/private partnerships to try to find solutions. But I see there being a difference when it comes to those public/private partnerships.

We just had an election as was pointed out, and we're all aware. We talk about consultation. I went through a consultation process. I knocked on about 5,000, 7,000 doors. I think a lot of you also had that same consultation process and the Mayor included, had that consultation process. The fact of the matter is we had a very open and frank election with regards to some of these issues.

The Mayor openly campaigned on the elimination of business tax. Some of us may not like that but that is what he openly campaigned on. And there was somebody, a major contender opposing him who openly campaigned on the other side. The citizens of Winnipeg had a clear choice and they made that decision and made that choice knowingly. I didn't fill out the Chamber of Commerce questionnaire when it came to my door during the election. I think Councillor Smith was the other fellow who didn't fill it out.

But you know, I felt I didn't have to fill it out because of the fact that I was working with my constituents and going door to door and hearing from them. The Chamber of Commerce, one of the things that I felt frustrating about the questionnaire was it's oversimplification on the issues facing our city including things like you know, are you or are you in favour of getting rid of the business tax. Yes, but we have to find solutions and I think that's what I've heard also from the Mayor and he said it in a seminar, that it's not just a question of saying we're going to phase out business tax period, but clearly there has to be something there that replaces or finds other sources of revenue if we're going to phase business tax out.

Is that different much different than other levels, have other levels government done in the last six, seven years? No. I saw Greg Selinger on the television the other night talking about how he has phased down their small business taxes when it comes to the province of Manitoba. So are we really on that much of a different page.

I've also heard today the talk of the school taxes and property taxes in specific and I agree, Mr. Speaker, property taxes are an issue. But the issue is not with the city, the issue is with the education tax and how that makes us uncompetitive and how crucial. That document even talks about the need to deal with working with the province, this document talks about the need to working with the province and the federal government with regards to these tax issues including the tax issues with regards to the province of Manitoba. School taxes have made us extremely uncompetitive in light of other cities and that is the solution, Mr. Speaker. We recognize that as a city, the municipalities across this province have recognized it as a city.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Nordman moves extension of 2 minutes, all in favour, contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: And have recognized it in their own communities as municipalities, the reality is Mr. Speaker, that, that is the solution when it comes to property not the other way around. This is a very good document. This is a very positive document. It gives us a vision where we can go forward. It gives us some ideas on what we can work on to achieve that vision. It gives us the starting point as was mentioned yesterday.

I guess Mr. Speaker, the question is, at the end of the day, do you want to, we've talked about this before, do you want to concentrate on the glass half empty or the glass half full. In this case I would say the glass is eighty five percent full. Do you want to concentrate on the fifteen percent

that's not there. The fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, this is a very positive and strong document.

In 1989 Mr. Speaker, the Berlin Wall fell marking the historic end of the cold war and that was nearly twenty years ago. Sometimes I wonder when the wall is going; the cold war is going to end in this city. And so to quote another famous speaker, but it may come as a bit of change, Jenny Gerbasi, tear down that wall.

But this is a positive document. We're going forward with it and I think this is something which will give us a start. Is it everything, is there some parts I admit I disagree with, yes and I've said what those are but otherwise Mr. Speaker I think it's consistent with a lot of the policies we've done in the past in this city but also refocuses us when it comes to building an entrepreneurial, a city which is a good thing, which is not a question of being right or left, it's a question of embracing small business to allow business people to be able to, to be able to be part of the city's framework for the future and this is an excellent start. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. No further speakers. Councillor, Mayor Katz, closing debate.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all, I very much enjoy the opportunity to hear from all the Councillors expressing their opinion and what I would like to say, this is a long-term economic framework. This is about real vision and real vision takes action.

It's interesting when you hear comments from different Councillors; one Councillor will tell you about the priority, about property taxes. They're extremely high and they need to be cut and I think Councillor Wyatt addressed it very appropriately and I remember actually not long ago wanting to move a motion about the education tax which is a large part of our tax. So we have one Councillor who thinks they're extremely high, lower than, we have another Councillor who thinks they're in the mid range, leave them alone. Obviously we can't all be right, so I guess even in this chamber we don't agree, but here is what's really at stake here Mr. Speaker, we're for the first time in quite a while, showing optimism. People are believing in our city. Our city is growing.

We haven't seen growth in a long time. There's a demand for homes in our city today. A demand that exceeds the supply that for the first time we're like Vancouver used to be or Toronto, where you list your home for 150 and you get 158, things like that are happening in our city and it's very positive Mr. Speaker.

The whole purpose of this is to capture that momentum and to continue it. That's what this is all about. Now, I understand that there are some people who may be pro-business and there are some who may be anti-business, that's not an issue here, Mr. Speaker. What everybody should understand, is small business is the economic engine of our city. Small business employs eighty percent of the people. That's where the jobs come from and the realities are, if we don't give them the opportunity to grow, to expand, to reinvest, where are all the graduates, where are the young people going to get jobs, whether they graduate from U of M, U of W, Red River, Winnipeg Technical, St. Boniface College, where are the jobs going to be to keep them here. That's the purpose of this, to keep our city growing. We don't want to see the exodus of our brain trust leaving our city.

And not only can we accomplish that, Mr. Speaker, but we can deal with the other issues that people do have concerns about. You know, I've heard people refer to the aboriginal issue; I challenge anyone to speak to Grand Chief Ron Evans and ask him if he's had a greater champion than yours truly on some of the real issues we need to deal with.

You know, they've mentioned safety. In the last two years, Mr. Speaker we've added 95 new police officers. We have a program called CrimeStat. We're addressing this issue and we're doing it. They've talked about recreational facilities earlier. Well for the first time we have a

policy and we're redirecting and investing 43 million dollars in our youth. Here is what's really going on, Mr. Speaker. Not only can we phase out the business tax because we've already decreased it by twenty percent in the downtown and there's no secret that we have every intention of doing that across the city so everybody is on an even playing field.

And when we did that, Mr. Speaker what did we do with our services. Well guess what Mr. Speaker, we increased our services, we put more money into snow removal, we put more money into riverbank stabilization, we put more money into pruning our trees, we hired more police officers, guess what Mr. Speaker, when you have a Council that works hard, that realizes what the priorities are, that does it's due diligence and understands economics, we can do both and on top of that Mr. Speaker, in recent times since I've been elected and I don't care who you want to give the credit to, give it to the Prime Ministers, give it to the Ministers, give it to the Premiers, give it to Council, who cares who gets the credit, Mr. Speaker.

But you know what, we do have a gas tax now that we're investing in our infrastructure for the first time in a long time and our infrastructure decayed over a long period of time, it didn't happen overnight. We now have a situation where the provincial government has come forward and has made a commitment of 137 million dollars over the next five years.

Not only that, for the first time since the mid 90's we finally after lobbying have got the province to come to the table and do 50/50 sharing on transit. We are taking some very big steps, Mr. Speaker; we have many more to take in my humble opinion.

This is going in the right direction. This is not, oh and may I add for the very first time, Mr. Speaker, this Council, okay, starting with E.P.C., put a million dollars of real money into housing, real money, Mr. Speaker. So what I say to you, Mr. Speaker. We are on the right path. We are making progress and yes I would like to see this supported unanimously and it's unfortunate that may not take place but I support this document and I urge everybody else to support this.

This will see real growth in our city and we will be able to redirect our energies at every concern that exists and that's what this is all about. Not just business, but aboriginal issues. Issues of the poor, housing issues, safety and crime, we can deal with them all and you know what I think anybody's crying wolf when they say we're not dealing with them because we are and the facts speak for themselves. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There is a recorded vote been called for, Councillor Gerbasi called for one, all in favour of the clause please stand.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Leipsic, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas and Vandal.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 4. The clause is carried. E.P.C. motions.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: The first motion, Councillor Swandel to be taken as read. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

Moved by Councillor Swandel
Seconded by Councillor Steeves

WHEREAS:

(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 221/2006, The City of Winnipeg authorized the expropriation of the lands and interests described therein and executed a Declaration of Expropriation dated the 27th day of September, 2006; and

(b) Notice of the intended expropriation was served by The City of Winnipeg upon the owner of the lands and interests intended to be expropriated, and was published in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the expropriated lands and interests are situate, pursuant to section 1 of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act; and

(c) The confirming authority has not been served with any notices of objection to the intended expropriation.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated the 27th day of September, 2006, executed pursuant to By-law No. 221/2006 and expropriating the following lands and interests:

(a) Parcels "A" and "B" as the same are shown bordered on Plan Deposit 1074/2006 WLTO, prepared by Donald Frederick Shiach, Manitoba Land Surveyor, and the following interests in land:

(b) Old System Agreement Number 151857 encumbering Parcel E, Plan 26811 WLTO and Parcel XX, Plan 17273 WLTO, and Caveat Number 220610 encumbering Parcel E, Plan 26811 WLTO,

The lands described in (a) above are expropriated free and clear of all encumbrances.

The lands described in (a) above except mines, minerals and named substances which are excepted from or not included in the Certificate of Title of the registered owner of the surface under The Real Property Act or are not owned by the owner of the surface under The Registry Act, and except reservations in favour of the Crown as excepted from the Title of the owner of the surface, or to which Title is subject by implication under the provisions of The Real Property Act is hereby confirmed.

Mr. Speaker: Motions number 2 is automatic referral.

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan

WHEREAS Community Centres provide essential recreational services to children throughout the city of all ages with the help of many volunteers;

AND WHEREAS the Programming Grant administered by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) has been set at $185,000 since 1998 and has never been increased;

AND WHEREAS there are no longer funds available nor new funds being put into the Recreation Program reserve fund which had been used for years as a source of funding for community centre programming;

AND WHEREAS the GCWCC no longer has reserve funds remaining from programming funding and these funds were used in the last few years to pay for essential programming at Community Centres;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Programming Grant for Community Centres administered by the GCWCC be increased by $50,000 annually and that this request be referred to the 2007 Operating Budget process.

Mr. Speaker: Motion number 3 is automatic referral. E.P.C., oh pardon me I'm sorry, motion number 3, I'm sorry. Motion number 3 has been dealt with but I want to thank Councillor Thomas and Gerbasi for their efforts of putting that. That'll go on file.

Moved by Councillor Thomas
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi

WHEREAS December 6 is recognized as The National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women;

AND WHEREAS December 6, 2006 marks the 17th anniversary of the massacre at École Ploytechnique in Montreal where 14 women were killed;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a moment of silence be observed to remember all victims of violence.

Mr. Speaker: E.P.C. motions are gone. E.P.C. Consideration of By-laws, Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 233/2006, 239/2006, 240/2006, 244/2006 and 248/2006.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 233/2006, 239/2006, 240/2006, 244/2006 and 248/2006.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that By-laws No. 233/2006 239/2006 240/2006 244/2006 and 248/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 233/2006, 239/2006, 240/2006, 244/2006, 248/2006.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 233/2006, 239/2006, 240/2006, 244/2006 and 248/2006 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Question period, none? Thank you. We'll continue now to the Protection, Property, oh pardon me Protection. Councillor Steeves, you wanted to deal with Protection first. Councillors are you in favour of dealing with the Protection Committee first before Property and Development as Councillor Steeves has to leave. All in favour, contrary? Carried. Councillor Steeves proceed with your report.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MARCH 6, 2006

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the disruption, I have to go, leave later on this afternoon but it's a, trying to get my stuff out of the way although it may not be a problem in any event. If I can just clear up one source of confusion Mr. Speaker for the children watching despite the fact that he's gotten a haircut and a beard, this is still Santa Claus, okay.

With respect to the report of March 6, 2006, I will introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda item 1.

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

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

Councillor Steeves: With respect to the report of March 10, 2006, I want to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Motions, none. By-laws.

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

Councillor Steeves: No bylaws, I don't think.

Mr. Speaker: By-law No. 242, Councillor Steeves moves By-law No. 242/2006 be read a first time. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 242/2006.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves moves that By-law No. 242.

Councillor Steeves: I apologize that's not in my proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, we'll continue, all in favour, contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-Law No. 242/2006.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves moves that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 242/2006 be taken and read a third time and same passed and signed and sealed. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

Councillor Steeves: Sorry about that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions, none. Now we go back to Property and Development. Councillor Steeves you have yourself a good trip and a good holiday. Merry Christmas and the best for the year of 2007. We'll see you at lunch time. Now, the committee on Property and Development Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 14, 2006**

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda items 1 to 12 for the report of November 14th, 2006.

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

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 21, 2006**

Councillor Swandel: With regard to the report of November 21, 2006, I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 to 4.

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

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 28, 2006**

Councillor Swandel: With regard to the report of November 28th, 2006 I want to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda items 1 and 2.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd like to pull off 1 please.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi is pulling 1 and on 2, all in favour, contrary? Carried. Item 1, Councillor Swandel.

**Item 1 - Waverley West Northeast Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan
File SP 5/2005 [c/r DASZ 1/2006]**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I will wait and listen to Councillor Gerbasi's comments and respond to them.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put a few comments on the record about this clause as I wasn't able to attend the public hearing at Community Committee because our Community Committee was scheduled the same night and I did want to put some comments on the public record regarding this because I think it is a significant neighbourhood plan for the whole city.

One of the more disappointing aspects of the decisions that have been made in regard to the Waverley West development was the recent move to redirect half of the province's profits from the development from the inner city to the building of the Kenaston expressway. The Mayor recently announced this deal that a deal such as this had been struck between the city and the province cutting in half the 15 million dollars that was to go to inner city revitalization.

The promise that the profits would go to the inner city were one of the reasons used to try to convince Council, those

reluctant on Council to support amending Plan Winnipeg to allow this development to go through, to support it in my case I didn't support it anyway, but, it was, others were convinced that this is what would happen and it was argued that the effects of continuing to sprawl out the city would be balanced to some extent by reinvesting the profits in the core area.

Yet once again Plan Winnipeg was amended and the development clearly going ahead, now this deal was struck later. So I think that is something that needs to be pointed out.

I was very disappointed that the Mayor and Council would actually defend and support this kind of a trade-off and our city's social and economic health will not be improved by placing the inner city lower and lower on the priority list which clearly what has happened here.

The other disappointment that will reverberate through the years as this Waverley West development progresses, is the decision to move, remove the flyovers which would have provided more connectivity between neighbourhoods and a more pedestrian environment.

The impact of this will be apparent as future neighbourhoods in Waverley West come forward. The hope, furthermore, the hope of having a higher density development and having more affordable housing options in Waverley West also seems to be out the window. Again, this development will be pretty much a typical suburban density with high income options and that we've come to expect.

Once again, I would also point out that Council was told at the time of the Plan Winnipeg amendment that this would be an innovative development with higher density than a typical suburb. It's amazing how things change once a development been given the green light.

On the positive side, I would like to say that in this neighbourhood plan, there will be geothermal heat and sidewalks will be included on residential streets and I think that these innovations certainly are appreciated. I would point out that this is the first of many neighbourhood plans that will eventually come to Council as the Waverley West development progresses and this one is probably the most progressive one we're going to get. The next neighbourhood plans will not have the M.H.R.C. or the province involved and cannot be expected to be anything other than the standard cookie cutter suburban developments.

And my last comment is that I hope that when we embark on the Plan Winnipeg review process we find some way to guide this sort of development in a direction that will actually lead to more innovative suburban development. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Thomas: Thank you Mr. Speaker, actually, I'm one of the ones who feel bamboozled because I did vote for this when it originally came forward because I was told it would be innovative, all the profits would go to the inner city, and that there would be certain things done. I was told that it would be higher density and that it would have a smaller footprint as a direct quote. It does not. I was told that there would be affordable housing options in the area. It has not got these.

I was never told that there would be a major expansion of Kenaston Boulevard and I'd like to know why it's here. That was never one of the option but I was told there would be a rapid transit plan and that is not here and I cannot support the changes that have occurred and quite frankly, the development I supported is not the development that's here today. So I cannot support this, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to support this second and third reading of Waverley West. Everybody knows that we have a real shortage of building lots in the city and that this isn't just about the creation of a new development, as such. It's all about a

huge number of jobs that are associated with this, Mr. Speaker. You not only have the people who draw these things and do all of the beginning consulting who earn their yearly revenues through these types of processes, you have the people who build the foundations, you have the people who do the framing, you have the people who come in and do the finishing, you have the cabinet makers who make all the kitchen cupboards, you then have the companies that sell all of the plumbing fixtures, you have people that sell carpet.

All of these people are employed in this city by the way, and they're not all wearing suits and ties by a long shot and this is about the economic development within our city. And it's not just about a particular housing development; it's about all those things. And frankly, I'm a little bit surprised to hear a couple of my colleagues actually stand up and argue that we should provide higher profits to the developer and in turn provide higher costs to the city.

The fact of the matter is, is that when you're discussing a development agreement and the way that this thing came forward, all of the costs for these flyovers were being attributed to the City of Winnipeg. The costs for the designation of Kenaston coming forward was costing the city millions and millions of dollars more than what was reasonable and so we did what we always do, we negotiate the package.

And what we negotiated was lower profits for the developer and lower costs for the city. I can't believe that people have a problem with that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Clement. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I've always seen the Waverley West issue as a capital region issue and notwithstanding some of the changes that's occurred to the development since I was here several years ago, the facts are, is that our housing industry is booming and as the Mayor stated earlier, you ask 150 you get 165. And with the shortage of lots in the City of Winnipeg area, if they, we do not approve this and if this does not come on line ASAP, those people are going to build their houses outside of the city, were going to lose that revenue. That is how I have always framed up this issue in the past when we were talking about Waverley West and that's why I think it's important we move this forward and that's why I'll be supporting it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers? Councillor Vandal, Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Swandel, Vandal, which one do you want?

Mr. Speaker: Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. First I'd like to comment that it was nice to see that Councillor Vandal got 165 for his 150,000 home when the Mayor only got 158.

I guess you know just to start, we got to look back at this to where it started, the whole conversation around Waverley West started, we sort of put a bunch of people in a room and we said you know in your wildest dreams if you can do anything you want, it was under this design charade process and we had people in from the University of Manitoba involved and people from government and stakeholders in the community involved and they came to wonder if this wonderful picture of you know, what if we can do anything we wanted and this is what people came up with and from that we've drilled it down through a Plan Winnipeg amendment and through the Plan Winnipeg amendment into the bigger picture area structure plan, finally down into this neighbourhood structure plan and all the way down to the subdivision and rezoning process and that's how these things, this piece where we are today, came to be.

You know, it's interesting to sit and listen to some conversation around reducing taxes and at the same time, now hearing some conversations that we should be spending tens of millions dollars building infrastructure for a developer who happens to be another taxing body. You know we need to be real in our discussions on these things and be

practical and be focused on today and what we as a government are responsible for doing.

This document, Plan Winnipeg, gives us you know a great deal of guidance in its front page. It says when two or more statements in this plan conflict or may conflict in their application, the Council of the city, the Committees of Council and the officers of the city having jurisdiction shall apply their judgment regarding the best balance between or among those plans and policies.

So within those plans and policies we have talked about the environment, we have talked about density, we have talked about how to manage our infrastructure and strategically invest in infrastructure and on balance, this plan that's before you, does all those things.

The province as a developer chose to take their money and shift it in a different way to accommodate the requirement for the extension of Kenaston and the extension of Kenaston by the way has been in this document right from the beginning. It was actually at the design charade, even prior to the Plan Winnipeg was included in all the transportation studies in Plan Winnipeg, in the Plan Winnipeg amendment process and all the way through the document so that has been there.

And in fact there's a couple of other items that need to be corrected because if you read this document it is higher density when you take the environmentally sensitive lands out, it is not sprawled. It's consistent with Plan Winnipeg because it is adjacent to and compatible with, the extension of Kenston has always been a part of the document as I have said.

So here we have, and the other thing that's in here that was really misplayed by some of my colleagues here was, that there is a full mix of housing in here. There's a great range of housing including affordable housing, there's 30 foot lots in some of this which will actually, the burden of today where the consumer can't go out and afford to buy a 40 or 50 foot lot, is now taken away because they can go instead of paying 2,000 dollars or 1,800 dollars a front foot for a 50 foot lot they're now looking at being able to buy a 30 foot lot and plan their building accordingly.

So these are all positive. They all started from that dream we had with the design charade, they've drilled down through the processes and they've brought us here today finally moving forward with getting some much needed buildable lots as Councillor Clement referred to in this dream and moving forward. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All in favour, excuse me. Councillor Smith did you want to speak? I wish you would put your hand up sooner. We've closed debate, I'm sorry. All in favour, contrary? Carried. Councillor Thomas wants to be recorded in opposition. Councillor Gerbasi in opposition. Thank you. P and D Consideration of By-laws, the second and third readings Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: I would like to move that By-law No. 210/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 210/2006.

Councillor Thomas: Nay, you're supposed to say opposed.

Mr. Speaker: I said contrary, you said nay, so you're recorded.

Clerk: By-law No. 210/2006.

Councillor Swandel: I move suspension of the rules and By-law No. 210/2006 be read a third time that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary?

Councillor Thomas: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: Carried. Yes she's recorded.

Councillor Swandel: Have the nays been recorded Mr. Speaker? Good, just wanted to make sure. I didn't want to miss that.

I would like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 227/2006, 228/2006, 229/2006, 230/2006, 231/2006, 232/2006, 234/2006, 235/2006, 236/2006, 237/2006, 238/2006 and 245/2006.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 227/2006 to 238/2006 both inclusive and By-law No. 245/2006.

Councillor Swandel: Correction Mr. Speaker, I think that's 227/2006 to 232/2006 both inclusive and 234/2006 to 238/2006 both inclusive.

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

Councillor Swandel: I move that the rules be suspended and that By-laws No. 227/2006 to 232/2006 both inclusive and 234/2006 to 238/2006 both inclusive and By-law No. 245/2006 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 227/2006 to 232/2006 both inclusive, 234/2006 to 238/2006 both inclusive and 245/2006.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Question period.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Thomas: Thank you Mr. Speaker. A brief preamble, in dealing with clause 1 of November the 28th, the Chair of the committee quoted Plan Winnipeg and how it was up to our judgment and I just wanted to comment because he supported Item 8 on Executive Policy Committee, these decisions are no longer up to our judgment. The majority of Council has passed that any Council decisions that are inconsistent with the forgoing be rescinded, so there's no longer a matter of judgment here and it has superseded Plan Winnipeg and you did that. And the comment that I wanted to get clarification on Mr. Speaker, when we were voting on Waverley West, is he referred to the development and the expansion of Kenaston and said that it was important that the city get the developer to pay for those costs. This is the first I've heard of this. I always thought that this was something that the provincial government had requested in their expansion, now am I hearing that this is something that was requested of them to do which compromised their ability to fund their commitment to inner city projects because it was demanded by the city that they do.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor your question.

Councillor Thomas: So, that's what I want clarification by, had this been demanded by the city that they change it so that the expansion of Kenaston was included in their development, is that what he said when he was closing?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: No it wasn't.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Councillor Swandel is it your understanding that the provincial government's position and they're the developer by the way in case anybody didn't know that, that when they made their comments in relationship to this particular subdivision, that the Premier said that all net profits from this subdivision would go to inner city housing?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: That's my understanding and I think the way the events transpired was that when we started getting into some of the details of

the development, that you know what would be required as far as infrastructure in order to proceed in an orderly fashion that's one of the other things that Plan Winnipeg guides us to do, is to develop in an orderly fashion, that the requirements would be that the province chose to do that and it still leaves a net profits going into the inner city for housing, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, your second supplementary question.

Councillor Clement: My first supplementary. So, would it be fair to say then that when the Premier made that comment that he actually didn't know what the net profit was going to be?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Who am I to say what's fair to say for the Premier but I would say that it's reasonable to say that, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question, Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Would it also be fair to assume that net profits means that that comes after the sale of the property, which they're being paid millions of dollars for and they're going to have all those millions of dollars before the net profit comes, coming into the general revenue stream of the province and if they chose to, they could take some of those millions and put that into downtown housing as well?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Councillor Clement, I think we all understand what net profits are and I think the city and the province have worked together in bringing forward a development that works for everybody and at the same time, enabling monies to flow into the inner city for much needed housing. So, you know, at the end of the day it is a good thing. It's reasonable in our development process to have done the work that we've done. Because something started or statements were made at the very front end of this it may have been misinterpreted by some, it certainly does get a little convoluted at the end but yeah, you're bang on, the monies are flowing as were suggested by the Premier and through this process whether it's the province or their development agency, Manitoba Housing Renewal Cooperation, we've been able to bring forward a wonderful development and ensure that the infrastructures in place, there's affordable housing, there's a good mix of housing and that monies will be directed to the inner city. You know, we've done the job.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions. We've dealt with the committee before, the, dealing with the Protection. The Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works report of November 21, 2006, Councillor Clement you're on.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED NOVEMBER 21, 2006

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the clauses of the meeting of the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee on November 21 and I'll move clauses 1 to 8 and 10 as consent.

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

Councillor Clement: And because there is an Executive Policy Committee change to number 9 I thought it might be appropriate for the local Councillor Swandel to move item number 9. I'm assuming that it's in his ward.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel moves it. All in favour, contrary? Carried. Motions? Motion on the floor? No, there is a motion. Motion number 4.

Councillor Thomas: Point of order Mr. Speaker. We should have actually moved 2 to 8, not 1 to 8. 1 was referred back.

Councillor Clement: We did.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS**

Mr. Speaker: We did. Motion number 4, this is E.P.C.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Automatic referral.

Mr. Speaker: This one is Councillor Pagtakhan, yes, okay that's automatic referral. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

**Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan
Seconded by Councillor Lazarenko**

WHEREAS the Exchange District is a vibrant destination site with heavy pedestrian traffic;

AND WHEREAS the current City snow clearing policy identifying the "Downtown Square" as the area for priority cleaning in the Downtown;

AND WHEREAS the Exchange District is within the City of Winnipeg Downtown Zoning By-Law boundaries;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the geographical area for snow clearing priority in the Downtown conform to the boundaries established by the City of Winnipeg Downtown Zoning By-Law;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the snow removal policy regarding cleaning of sidewalks to a paved surface include the Exchange District sidewalks on the following Priority 2 and 3 streets to better reflect the needs of pedestrians: Albert, Arthur, McDermot, Bannatyne, Rorie, Market and Lombard.

Mr. Speaker: By-laws Councillor Clement.

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

Councillor Clement: I would like to move By-laws No. 246/2006 and 247/2006 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 246/2006 and 247/2006.

Councillor Clement: I would move that By-laws No. 246/2006 and 247/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 246/2006 and 247/2006.

Councillor Clement: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 246/2006 and 247/2006 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Question period, none. Committee on Fiscal Issues, Councillor O'Shaughnessy, report of November 21, 2006.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED NOVEMBER 21, 2006**

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured to introduce the report of Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues for November 21, 2006 and move Item 1 and 2 as consent.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. No motions, Consideration of By-laws Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, it's my privilege to speak on behalf of the Standing Policy Committee on Finance to move that By-law No. 243/2006 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 243/2006.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'll move that By-law No. 243/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 243/2006.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 243/2006 be read a third time and that same be passed in ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Any questions? Downtown Development, no report. No motions. Question periods, Downtown Development, none. We'll proceed. Alternate Service Delivery Committee, no report. Councillor Swandel By-laws.

ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move that By-law No. 241/2006 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 241/2006.

Councillor Swandel: I move that By-law No. 241/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 241/2006.

Councillor Swandel: And I would like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 241/2006 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Secretariat Committee on my behalf, Councillor Swandel you want to move clause, item 1.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2006

Councillor Swandel: I would be honoured to Mr. Speaker. I'll move item 1 of the report of the Secretariat Committee.

Mr. Speaker: That's the scheduling for the next year's meetings. All in favour, contrary? Carried. Before we call for adjournment, I would just like to say that the, we're now at the season of holidays, and we wouldn't be back to Council until June, January. I wish each and every one of you a very special Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year and those who are celebrating Hanukkah, the best and those who are celebrating the Julian calendar, Khrystos rozhdayet'sya, Z Novym Rokom. I hope you understood that. So I, you know this is the time for New Year. I'd like to make sure that all of you have a joyous time and we're meeting at 12:00 noon and Councillor Browaty is going to move adjournment. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Gerbasi, Leipsic, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Vandal and Wyatt.

Council Adjourned at 11:25 A.M.