COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday January 24, 2007

The Council met at 9:43 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 Fielding.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The pages, I'd like to introduce the pages here today. Bryce Brousseau of Vincent Massey Collegiate, resides in the St. Norbert Ward, also Simone Jaman of Miles MacDonnell Collegiate, resides in Elmwood - East Kildonan Ward. Those are our pages.

Welcome of guests and announcements. Duncan McMonagle, journalist instructor of Red River College and his class of journalist students, would you please come forward. Would you please rise, all the students, collegiate.

Thank you and welcome to Council. Next is the condolence motions, just a minute I don't have it here, oh yes, sorry. Mayor Katz point of announcement, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have two comments. Number one as most of us are aware, Mr. Speaker, Councillor O'Shaughnessy did suffer a heart attack. We are very thankful and grateful of the fact that he's doing well right now and he's resting at home and I'm sure myself and all of Council wishes him a very speedy recovery. We miss him and we hope he'll be back real soon.

On a much brighter note, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to announce two wonderful events that will be taking place in the very near future. Councillor Wyatt and Janet are expecting and I think we want to wish them a congratulations. I think it's a wonderful event. As well as Councillor Steeves and Lori are also expecting so there are many wonderful things happening on the floor of Council. Congratulations from myself and everybody on Council.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Steeves when are you due? I'd like to now get a motion read, condolences motion for the mother of Councillor Thomas, Eugenia 'Jean' Thomas, madam clerk.

Clerk: Moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Browaty that Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Eugenia 'Jean' Thomas, mother of Councillor Thomas which occurred on December 9, 2006. This Council extends to Councillor Thomas and family its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Would everyone please rise. Thank you. Second condolence motion also, I'll ask the clerk to read this out, condolence motion for former Councillor Geoffrey Dixon who served on Council for some of us here back in the 70's, madam clerk.

Clerk: Moved by Councillor Lazarenko, seconded by Councillor Smith that Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor Geoffrey Dixon which occurred on November 20, 2006. Mr. Dixon served the citizens of Winnipeg as Councillor for the Midland Community from 1971 to 1977. This Council extends to his wife Verna, daughters Susan and Diane and their families, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Would everyone please rise. Thank you. Leave of absence for motion for Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Clerk: Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan, seconded by Councillor Clement that Councillor O'Shaughnessy be granted a

leave of absence from today's meeting due to illness.

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

MINUTES

Councillor Browaty moves that the minutes of the meeting held on December 6, 2006 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour, contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Now we get into the agenda on delegations. We have ladies and gentleman a number of delegations here today. Each one will be allotted their time of what they're allowed to speak, what Council allows them to speak and you have to understand that you know some issues that may be very touchy, so we'll try to do this as best way as possible and we'll hear the delegation and hear, excuse me, Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I apologize Mr. Speaker, if I may; I was going to make a couple of statements on, just announcements for Council to be appropriate right now very, very brief.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead, yes.

Councillor Steeves: Sorry about that I should have talked to you before Mr. Speaker. I was, that's why I was kneeling beside you there, trying to get your attention, you were very busy. I don't know if this is appropriate in this chamber but I did want to mention I think everyone who is aware, especially the American football fans in the crowd and across the city, this is a pretty remarkable event for this city in this province in that in the Super Bowl coming up in I guess in just a little more than a week, there is going to be a player, likely starting for the Chicago Bears by the name of Israel Idonije who is from the Brandon area I understand and played of course here at the University of Manitoba. This has never happened obviously in our city and our province's history and I think, I want to put it on the record, what a great source of pride this young man has been for this city and for this province. So I just would put that to the Speaker and wish Mr. Idonije all the best on Sunday with my apology to the Colts' fans in the crowd.

The other issue, bravo, the other issue, Mr. Speaker and again I'm not going to ask for any moment of silence or anything, I did want to mention however that I think over the course of the last month a fellow by the name of John Heide passed away. You may remember Mr. Heide. He was the fellow who worked in the Parkade here at City Hall and he was a terrific employee and a great man. Probably not protocol to have a moment of silence, I'm not asking for that but I do want to put on the record I think the sorrow of this Council in his passing. He was a person who did a wonderful job in that Parkade and a person who truly and clearly loved his job and did a wonderful work at it. I think he was a great employee and he is going to be missed. I understand he leaves behind a family, so our condolences there. Okay and there was one other matter, I don't know if it's appropriate right now from Scouts Canada it's their 100th anniversary Mr. Speaker. It's a very short matter that they request to be read at Council, would it be appropriate to do that now.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Councillor Steeves: Today we honour a man and his big ideas, on August 1, 2007 a group of boys headed by Robert Baden-Powell began an island experiment where they would learn philosophy of the outdoors, enjoy the beauty of nature, learn the secrets of the wilderness and leave each place a little better than you found it. The boys were chosen from different backgrounds so that they could learn each others customs, to create a tolerance and understanding that would make them, make the little camp flourish.

The experiment was called Scouting and for 100 years it has made great strides in youth development of Canada around the world. Today more than 28 million strong, scouting can be found in 216 countries and territories. That's quite an accomplishment in 100 short years. Scouting has a defining impact on

Canadian society. Start in the days when Canada was still a relatively new nation, Scouts Canada has gone on to provide 17 million of our country's children with their first opportunity to sleep outside in a tent, to experience a taste of leadership and to build self confidence and self reliance. This is the legacy of generations of dedicated scouting volunteers from every corner of this great country. They are to be commended and congratulated for the contribution to making Canada a great nation. Congratulations Scouts Canada on 100 successful years of youth development. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you and that's coming from all Members of Council and the citizens of Winnipeg, thank you Councillor Steeves. Just a reminder Councillors if you have any announcements please give it to the Clerk or myself in advance.

Okay now dealing with delegations, I asked the Clerk to put speakers, we have speakers on the outside. Those of you standing outside in the foyer, that in yourself you'll be able to hear the discussions that are, can be discussed here, the delegations speeches and the rest of it and I'm sure all of you that can hear me? Good, we're in business.

Okay, the first delegation is Dawn Bronson on behalf of Parks Canada in support of item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated January 9th. Ms. Bronson you have ten minutes, would you please come forward. Dawn, Ms. Bronson. There you are. Thank you. Give that to the Clerk to distribute. Thank you. You can proceed.

Dawn Bronson: Good morning and thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak at today's Council meeting on behalf of Parks Canada. I can't remember any other time, certainly since I have been working with Parks Canada here in Winnipeg, that we have taken this step.

I had the opportunity to speak recently at the Standing Committee on Property and Development and I was extremely encouraged by the discussions that happened at that committee meeting. These aren't easy issues and the engagement of your Standing Committee and the efforts they put to finding a solution are very commendable.

I'd like to take a moment and explain Parks Canada's interest in the Exchange District and also in the proposal dealing with the 38 to 44 and a half Albert Street property also known as the Business Block. The Exchange District, as you know was designated ten years ago as a national historic site and Parks Canada is the lead federal agency for national historic sites. We work with owners, operators and stewards such as yourselves and we work with, to help make sure these important places remain for the benefit of current generations and future generations.

In the Exchange District, we Winnipeggers have one of the largest urban historic districts in North America. It comprises twenty city blocks and contains over a hundred designated heritage buildings. The district is indeed a national treasure. I'd like to put this designation into context. Across Canada there are about twenty five historic districts that have been designated by Canada. Only a small handful of those districts are in our large urban centres and none come up to the size and the complexity and the richness of the Exchange District.

There are a few that I would offer as comparables. A couple of notable districts like Chinatown in Victoria, a district called the Main, and that's St. Lawrence Boulevard in Montreal, and if you've ever been to the east coast, Water Street District of St. John's, Newfoundland. In that company, I think what we have here in Winnipeg is special and worthy of our stewardship.

I'd like to read a paragraph from the original report that went to the Historic Sites and Monuments Board when they considered the Exchange District for designation. I think that quote is relevant to today's discussion. And they said it's not the individual buildings themselves but it's the historic process of bringing together large numbers of heritage

structures, illustrating important themes within a tightly defined area that makes the Exchange District a distinctive place. And after that review, as you know, they went on to make a recommendation that the Exchange District is worthy of national designation and the Minister of the day concurred and placed that honour on this part of the city of Winnipeg.

So, what does the Business Block do to contribute to the national historic district and the answer is simple, it's heritage values. Heritage values are not theoretical concepts; they're concrete expressions of why a place such as the Exchange District has been designated by the government of Canada. And we were fortunate I think, to take a step a number of years ago after the district was designated, to describe in a report the heritage values of the Exchange District. It was a joint effort; it was an initiative of the city, of the province and of ourselves and it resulted in this document which I'd like to pass around. It's called the Exchange District National Historic Site of Canada commemorative integrity statement, if I might pass this around.

This commemorative integrity statement, it's the cornerstone of the values based planning that drives us to make our presentation today. We've highlighted in this report some of the most relevant sections that relate to the Business Block and I'll summarize them in four points.

The Albert Street Business Block is part of the district's dense urban environment. It's characterized by side by side buildings up to the sidewalk. Its part of the continuous edge created by buildings along a city block and it contributes to the density and indeed the intactness of the Exchange District.

The C.I.S. goes further and highlights for all three levels of government, that the decisions and actions that we take in the Exchange District should focus not just on the individual buildings, but on their contribution to the whole, to the street scape and to the district. The recommendations of the policy, Planning and Development Committee and the Executive Policy Committee demonstrate a solid understanding of that role and show responsible stewardship in action and I commend you for that. The proposal to demolish the Business Block and replace it with a parking lot would be contrary to those heritage values.

When I spoke at the Planning and Development Committee, I talked a little bit about the cumulative impact of a series of individual decisions on a place like the Exchange District and pending the nature of those decisions, we could find ourselves at some point crossing a threshold. It's like a jigsaw puzzle. You can remove a few pieces and the picture is still recognizable. But at some point you won't be able to discern the picture.

We haven't reached that point at the Exchange District and it is continues to be a national treasure. But there have been some notable changes since it was designated ten years ago. The Leland Hotel if you recall was destroyed by fire in 1999. The Bank of Commerce at William and Princess was demolished in 2001. Other structures such as the Ryan Block on King, the Warehouse on Princess and the William Saddlery have been boarded up and they face an uncertain future.

On a positive note, there's been significant condominium development that I think will bring people, bring activity and bring life to that district. Future changes in the district are inevitable and they are part of a healthy evolution. These changes can occur without eroding the integrity of the district. However, for those to happen, development initiatives need to reflect and celebrate the heritage values.

The district is ten years old. Perhaps it's time to step back and take stock of the area. Take a look at the changes that have happened and what our goals are for the future. I think it may be time to do a review of the elements that went in initially to the commemorative integrity statement which I've passed around, to ensure that those values are being maintained. Parks Canada offers and is willing to work with the city on such a review.

I also understanding that there is interest in developing a secondary plan for the Exchange District and I think this would be an excellent step forward. It would describe for all parties, the future vision for this area, as well as the rules of engagement for developers. I think it would give us greater context for dealing with individual decisions like the one facing Council today. Again, Parks Canada would be pleased to work with the city on a secondary plan for the district.

I'd like to now conclude my presentation and offer the following recommendations and I do so fully recognizing that the jurisdiction for this decision rests with the City of Winnipeg. But in consideration of the importance of the Exchange District to Winnipeggers, Manitobans and indeed all Canadians, we encourage the city to adopt the recommendations of the Executive Policy Committee and the Planning and Development Committee and more specifically, we recommend that the city designate the buildings at 38 to 44 and a half Albert Street as grade three buildings, that we protect the Exchange District streetscape values that are embodied in the Business Block until a viable proposal compatible with heritage values comes forward.

And finally, that the city mandate its employees to work with stakeholders in a review of the Exchange District, leading to a secondary plan that will guide future development and ensure heritage values and the national significance are protected in the evolution of this vibrant and unique national historic district. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I believe there is a question. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: It's really great that you're here today. This is a national treasure, the Exchange District and I'm wondering if your department has any funds available for promotion of the district to in effect develop it further?

Dawn Bronson: We have worked with the city and we've worked with the province over the course of the last number of years and done a number of different initiatives, including things, working with, providing input into things like walking tours, working with the BIZ. Most recently we are contributing under the Commercial Heritage Properties Investment Fund, approximately a million dollars to the Union Bank Tower. The government of Canada has invested in a number of other buildings over the years in the district and we will continue to look for ways and means to work with the city and with other stakeholders to protect this district.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Ms. Bronson for coming and speaking to us. When you talk about redeveloping this site in the future, what kind of options do you see as being appropriate in a national historic site? There's talk about you know people say, oh we'll just save the façade and that's fine and I guess I just wanted to get your comments on that idea.

Dawn Bronson: That would, thank you Councillor Gerbasi and there was certainly a lot of discussion at Planning and Development Committee about what might those options be, and I think really what we need to do is step back and take a look and understand what they all might be. I think the guiding document here that would give us insight would be the commemorative integrity statement and it speaks to a few values that are important, like buildings in a continuous block, buildings up to the sidewalk. And I would suggest that if you had a hierarchy of, or a series of options, an option that would include a building that's being used is preferable to a façade and a parking lot.

Mr. Speaker: That's it? Thank you for your presentation.

Dawn Bronson: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The next delegation on the same subject is Cindy Tugwell on behalf of Heritage Winnipeg. Is Cindy Tugwell present? If not, not present? Next delegation is Ken Zaifman in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated January 9,

Historical Buildings By-law, Mr. Zaifman are you present? Coming. You have ten minutes in your presentation.

Ken Zaifman: Thank you. I'd like to take, thank Council for allowing me the opportunity to make a presentation. Although I'm speaking in opposition to the designation, I am prepared to tell Council that I'm working with Heritage Winnipeg, CentreVenture and the Exchange BIZ to try and craft a solution that may satisfy all the stakeholders.

I am prepared to take the comments made by Councillor Swandel at the Property and Development meeting, that the designation of the Albert Street Block will not impede the St. Charles Hotel redevelopment. I'm also prepared to accept the comments made by Councillor Vandal that there are funds available to assist in the presentation and the preservation of the streetscape. As I said, I am working with Heritage Winnipeg, the Exchange BIZ and CentreVenture to craft a solution that may satisfy all the stakeholders and by way of background, I am the lunatic who purchased the St. Charles Hotel with a view to redeveloping it and that probably was due to a drug-induced euphoria at the time I signed the offer to purchase.

Having said that, I have said, I set a timeframe within which these discussions must be concluded. In order for the St. Charles Hotel proposal to proceed, the Albert Block issue must be resolved in a timely way. Let me be very clear. The redevelopment of the St. Charles is linked to the use that is intended to make of the adjoining property on Albert Street.

I am not opposed to maintaining the streetscape. I am not opposed to try and work with stakeholders to try to integrate it into the St. Charles proposal. But, there is a limit to what I as a private developer can do and there is a limit to the economic viability of the proposal if the designation continues and the building stays as is. Any of you can walk by that business block and can reach your on conclusions from the outside, from the inside, whether it is worth preserving in total or in part.

I would be remiss in not thanking Councillor Pagtakhan for his assistance. I would also be remiss in saying that the only, to navigate through the city hall process, I should say, I would also be remiss in saying that the only call that I received after I purchased the St. Charles Hotel was from the police and fire paramedic officials who said that they no longer would need to attend there on a weekly basis, either for ambulance, fire or police services.

I would also be remiss in not commenting about the position of Parks Canada. Their rhetoric is fine but there is no money behind that rhetoric. I would also like to state that in my discussions with Councillor Gerbasi and an email entitled good news for the Exchange BIZ, after the Property and Development Committee had decided to designate the property, referred to our proposal or my proposal as a manipulation and a tactic.

It compared, it congratulates the Property and Development Committee for taking a principled position as opposed to the unprincipled proposal to redevelop the St. Charles Hotel. I brought my concerns directly to Ms. Gerbasi and I make that comment in passing.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker am I allowed to us a clause of objection to this personal email that he's reading out that is not accurate.

Mr. Speaker: Well did you specify that it was only for his eyes and not to be released?

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, I didn't even send it to him. It was sent to a personal email list and it's not even, he's rephrasing it and it's inaccurate and I'd like it removed from the record if that's possible Mr. Speaker, it's not accurate.

Ken Zaifman: I'll put it into the record. I don't say with any rancour, the point I'm trying to make is, I think that we're all looking to achieve the same goal, the redevelopment of the Albert Street area. I say that because I have, in spite of all that has occurred and the frustrations in trying to move ahead with the project and

committed to make the proposal work with the Albert Street Block and my hope is that it can work.

The choice ultimately will be that of Council, but I'm willing to commit my time, energy and some money to redevelop the St. Charles Hotel. I thank the committee, the Council for giving me the time, I thank the Property and Development Committee for allowing me to make a presentation and I hope that the Council will take these comments into account when making their decision. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions of the delegation? Mr. Zaifman, I think Councillor Gerbasi was correct. You know, that email that she sent was not to be used publicly. I would ask the, that, you know to be taken off your comments. Thank you sir. The next delegation is Steve Bemrose in support of Item 2 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 10, 2007 regarding the Kelvin Community Centre. Mr. Bemrose, you have ten minutes and you can use that outside mic.

Steve Bemrose: I hope you can hear me at the back. Good morning everybody and thank you for this opportunity. I'll be brief. I don't think I need the ten minutes that you're allotting me but there may be some questions or there probably will be.

First of all, I wanted to stress the point of the Kelvin closure and how it relates to General Council. A couple of points I will make is, this community centre would be closed if, even if there was no new Recreation Leisure and Library Facility policy in place. General Council has been aware of the history of this facility for a number of years and it was in the condition for closure because of a number of reasons.

It was not just the fact that there was no volunteers, which is one of the reasons, but there was the facility itself being unprogramable, the amount of dollars that was needed. General Council a number of years ago, a committee was struck of volunteers from community centres. It was called the Community Centre Review Task Force. Some of you are aware of this. This Community Centre Task Force looked at all 71 community centres at the time. And they were scored on seven indicators, a number of the indicators were finance, programming, facility, volunteerism, governance. They ranked 70 out of 71 in these.

Those were some key indicators why this community centre would have been closed. General Council is not in the business of closing community centres nor do they want to be. General Council is in the business of keeping community centres open and I'm sure the city is also. And we will continue to do that. These community centres and the two that had come forward back in July of last year were for all intents and purposes, closed community centres and I'm speaking of Brooklands and Kelvin Community Centre.

So, it's not anything new that's coming up today that the closure of Kelvin Community Centre. So I just want to mention that off the bat. But in saying that I also want to talk about the positives in the neighbourhood that are going to take place and have taken place since the announcement of Kelvin closure last July.

General Council has been working with Community Services to make sure that programming in the area is kept. Any new programming would be looked after. We've already worked and had discussions with schools in the area. Glen Elm, Lord Selkirk, also churches in the area, one of them already is providing a new program. They received a grant and offering after school programs. Our community centres in the area of Chalmers, Melrose, Bronx Park will continue to provide programming for the residents of the Kelvin catchment area and those programs will continue and new ones will be, begin in the area.

The key feature that we'd like to present today is that the rinks in the area will not be closed. We assure you they will not be closed. We have an agreement with Bronx Park, they will maintain them. They will receive the operating funds for those rinks and they will be maintained with staff, not just open doors. They will have

staff at the facility. We're talking about the fieldhouse in the back that is part of the policy to remain and the fields. There's plans to look at the repairs of the fields, the soccer pitch and baseball diamond to make them more usable and also there's plans to put in a playground as most of you are aware, the playground was removed from the front of Kelvin Community Centre and a new one to be put in that location.

So, I think there's some positives that come out of this. I know a lot of people talk about the plan and the RALPH policy and looking at the future. General Council has been given the role to look at the bigger picture in the city. The dollars are limited, what can be done. It was mentioned that community centres need well over 200 million dollars to get them back into shape and there's no dollars to do that. We understand that, so what we have to do is work with what we've got and create some synergies with the communities and that's happening already.

We've got a great example of this in the southeast corner, area of the city, with Glenlee Community Centre and Norberry Community Centre merging together. They understood what was happening. They looked at what was going to work best for them in that area. They were having some of the same troubles that Kelvin was having, so they since amalgamated, looked at what was best, they're moving to the Norberry site and will be closing the Glenlee site and the community has decided that on their own, based on some of the same issues that we're dealing with in the Kelvin.

There's a number of other amalgamations that are on the books or are working through right now. We have a brand new one announced is Isaac Brock, Clifton and Orioles Community Centres. The three of them have got together and formed the new Valour Community Centre. We're very pleased with that. They're working right now just with the governance and the programs that the three have already been providing.

So there's some positive things happening in the city in community centres and I know that closing doesn't sound like a positive thing and we sure appreciate the work that the community centres and the volunteers have done, including the volunteers that have come forward in the Kelvin area. We hope that they'll continue to volunteer in the area in the future and you know we're pleased that they did come forward and I commend them for the work they've been doing.

So really, that's what I wanted to come here to say. The General Council still supports the closure of that facility, not community, we're not closing community, we're not closing programming and I would just now like to open it for any questions

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr., thank you for your speech. There is a question being asked now. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. While you said that there were no volunteers, are you aware that there are now over 70 volunteers operating out of Kelvin Community Centre?

Steve Bemrose: Yes I understand that there's a number of volunteers there. I didn't say that there was no volunteers; I said that was one of the issues that had led to the decision of, or a recommendation of closure.

Councillor Thomas: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Yes and while you said that there was no programmable space, are you aware that there are a number of programs, quite a few programs operating out of that space now that you considered not programmable?

Steve Bemrose: I didn't say there was no programmable space. I said that it's not very usable space. We looked at it a number of years ago, that it's not feasible to have seniors' programming in there because of the narrow stairways,

inaccessible for handicapped and a number of issues like that.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: There are two wheelchair ramps, one in the front and one in the back. And I guess my final question to you, are you aware that while you're talking about a voluntary amalgamation that occurred between two community clubs, that neither Bronx Park Good Neighbours nor Kelvin were asked to participate in an amalgamation strategy for their community.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Bemrose.

Steve Bemrose: Yes, I was aware of what you're saying that the community centre was a closure. It was not amalgamation. It's not amalgamation, it's an actual closure.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, no further questions? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I guess I'm looking at the bigger picture too and I'm hearing the Chair of the Standing Committee making statements about, that the smaller community clubs aren't valued the way or aren't as useful as the new mega centres and are moving to some new model, which concerns me a lot because I have a lot of small community centres in Fort Rouge and a lot of them in many of the older neighbourhoods of the city, a lot of Councillors have those and they are very much important and I'm wondering if the G.C.W.C.C. supports that approach or is still going to continue to be supportive of smaller community clubs where that's what seems to be serving the community well.

Steve Bemrose: Very good question and yes, General Council supports community centres, the neighbourhood community centres as we call them, the smaller centres and of course we support the bigger ones. Our role is to support all community centres and will continue to. We're not in the business of closing community centres. There would be no General Council if we're going to be closing community centres. We're there to support the centres. We're made up of representatives from community centres, totally. All our volunteers come from community centres and they're not in the business of closing community centres. They're looking at what's right for the community and the big picture for the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Bemrose, it seems to me when we set out on this path to do the recreational and leisure facilities piece that we clearly were going down the road of providing facilities that would give us the ability to improve programs in neighbourhoods and programming. We seem to constantly come back to this chamber talking about bricks and mortar and not about programming. Has the focus of G.C.W.C.C with respect to Kelvin Community Centre and Bronx and other things that are happening in that region, been focused on improving program for the neighbourhood?

Steve Bemrose: Yes, right from day one that is our number one concern, is the programming. I mean like you say bricks and mortar are just some place that you go to do the rest. We are and we actually are looking at right now, some programming not just about going up to Bronx Park but in saying, having people stay right in their own community also with some of the programming that's out there now and with the new structure at Bronx Park, they're going to be able to provide much more than what's been provided in the past.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel your second supplemental.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Did we make a policy that we would look at needier neighbourhoods in addressing them first and foremost and getting more programming into those neighbourhoods in respect to this policy? Was it not part of our original policy?

Steve Bemrose: I believe the policy was looked at the city as a whole. It didn't

identify the needier any more than the other. I think it identified programming as a big issue and the facility as an issue also, city wide.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Any decision made here with respect to this motion that's coming before us today, will it have a financial impact on our ability to deliver other services or improve programming in other parts of the city?

Steve Bemrose: No, I don't believe so.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. You know, things change. You know with the announcement of the possible closure of this community centre, the community has come together. I gather there were 500 people at their Halloween night at the centre which is incredible. Should we not recognize that a community has come together and wants to keep this community centre going and should we not aid them to do so?

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Hold it; hold it, the gallery, please. Please, it's very hard for this to be taken down into the minutes with tape recorders because it distorts whatever is being said. So please try to keep that, listen to what is being asked. Okay, Mr. Steven you can proceed with your.

Steve Bemrose: Thank you Councillor Smith for your concern and what we've done is, we're looking at the volunteers that have come forward and we commend them and I mentioned that. They're providing a service for the community. The facility out front is a bricks and mortar piece. We still think there's a place for these volunteers, whether it be in that facility, whether it be in facilities, neighbouring facilities, it doesn't mean that has to stop and we truly believe that they can work in the community. Maybe not Bronx Park, maybe not Chalmers, but there's the other programs we're talking about and we still think there's a place for them.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, no further questions? Oh, Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Correct me if I'm wrong Mr. Bemrose, but does the G.C.W.C.C. provide programming at various community centres?

Steve Bemrose: We support community centres through funding from the City of Winnipeg at various community centres and we work with them to develop programs also.

Councillor Vandal: Could you define support programming, in which way?

Steve Bemrose: Well we receive 185,000 dollars annually from the city. 100% of that goes to programming at community centres and we actually work with community centres to implement those programs.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question.

Councillor Vandal: Final question has there ever been any of that funding go towards Kelvin for programming?

Steve Bemrose: I believe Kelvin has received some funding in the past years for some programming.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillors, when you get up to ask questions, please stand, ask the question and sit down, ask and sit down because it's hard for me to keep track of your number one, two and three questions. Mr. Bemrose I believe that is it. I want to thank you for appearing here today, giving us some enlightment into the, into this question. Thank you sir.

Steve Bemrose: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The next delegation is Regan Wolfrom along with Gary Swanson. Please come. You will have ten minutes and five minutes each. Mr. Wolfrom you have the ten minutes and Mr. Swanson you have the five minutes,

and stay, Mr. Wolfrom stay till the end of your presentation so that some questions can may be asked of the Members of Council. First is Mr. Wolfrom, you have ten minutes.

Regan Wolfrom: Thank you. Before I begin I would like to table a few correspondences if that's okay. I have a correspondence here from the Winnipeg School Division that shows their full support of keeping Kelvin Community Centre open. I also have, I have a correspondence from the Parent Council at Lord Selkirk School which is the school that is nearest to us and they make it quite clear that they depend on Kelvin Community Centre and they support it remaining open. Let me find that as well. I also have a few items I'd like to have distributed to the Councillors if that's also okay. So, these are the letters to table and then these are for the Councillors. Thank you.

Good morning. My name is Regan Wolfrom and I'm the President of Concerned Elmwood Neighbours. Our organization has been running programming out of Kelvin Community Centre since September of 2006. I have a letter here from Elmwood's most famous athlete, Clara Hughes. Clara, of course, is widely known as Canada's top Olympic athlete having won medals in both the summer and winter Olympics. She is also known as a role model and a philanthropist having donated 10,000 dollars of her own money to Right to Play, which is an organization that uses sport and play as a tool for the development of children and youth in the most disadvantaged areas of the world. And I'd just like to read, it's a brief letter.

Dear Members of Council, His Worship Mayor Katz. People wonder why many of Canada's premier athletes come from Winnipeg. When asked, I always say that the reason is the array of community programs that are available. Coming from Elmwood, my days were spent playing ringette, soccer and softball at Kelvin Community Centre. This is where my athleticism was developed and I cannot help but think of where I would be today without access to these sporting programs so close to home. Kelvin Community Centre is a place to be cherished. It's a place where kids can get together and find positive outlets and learn the joys of play. And the heart of Kelvin is the clubhouse where kids can lace up their skates, spend time with role models and get a chance to do things that they wouldn't have done otherwise. The volunteers at Kelvin are ready to keep the club going and I'm going to be lending my name and my support to their fundraising efforts. Our kids need their community centre and our community centre needs its clubhouse and its volunteers. All you need to do today is vote to keep moving forward with the work of Kelvin volunteers. You just never know where a kid might end up with an outlet like Kelvin. Sincerely, Clara Hughes, 5 time Olympic medallist, cycling and speed skating, proud supporter of the Kelvin Community Centre.

Kelvin Community Centre is a safe zone in Elmwood. It's a place where caring volunteers help our youth to find their way past the bad influences in their life, the drugs, the gangs, the street crime. For some of the children in our community these things are often overwhelming especially when dad is in a gang or your best friend brings a crack pipe on your night out.

These are some of the realities of our community. But the people of Elmwood are standing together to make a difference. And today, you have the chance and the privilege to make a decision that will change our children's lives. This cannot be overstated. We have kids handing in their knives. We have former car thieves who want to join our wrestling team. If you have never experienced that moment, when you see a child turning his life around, then you won't know what we've been doing here when we're at Kelvin.

Our kids, many of them are here today and they are standing up for their community. They know that it is up to them to take care of their club. They know that it is up to them to be leaders. They are willing to take that on. I am here today to ask you to stand up. I am here to ask

you to take care of your city. You need to let our children become the leaders that we know they can be.

A couple of boys stole a few drinks from our canteen. We knew what they did but we waited. After a few days, they came to us. They told us what they did. And they told us that they're sorry. What does it say when young men stand up and take responsibility. They're growing up. They're becoming men, they're starting to believe in something and they're earning our trust.

We have volunteers at Kelvin Community Centre, over 100 of them. They deliver our newsletters. They run our programs and they reach out to our kids. We have volunteers. We had a barbecue for our community. We had 500 guests. We had 2 haunted houses. We cooked 800 hot dogs and served 1200 drinks. We have volunteers.

Tomorrow night we will have our skate night. We will have music, we will have hot chocolate, we'll be skating with the kids. We have volunteers. Kelvin was never dead. Kelvin was never empty. And Kelvin is certainly alive today. So what do we need. We have a clubhouse and we use our clubhouse. That's how we run our programming. That's how we make a difference. We cannot run programming out of a dressing room. We cannot run programming out of a penalty box. We need a place to bring our children together with our mentors. We need a place for our volunteers to meet. We need a place to call our home. If you take away our clubhouse we will start to lose everything.

The rinks won't last if another club is forced to maintain them. How can a caretaker be in two places at once? And our fieldhouse cannot stand on its own. It makes no sense to leave an unsupervised building in an isolated location. If we are finding kids smoking crack in our penalty boxes, what is stopping them from moving their drugs into our field house. How can we keep our kids from being bullied or mugged or knifed when all of our volunteers are a thirty minute walk away at Bronx. And how will we keep the gangs away from an empty fieldhouse. We've already had a gang clubhouse on Chalmers Avenue, we don't need a new one.

It makes no sense to close Kelvin Community Centre while the Bronx Park expansion is incomplete. It makes no sense to padlock the doors to our clubhouse when we have programs to run and nowhere else to go. How can we keep our volunteers when they're being told that their work doesn't count. How can we help our children when the message they're receiving is that they just don't deserve a place for themselves.

No one can argue that it's logical to demolish one building before you build its supposed replacement. No one can honestly tell our community and this city that it makes sense to close Kelvin before opening the new Bronx that you want us to use. If your final decision will be to force the people of Elmwood to use a club in another neighbourhood, it only makes sense to wait until that club actually exists.

But Bronx Park is not our community centre. Our kids can't walk there. A child cannot walk five kilometres every time they want to go to the nearest club. There's no room for our programs there and a child will not take ownership of a centre that is not in their community. It won't be an expansion for Bronx Park if you close Kelvin. Bronx Park will have their space, Good Neighbours will have their space and Kelvin will be left with a broom closet. It's not fair to our neighbours in East Kildonan to make a promise to them and then to change the terms. It's not fair to blame them for your decision today.

There is only one solution that will make everyone happy. Our clubhouse must not be padlocked or demolished while the Bronx Park project is incomplete. It makes no sense for anyone here to argue for closing Kelvin today. It makes no sense to tell the people of Elmwood that their work at Kelvin is not worth continuing and it makes no sense to throw away six months of community building when no alternative is available.

This city needs you to show leadership today. Leadership isn't blindly following out of date reports from 2001 and previous budget commitments and calling it a hard decision. Leadership is a willingness to accept counsel from others, to adapt to changing environments and to even change an opinion once in a while and we need you to make your decision today. We have been working far too long under this threat of closure. We need an answer and not a referral. We need to move on to the next stage.

Kelvin Community Centre is making a difference on the ground right now. The new Bronx Park is years away. When the people are willing to give their time, their money and their hearts to making this city better, it's the responsibility of leaders to support them. We need your leadership. The Kelvin clubhouse must not be closed. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Wolfrom.

Mr. Speaker: You can step aside, please for a moment, you can step aside and Mr. Swanson you have a time of five minutes to speak on the same subject matter.

Gary Swanson: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Your Worship, Councillors. Thank you for the opportunity to speak about the proposed closure of Kelvin Community Centre. You may want to ask why we, why would CUPE, why would the President of CUPE Local 500 speak to this closure. My career has been spent almost entirely working for the City of Winnipeg and the inner city. We are most concerned to see yet another central community centre possibly have its doors shut.

One, over the last number of years we've seen the continual struggle of inner city community centres. We have seen the closure of Boyd Park, Brooklyns, we have seen clubs go under administration such as Norquay, Weston and others amalgamated such as Orioles, Clifton and Isaac Brock. This is continually happening in neighbourhoods that, who absolutely needs the facilities. These neighbourhoods need viable civic supported community centres to provide key programs and services to the residents. This is essential to the well being, health and safety of these neighbourhoods and is part of Plan Winnipeg.

Are we as a city asking the right questions. Do we have the right model to support these clubs. Are we truly focusing civic resources to these communities. We question how we can take away a much needed asset without providing a real alternative.

For a large part of my career with the City of Winnipeg as I said, I've worked in the central part of the city; I've seen the slow death of organized sport for children in these communities, the continual reduction of recreational services for children and adults, the deterioration of community facilities and the attrition of the civic workforce providing services to these communities. Kelvin is a micro Cosmo of what we're seeing in the City of Winnipeg today.

There has been a shift toward the model of mega community centres, recreation centres. For many suburban neighbourhoods in Winnipeg this is the way to go. It provides economies of scale, there’s more centralized delivery of programs, they have skilled volunteers, transportation is not an issue and most importantly, it is sustainable because of the disposable income available in these communities.

But we see almost the opposite in communities such as Kelvin. It is a community made up of hard working people trying to make ends meet on a daily basis where their personal time is limited. Experience in volunteer boards is limited and the capacity of the community needs to be constantly built. It's a community that needs sustainable funding and sustainable services from the City of Winnipeg.

Taking their community centre away from them without viable alternative is abandoning them. There is a better way. We have seen that better way and I'll give an example where the city has partnered with the G.C.W.C.C., Community Services Department to be specific, at

Norquay and the Community Development Branch in Community Services was assigned to work with community building a splash pad.

In that, in that project though, was a synergy that was developed by the community development people in Norquay and they brought together other key players in the community to help build the splash pad but also help rebuild that community centre and today Norquay is operating and thanks to the work of G.C.W.C.C. and civic workers, that's happening today, but they constantly need support. We can't just walk away from them and I understand that they had a 30,000 dollar programming grant from the G.C.W.C.C. and Mr. Bemrose has said that they get 185,000 dollars on an annual basis. Well if you giving 30,000 dollars to one club, how can that be sustainable. I don't think they have enough money.

We're going to suggest Council direct the Community Services Department to work with and support the Kelvin residents to develop community driven programs and services in their neighbourhood. We also recommend that Council assure the Community Services Department has the internal resources to fulfil this mandate which we know the department does not have at this time. The residents of Kelvin are appealing to us as the greater community in Winnipeg to stand alongside them and support them. We ask Council to keep Kelvin residents, to help Kelvin residents help themselves and give them the opportunity to determine what their needs are in their own neighbourhood. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Gentlemen, both of you, questions of the delegation? Councillor Wyatt is first followed by Councillor Thomas. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Either one of the delegations.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, actually Mr. Wolfrom. Thanks very much for your presentation Mr. Wolfrom. I think what the community has done by rallying around Kelvin is quite impressive to say the least. My question would be, in light of the core group of volunteers that you're saying you have involved now and the folks that are rallying around Kelvin, is there the interest or the will to raise monies because I've been involved with projects raising money for recreation as you know in the community to raise monies towards, because there clearly is a need for infrastructure, there's a need for capital costs, whether that's 1.6 million or whatever, there's a cost involved here with regards to the aging of the facility and so on. Is there a will to pursue that in the community and raise monies with others, government and private sector?

Regan Wolfrom: Yes, that's an excellent question. We've actually been looking into this quite a bit and what we would like is we would like the city to continue its commitment to provide the operating costs for Kelvin and to allow Kelvin to have access to the standard general Council and Community Incentive Grants. Capital improvements, we will fund raise from other levels of government and from private organizations. We are not asking for a handout from the city for capital. We will handle that ourselves. People have been saying to us, we want to give you money, we want to support you. What we need is operating and we need status. Once we have that we can raise money.

Clara Hughes is going to lend her name to our cause. She is very influential. She managed to turn her 10,000 dollar donation into over 150,000 dollar donation being matched by other people to write the play. That's a serious achievement. The fact is, the federal government themselves have recognized that places like Kelvin are important and they're willing to give anywhere up to 500,000 dollars to organizations. Now, we might not get 500,000 dollars but I'm sure we can get something, but what we need is a commitment from the city to allow us to have our operating grant for another year or two or maybe three and then we will provide the capital for our own improvements. We do not expect more money from the city for that.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor Wyatt? Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Thank you for coming Regan and Gary, I appreciate your support. In his presentation, Mr. Bemrose said that there was money for programming, have, while you've been operating programs have you ever received money for programming?

Regan Wolfrom: No, we have not.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Your second, Councillor Thomas your second question. Now, is that it?

Councillor Thomas: Second question.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, go ahead.

Councillor Thomas: Second question is, Mr. Bemrose said that they were looking for space within the community other than their offer to have you join the Bronx Park area, has there been any approach for them to look for, to talk to you about locations within the community?

Regan Wolfrom: There has been no mention from the General Council to help us with that. We actually approached them and said we are more than willing to consider other alternatives for programming as long as it's within our community. John King and myself went to a meeting with General Council that was recorded by both sides in which we said that, but there was no follow up from the General Council and all this talk about arrangements with schools, those arrangements don't seem to be the same thing we're hearing when we talked to the schools. I know that Glenelm started a drop in centre but there's no drop in for Lord Selkirk which many people would argue is the far needier school of the two. So the General Council no, has not provided any alternatives for programming aside from a building that does not yet exist.

Mr. Speaker: That's it? Councillor Vandal, your first supplementary.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Wolfrom I need clarification as to the programs that are offered at Kelvin by your volunteer Board of Directors?

Regan Wolfrom: Okay, well currently, the programs that we have are, we have an aerobics program for adults. We have a martial arts for mom and me that is free for women and children and actually was so successful that there was a waiting list. We also have a karate program both for adults and children. We have a creative movement program which is running on Saturday. We have a wrestling drop-in which actually has a lot of interest being generated. We have a program for the Follow in Christ Method which is actually not offered by; actually I don't think it's offered anywhere else in the city at this particular moment in time. Let's see what else is there, there's our youth drop-in which is actually becoming quite successful. The youth come by on Thursday afternoons, they do some crafts and they get to know one another. We're also looking at other programs, we're thinking about starting a shinny, a weekly shinny game where kids can just get together and play some hockey. We also have our other events like our family skate nights like the one we're going to have tomorrow night where people are invited to have some fun and get some free hot chocolate.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. Do you have a group of volunteers prepared to sit as Board of Directors?

Regan Wolfrom: Yes we do. We actually have a provisional Board of Directors which is not officially sanctioned. What we would like to do is have a new AGM. Our By-laws state that we would have an AGM in March; we would like to do that, at which point we could get a new Board of Directors that accurately represents the wishes of the entire community now that everyone knows the situation of Kelvin.

Mr. Speaker: Your final supplemental.

Councillor Vandal: You referenced a grant from; I believe G.C.W.C.C. or the city. Could you clarify where the grant comes from, how much it is and what it's for?

Regan Wolfrom: Are we talking about the operational grant we hope to have?

Councillor Vandal: Possibly.

Regan Wolfrom: Well I mean the General Council currently provides I believe its 43,000 dollars for our operating. There's also of course the pool of programming grants for 185,000 dollars. We would like the ability to tap into our operating fund year to year. We'd also like the opportunity to apply for the programming fund as with everybody else. Those are the only grants that I believe we're looking at with General Council, maybe socio economical grants as well. All the other grants that we're looking at are from either other levels of government or from private organizational sources.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel. First supplementary.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker and Mr. Wolfrom. I heard you mention that you not had any of the programming dollars that G.C.W.C.C. provided to you. In my ward, the four community centres apply for those funds. I'm just wondering how many applications from Kelvin Community Centre have gone forward to G.C.W.C.C, and for what specific programs they were for, say over the last four years?

Regan Wolfrom: Well, that's a good question. Now I'm not sure about the programming grants for the past few years, all I know is that since I started my tenure as the provisional President we have been unable to submit grants because we have not had any official status. So I can't speak too much to that issue. I can probably get back to you on it but at this point I don't have the information.

Mr. Speaker: Your second supplementary.

Councillor Swandel: I assuming you not having official status is because of the issues at the AGM and not having quorum. Can you give us an idea of what the input of the local politicians whether it be M.L.A.'s, School Trustees, Councillors, was it at those AGM meetings?

Regan Wolfrom: Well okay, Councillor Thomas had her assistant come; she was unable to attend due to a prior commitment because we didn't give a lot of notice for the first AGM, I see, not the one we were involved in. When we created our own Annual General Meeting which did not receive sanction from the General Council even though they were in attendance, that general meeting actually had participation both from Councillor Thomas and from our M.L.A., Jim Malloway so we've seen support from both of those levels of government and the fact is we had 56 eligible voting members at our AGM that we advertised. It's unfortunate that they held an AGM meeting on the same night as Pathways Process at Bronx Park back in late April. Perhaps if half of our members hadn't been at Bronx who are active, maybe they would have been at Kelvin, so that's unfortunate and I think we really need that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel your final.

Councillor Swandel: Just a final, I guess it seems like since they're been activity and some noise out there, the local politicians have been present but when the wheels were falling off and there was no quorum it seems like you were abandoned. Can you comment on that?

Regan Wolfrom: Well, that's an interesting way to look at things. The way that I believe most Councillors and M.L.A.'s will look at these situations is that they were, they rely on someone to say there's a problem with our executive and the fact is when we had successful summer drop-in's, we still had sports running at Kelvin, people thought okay, somebody must be running it, so nobody called the Councillor, they wouldn't call the M.L.A. and the fact is, it would be rather unorthodox for a M.L.A. or

Councillor to go nosing around community centres saying, hey, what's going on with your executive. The fact is, they don't want to appear to be too controlling, they want to give the community centres a little bit of autonomy and I believe that's what they did and when the call came to them that we needed help, they were right there and they assisted us.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Nordman I believe you have only about one question.

Councillor Nordman: Thanks Mr. Speaker. Mr. Wolfrom at this point in time are there any house leagues, you know eight, nine A1's, ten A1 hockey teams? What's your plan if you in fact go forward with a summer schedule for baseball, soccer? Is that sort of in your planning?

Regan Wolfrom: Well basically, we have hoped to actually have a hockey team last winter unfortunately because they thought the club might be closed during the winter season we were unable to get one. If we are allowed to continue, we will certainly be looking again at getting soccer teams at Kelvin. With baseball we're not sure if we're going to pursue that too much because there's been complaints about balls hitting windows; they are (in audible). But as far as soccer and hockey we're more than willing to continue with that if given the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Thank you. Next delegation, on a different note.

Councillor Thomas: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Question period is over.

Councillor Thomas: No, I was just wondering if this is the time where I present the motion for the additional delegations who want to be heard on this clause. You submitted that, that to me to move suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker: How many have you got?

Councillor Thomas: There was a list that was sent, I think, I think there's, is there four names? Okay, I was, I emailed my assistant and I was told that there was a list that was given to, no, I was told that there was a list that was, that was given, that had, I will look at it right now.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor why didn't your assistant fax it on to us?

Councillor Thomas: Its four people, pardon me, five people. Al Mackling, who's a resident in the area, nice to have you back Al. Elaine Rasmussen, Carlos Sosa, Wayne Mezzo and Christine Bennet-Johnson. They're residents and I thought this was the time to move suspension of the rules to allow additional delegations. There's usually a time to do this and I was just waiting for the appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas, past practice has been we allow two for, two for and two against.

Councillor Thomas: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: So you can have four and there'll be no questions. They have five minutes each and no questions after by Council, that's our policy. So, what are you moving?

Councillor Thomas: Yes, so I'm moving suspension of the rules to ask for additional delegations to speak on this matter, which we've often done on other issues if there's more delegations than the two for or two against who want to speak and I've read out the list of names. I thought they were presented to the City Clerk.

Mr. Speaker: No, they haven't.

Councillor Thomas: I apologize, I emailed my assistant and he did tell me that they, that they were brought forward, but I don't know what's happened here. I have the list here. But I thought they were, I thought a hard copy was brought up to the City Clerk and to the Speaker, so I don't know what happened with that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas would you please read out, would you please read the names out.

Councillor Thomas: Yes. I'll read them out.

Mr. Speaker: Those who are for and those who are against.

Councillor Thomas: I'll read them out again. Al Mackling, a resident, Elaine Rasmussen, Vice Principle of Lord Selkirk, Vice President of Lord Selkirk Parent Council, Carla Sosa, resident, Wayne Mezzo, resident and Christine Bennet-Johnson resident.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, the four of them will get five minutes each, no questions to be asked by Council, apparently two, two, sorry, two because I said two for and two against. You've got four that are for the same subject matter, so you have two names. Give us two names that we could deal with and give them that five minute time.

Councillor Thomas: I'm not clear on.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, point of order. I believe Council can waive the rules with 2/3's of the vote and if the Councillor's requesting that all five speak for five minutes, Council has the authority to make that decision. They may decide not to, but they have that authority, just because in past practices we've allowed two for and two against is not what we have to do today Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi we have a policy that we've been adhering to all the way through. It is two for and two against. Councillor Thomas has four names for, so Council will make a decision. She has five names, so look I'll call that question to the Members of Council that if they so wish we'll deal with that and let's get on with the business. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Mr. Speaker I'd like to try and help out. I'd like to move suspension of the rules to allow these five delegations to speak for five minutes each, no questions.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, there we are, a positive motion. So, now Council Members you heard that, all in favour, contrary? Carried. Okay let's proceed. Who's the first name? Mr. Mackling. Have you got the list? Mr. Al Mackling, the former Attorney General for the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Al Mackling I've given you a title so proceed, you have five minutes.

Al Mackling: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Lillian Thomas and the rest of Council for suspending the rules so that I could add a few words to this debate or this issue. I, as some of you know have had some experience in civic affairs. I was an Alderman in St. James for a period of eight years and really enjoyed that and come to appreciate that that level of government is closest to the people and is sensitive to the issues of the people, probably to a far greater extent than other senior government levels.

I've had the privilege of having served in provincial affairs in the legislature. My aspirations for federal participation were never successful. I'm sure that's of no interest to you. But during this time, I have received the benefit of advice from constituents. I think I obtained a reasonable share of wisdom over the years as to when a politician should listen to the people. And I think this is one instance where you all should listen to the people.

I think it's ironic that in our society, we seem to be able to spend millions and millions of dollars on professional sports, professional sports highlight issues. We hear a concern or at least an acknowledgment of a very successful young Manitoban that's going to be playing in the big pro ball game in the United States and I think we all appreciate that that's something that's very significant. But I think of very great importance is the participation of young people in amateur sports, in community sports.

It seems to me that we in our society have to place a greater emphasis, provide a greater evaluation for putting money into community centres, into community activities that'll produce citizens who are not only honest and contributing and

competitive, but that will not be the converse, that will not be problems for the city. It seems to me that we want to emphasize in our society correcting the major problems that occur. We get advice that we should be hiring more police. I think we should be spending more money on young people, investing in them, not closing.

Now maybe there's some logic in realignment here and making adjustments. I appreciated the fact that Councillor Wyatt returned my call and we had a discussion about that and he said, he assured me that, well this wasn't a complete closure, it was, it was some adjustments being made. Well maybe we can defer all that. Maybe this Council should sit back and take a longer, deeper look at what the requirements are in our society. Let's not be quick to frustrate the obvious good intentions of a community.

Now, there are some communities that can't afford to have as many volunteers. We have families where not just one person working, we have both husband and wife working to sustain that family and they're tired at the end of the day. They can't rush out to the hockey rink and supervise and guide.

Not every community is the same. Rich suburban communities can't be treated exactly the same as core area communities. And we should listen to the experts who are saying in this era of reduced, reduced energy, that we're going to be facing an energy crisis, we should be having people moving into the core of the cities, not moving out. We should be making core areas much more attractive from every point of view, including community centres where people will have an opportunity to enjoy life to the fullest.

I ask Council don't make a decision today that you will regret. Don't close this community centre. Rethink your position on it. Revaluate what you should do to reinvigorate the communities, the inner part of the city.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mackling.

Al Mackling: Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mackling. Elaine Rasmussen. Elaine, ladies and gentlemen it's hard to conduct a meeting with applause. Elaine Rasmussen, five minutes. You have five minutes. Proceed.

Elaine Rasmussen: Okay. Dear Mr. Sam Katz on behalf of the Lord Selkirk Elementary School Parent Council, I wish to express my deepest concern regarding the closure of Kelvin Community Club. Our school is located only three blocks from Kelvin Community Club. Our school has had the opportunity to use Kelvin for our speed skating practices.

Many families in our neighbourhood face economic, excuse me economical challenges, some rely on public transportation, some work extended hours at low wage jobs. This makes getting to and from community clubs particularity a challenge. Moving Kelvin activities to the Bronx for example would present a significant deterrent to many families. We feel that our neighbourhood is where gang recruitment is very, a very real possibility.

We regard providing more opportunities for healthy community engagement as a valuable prevention, as such, keeping the community club open is a form of crime prevention. As involved parents, we believe that the schools, the communities and businesses and civic leaders can work together and each of the good citizens of the future. We ask to reconsider the plans to close Kelvin Community Club and give our neighbour the opportunity to develop more activities for our youth. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Carlos Sosa, you have five minutes.

Carlos Sosa: Before I start I'd like to table a letter that was submitted to Sam Katz, Lillian Thomas and Dan Vandal from Professor Chris Leo at the University of Winnipeg and his letter is of support of Kelvin Community Centre and he is a very recognized issue on issues of

municipal issues across Canada. I would like to give this now to the Clerk.

City Councillors, Your Worship Mayor Katz, members of the public, today I am here because I care about my community, and Kelvin Community Centre. As a long time resident of Elmwood I'm here to say why the club should be saved from the wrecker's ball. The community club is important to the Elmwood community. If City Council proceeds with the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee to close the club, this will be bad news not just for the area but for Winnipeg.

Over the last seven months there has been a revitalization of the centre. The revitalization has brought over a couple of thousand people to the club. I'm also here to speak on behalf of the people who cannot be here, those being the youth, the mothers, the fathers, the families, and the senior citizens who have all used the club over the years.

When I was younger, the club played a significant role in my life. I played soccer there. It was a place for me to go like the kids today from the area. Since Elmwood is a high needs area of Winnipeg, it is key to provide a safe place for youth and for the area and the community at large. A safe place that keeps them out of trouble and participating in communities and in activities that facilitate community safety. If the club were to close, the youth of the area would have very few options for recreation.

I am also concerned that a number of City Councillors including the Mayor have made statements that would be considered untrue. There have been claims that this is a fair process when in fact it has not been fair. There has been no consultation with the residents of the areas surrounding the Kelvin Community Club. Another claim is that the club has no volunteers, again that is simply untrue and the fact is, what Regan said, this club now has over one hundred volunteers.

As someone who is majoring in conflict resolution studies at the University of Winnipeg and is doing a practicum in community justice, I understand the importance of keeping community clubs open. When the city talks about reducing crimes on their streets and neighbourhoods, it is hard to believe the city is considering closing a community club which is so key to an area like Elmwood.

Instead of, a community club should be considered as a crime prevention tool to keep youth off the streets and doing something productive in the community and instead of something that would harm society and that would be considered unproductive.

As I conclude my speech I ask you to vote against this proposal and to save the community centre, not just for me but for the young kids, the seniors, the families and the schools who use the club for their physical education classes and for Winnipeg at large. Do this for the safety of the area, for healthy living and for the community and for Clara Hughes who has written a big, a very passionate letter as to why the club has played a good role in her life. Do this for Winnipeg and do this for Elmwood. Please save the club.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Next delegation is Wayne Mezzo. You have five minutes sir.

Wayne Mezzo: Hi, my name is Wayne Mezzo. I'm a concerned resident of St. Boniface with family still living around Kelvin Community Centre. After reading about Kelvin's problems in the Herald newspaper, I could not stand by, knowing and experiencing first hand what closing a community club can do, Pirates, one, two and Maples does in the area.

For over the ten years enrolment in west Transcona was down in hockey and ringette. Residents said no, to going to Park City West. Only in the last few years has enrolment made gains at Park City West building hundreds of new houses in the past years will do that. Well what about all the people whose clubs were taken away. Their kids have had no place to play, leaving how many kids out of hockey and ringette, just ask Mrs. Liptky and her son Travis.

Residents on Regent where Pirates sat, have had a view of an empty parking lot for twenty years, only in the last few months has someone started to build on that lot. Coaching in the 70's, 80's and 90's and sitting on the boards of East End Community Club, Northeast Hockey League, in rolls of sports director, convenor, schedule makers, I have seen first hand. Southdale, Gateway, and Dakota are super centres. Bronx Park is only going to be a mini centre. Why? Where is the indoor rink taking the pressure off Terry Sawchuck as the only indoor rink in East Kildonan - Elmwood.

Teams of hockey and ringette from all over the city must travel outside the city to find indoor ice. How many casual hockey, ringette, broomball, sponge players are there in the city. What will closing the outdoor rinks do to them. Only people in registered sports will be able to play because no indoor rink will let a casual player just jump on the ice and play. Southdale, Gateway and Dakota do have something in common. When you walk in, no one knows anybody, unlike the small community club.

Now let's talk about my involvement in Kelvin. After talking to Regan in late summer of 2006, I offered whatever help I could give at that time to raise money for the club. Nothing was planned. He would keep me in mind. In early October, 2006 I received a call from Regan. The plan was for a Halloween barbecue, could I help. After thinking about it for about twenty minutes I called him back with my answer and a new plan for the Halloween party.

Volunteers from Elmwood, St. Boniface, St. Vital, St. James, Transcona and North Kildonan pitched in for the party, only problem was turning down Gary Demitroff of St. Boniface who had two heart attacks in 2006 and still showed up, is that commitment. And a grandmother from Grand Beach, that was willing to take a bus into the city for the event. Now that's commitment. By giving Regan and John help and showing them how to put on an event, something the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres did not do, they were able to put on a party Elmwood has not seen in years, at no cost.

Past few months since Halloween I have stopped by Kelvin numerous times and I must take my hat off to John and Regan and the rest of the members of Kelvin Community Club for taking Kelvin off life-support and breathing new life into the club. Once again kids can now be heard and seen at the club in a safe place and remember what Zach Sweet said, who played on the Bantam Triple A soccer team said in the Free Press on Thursday, December 28/06 on page C9 if you want to know. We play until we drop. It's really fun on the outdoor rinks and it's great to get away from the referees whistle and the parents.

Since January 3rd, 2007, without telling Regan and John, I have taken it upon myself to contact other organizations who deal with the same problem based by Kelvin and residents daily. Working together can learn and understand from the professionals, tackling the problem head on. This response was outstanding with some offering help to run the programs and events at Kelvin. This does not mean that they would take Kelvin over. They are there for help and support.

Meetings will be scheduled in the next few weeks to bring everyone together. New programs are being worked on every day. Kelvin Community Club will be running like a club, community club until it, pardon me, sorry. New programs are being worked on every day. Kelvin Community Club will be run like clubs used to be run, involving every member and deciding the program and the club and the future of the club.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Your time is up.

Wayne Mezzo: Hold on. The support of the people has grown since Regan and John first started. Everytime, they

Mr. Speaker: One thing I have that you don't have, I've got a switch that can cut you off.

Wayne Mezzo: Well you shut me off, I'll keep on going. I'm a, as a paid taxpayer with no kids I'd rather see three kids playing shinny than three faces on the

front page of the Free Press or CKND news.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mezzo.

Wayne Mezzo: charged for stealing.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mezzo.

Wayne Mezzo: and now you decided, bring the police in, it does not get his way in closing Kelvin, here take your puck and go home.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mezzo.

Wayne Mezzo: People of Winnipeg don't need you and if you count more.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mezzo, please, please Mr. Mezzo, that's not,

Wayne Mezzo: I got carried away.

Mr. Speaker: I know you did, but you're sending a bad message to all Members of Council. Thank you, sir. Christine Bennet-Johnson is the final delegation.

Christine Bennet-Clark: Hello. I'd like to just clarify with Ms. Thomas that I phoned you and left a message. I'm Christine Bennet-Clark. Maybe you just heard my name wrong. Was it me you're referring to? That's okay. Not the first person to get my name wrong.

So I'd like to, I'm glad to be speaking last. I'd like to thank you for this opportunity and say good morning to all of you, Mr. Speaker, His Worship the Mayor, City Councillors and the public. My presentation is going to be a little bit different. I come from, I'm the President of the Wolseley Residents Association and I'm, excuse me, but I'm not here, excuse me, in the capacity as the President of the Wolseley Residents Association, I'm here as a resident of Wolseley wanting to speak to this issue from my experience with the association but also as an organizational governance consultant and a mediator. I've had the, I'm here to support the residents of, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Ms. Johnson you have five minutes.

Christine Bennet-Clark: I'm here to support the residents of Kelvin Community Centre's request to keep the centre open, but I'd also like Council to consider engaging in an extended public consultation process based on what is called a Charrett developed by Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The Charrett model was recently used in Wolseley to look at the development of the old Grace Hospital that was deemed surplus by the provincial government.

And the model that we're, what were having to deal with here, what happened when the old Grace was put up for development proposal, the community immediately round up, rallied together just as Councillor Harvey Smith said and it is one way of getting communities to rally together. And what I'm proposing is that there are different ways that have more positive outcomes and produce positive relationships and what is occurring here today is an example of democracy in action.

City Council has made a decision based on their own decision-making process and now the city administrative task is to implement that policy. They have diligently; the city administrators have diligently used an approved process to do that which includes some forms of public consultation. At this next stage, the public has engaged in a legitimate, democratic process of protesting decision that was made.

The opposition, tension and conflicts that arise are the status quo of good democracy. I'm hoping to change that view with a proposal. Two issues jumped out at me concerning the decision to close Kelvin Community Centre. One was that there is a big gap between what the residents think a community consultation process looks like and what the governing body of the city means by public consultation. Neither is right or wrong. What is meant by public consultation depends a lot on your perspective as a stake holder.

What is changing is the very nature of democracy which calls for more public participation. The dilemma we are facing as a community is the changing relationship between the governance body, City Council and the residents of communities. To me, the question is how can public participation take place in a less conflicted manner.

The other issue that jumped out at me was that the Winnipeg Recreation Leisure and Library Policies, RALPH as I've heard it affectionately referred to, adopted in 2005 and subsequently adopted was the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centre's 2006 community centre business plan; we can only look forward to more contested decisions over the next few years. It seems to me that we are at a critical juncture to give consideration to the expanding notion of democracy.

In suggesting a charrett as a model for public consultation I'm wanting to encourage Council to consider reviewing the Kelvin Community Centre decision as a trial run for adopting a more structured decision making model for future decisions.

I was fortunate enough last fall to participate in a public consultation process of the charrett developed by and used by C.M.H.C. The charrett was held over three days on a weekend with numbers of community residents, participating both throughout the whole event and others for different parts of the event. One essential aspect of a charrett is that it is facilitated by a third, neutral third party; Heather Cram from the firm of Hilderman Thomas Frank Cram was the facilitator in this case.

A major feature of a charrett is that the information is presented to the stakeholders that may not otherwise be available to them. The shared information becomes the centre for decision making allowing for all the stakeholders to work from the same page. The process began with a detailed account of the process, of the history of the site and we had a lot of documents for guiding the decision making process. And it was unique and it brought, the charrett was unique in that it brought together all the stakeholders so that we could come up with a joint plan and from the charrett.

Mr. Speaker: Mrs. Johnson your time has expired. You have a lengthy letter here. I'm sure that Council Members will read it in its entirety later on. I'll just give you about 30 seconds to sum up. Thank you.

Christine Bennet-Clark: Thank you. In closing I'd like to encourage the members to support the neighbours of Kelvin Community Centre's request to keep the centre open, and to engage and to use the time in between to engage in a process that would look at how we can use this new strength of the community to not just the community benefit but all of our benefits. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That takes the delegation on this issue, second delegation, the next delegation is Gary Swanson, Gary please come here. You have ten minutes to deal with the issue of the report of Executive Policy Committee regarding the 311 Customer Service Model, followed then by Nick Ternette, Paul Edwards and Shelley Tataryn. Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Your Worship and Councillors. Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak about the 311 proposal. I just wanted to say that you know when we sign up to be a delegation at City Council, we're asked whether we're opposed or we're for the motion and I just wanted to say that often times we're coming here and we're in the middle of it and in this particular case we think 311 is a really good idea. We're just, we're concerned about the process and how we get there.

As you know, CUPE Local 500 represents 5,000 civic workers including a large segment of clerical and administrative support workers who will be affected by this initiative. Well our focus obviously is about how our membership is affected by the 311 proposal. We must be all mindful that this project will impact all civic employees in all department operations when fully implemented.

We think the recommendations of the consultants of 311 project are worth pursuing. The report has been informative and is useful in identifying what the city administration should consider and do to implement the 311 project.

On the options presented, we are in concurrence that a consolidated model would offer the most potential for Winnipeg. In our original report to E.P.C. on January 17th, 2007 we noted, we had two major concerns on how the city is approaching to set up, the set up of the service. One, the human resource aspect of the service we believe is under valued or is being diminished as a key element in the provision of 311 and the second point we made was the private sector option for implementation is being promoted with what we believe is not sound justification or substantial reasons and the reason we say that is that there is no privately operated 311 centre in Canada and there's only two in the United States and both were a result of major catastrophes to those cities.

We have noted E.P.C. amended the administrative recommendations and added a third alternative. A blend of two options originally presented. With the 311 centre infrastructure built and owned by the private sector, while the civic staff operate the 311 centre. We are still of the best, we are still of the opinion the best model for the citizens of Winnipeg is an internally owned and operated 311 facility.

We therefore appeal again to Council to not spend a quarter of a million dollars hiring a private sector consultants to develop and promote their involvement in providing a 311 centre. Spend that money and let's go ahead and build the internal one.

I would like to elaborate on the two deficiencies that we highlighted in our presentation to E.P.C. While the, at focus consultants report gives extensive treatment to the systematic requirements of a service call centre, there is very little of the human resource element. There is some reference to the role of customer service representatives play in the system but there is virtually no emphasis on how important their part is for the call response system. The dual dimensions of what the CRC, CSR's excuse me provide, customer service and knowledge skills are noted but not recognized as being key to the entire service centre performance. And when we have call centres right presently in Public Works and Water and Waste, when they receive a call, they have tremendous knowledge about the operations of those departments and the citizen receives a value added service because of the knowledge of our people.

For the 311 service to be effective it must be rely on the cordial citizen and city staff interaction, not just the technology. This is the most critical element for the effectiveness of the system as the customer service contact and knowledge level of those who respond will lead to permanent public satisfaction.

There was only a passing reference to the responsibility of procedural and training supports that affect customer service response capacity. Our members have noted these requirements before as being deficient and have compensated with their own initiative and input. In fact, the city and CUPE have collaborated on providing such training through the Joint Education and Training fund.

We believe that our existing staff are not only skilled in customer service responses and knowledgeable of city services; they are committed to the city of Winnipeg. They have demonstrated a range of qualities that not only provide service but provide the city with a quality service that our citizens value greatly.

They know the public and the city and therefore they can anticipate background information related to callers questions. And I'll give you another example. When a person calls for a recreation program, the person that's taking the call has tremendous knowledge about the number of programs that are available to them, where they can go, how they can fit a younger child in on the same time slot if it's a swimming class. Those, that kind of knowledge you cannot replace by an outside source.

Our people can situate questions and caller needs within a physical context that helps city officials understand questions, complaints and comments. They also know what city departments do and importantly, they know where there are overlaps and related services so they can provide immediate feedback that helps citizens who are calling to clarify what they need.

And third, city staff have shown they are able to deal with difficult calls that involve complaints or caller aggression. These calls require a great deal more than customer service and knowledge skills as they often are dealing with other unrelated personal issues of callers and how many times has our people answered a call, it could be a Animal Services call about the dog barking next door and how we, and how our people at the end of the phone have calmed them down and dealt with it and provided the service level to them.

We believe that existing staff represented by CUPE, the WPA, WAPSO can and WAPSO can contribute the most important element of the new 311 service. That's the human factor. While the development of a consolidated service for the city may result in labour relations implications, we believe we can help enhance the delivery of city services to the public which is our primary concerns for all our members. We are prepared to share our extensive experience and knowledge on how to respond to the public calls and I'm here to commit, my local to working with the civic administration to make sure that this operation gets up and running.

The private sector option and we have to speak to this; the consultant report introduces a possibility of private sector delivery of 311. They refer to it in option six as the independent model; however there's very little explanation as why this option should be considered. The consultants do not provide the advantages and disadvantages analysis the four other models kept.

From our point of view, the lack of intention to the serious disadvantages of this approach to delivering 311 service or any public service is significant. The administrative, administration's recommendation to Council to consider both internal and external means of providing the 311 service was a good one and they are required to under the Alternative Service Delivery but there is no sustained explanation as, on how the external service could be provided enhanced benefits and therefore why it should be considered.

Our recommendation and again we support a great deal of how the CC, the 311 system can be developed, as defined in the ad focus consultants report and the recommendations and the administration and E.P.C. To enable a smooth transition to a new 311 service we think it would be appropriate for the city to commit to its employees, those current staff who make up the staffing of, or who will make up the staffing of the 311 call centre.

To do this we think the administration would do well to work closely with front line call responders to tap into their experience and knowledge and for those employees who will not have a position within the new call centre, we think it would be, we think a commitment to redeployment is needed.

We believe that the consolidated model can be adopted and measures taken now to start and to plan some of the implementation internally. The public deserves a system that answers their questions and guides them to city services they need. There is no valid reason to wait to do that. And thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith has a question.

Councillor Smith: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: First supplementary Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Swanson, this half a million that you're talking about, is it clear in my mind that you're saying this is a waste of money, this expenditure?

Gary Swanson: I'm not sure. I'll make an opinion of whether it's a waste of money

but I think we could save the money and build the internal one right now. I think our people are ready to go to it. I think there is the expertise within the city civic structure, in the administration and we have a consultant's report that guides us on how to do it.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Oh, Councillor Leipsic your questions?

Councillor Leipsic: Mr. Swanson, I just wanted to ask you, I notice you're saying 311 consultants report shouldn't be taken because of the cost that Councillor Smith has.

Mr. Speaker: Please stand, stand, stand.

Councillor Leipsic: Thank you and then just recently a few minutes back you said the PUFF and RALPH report which cost a half million dollars should be disregarded, I'm just curious you arbitrarily decide when and how and where to accept recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: I don't know if I recommended that the RALPH, I don't believe I made that point that the RALPH should be disregarded. I said that there was a way to deal with the issue in Kelvin by bringing in people that have skills to facilitate and bring synergy to community, to provide services in Kelvin.

Councillor Leipsic: Well you weren't accepting the recommendation?

Mr. Speaker: Your second question.

Councillor Thomas: It's not in the RALPH report.

Gary Swanson: Yes, I'm not sure if, yep.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, is that it? Mr. Mayor. Your first question.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Gary I very much appreciate you coming down and making this presentation and I'm very grateful that CUPE has basically come out and said what good service 311 would be and I think we all concur with that. You made the comment that you obviously prefer the internal over the external and I certainly understand where you're coming from, but at the presentation that yourself and Greg Manzik made, as a result of that, we talked about a hybrid and came up with a hybrid of internal because I think you expressed the hundreds of years of expertise that we had access to, but also acknowledging the fact that we have a dilemma because if there's an equipment need which could cost millions of dollars, somewhere between 10 and 12 million dollars. So my question is, do you support that hybrid model? Yes or not will suffice.

Gary Swanson: If that's the only way the city can make it work, yes.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, thank you Mr. Swanson. The Mayor indicated that the reason we would need to go to this hybrid model would that is would save us money and guess I'm wondering are you absolutely convinced, I mean we haven't studied it and we don't have numbers but is it a fact that by going to the private sector we automatically save money or is it possible that we would just be leasing it or spending money in a different fashion? I mean that's an assumption that was just made and I wonder if you agree with that assumption?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: I guess the jury's out until we see all the numbers come in. We don't know how, and I think it would be unfair to speculate which model is going to end up being in the best interests fiscally for the taxpayers of Winnipeg. But I think you can not only measure fiscal you also have to measure on the value added service that our members provide. So there's a whole conglomerate of factors that go into making your final decision and we have to, we have to measure and we'll all have to measure on whether you know a P3 model for the infrastructure and facility is one that will

work in the best interests of the citizens of Winnipeg and your tasked with making that decision I guess down the road. The only thing that, and I lost my thought, but I had another thought on P3.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Your second supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Do you think the 250,000 dollars we've already spent 250 so far but the new 250 we're going to spend looking at the outsourcing model which isn't done anywhere in Canada or in only two cities in the State. Is this something that seems like the best use of the money or would you think we should focus directly on just getting the 311 system in place sooner rather than investigating this kind of far out idea?

Gary Swanson: I'm going to speak to the merits State of the City Address and he made a commitment there from the Red Tape Commission to try and have all those recommendations from the Red Tape report implemented by January 1. I think by, I think there may be undo delays by waiting and looking at other options. When we see that across this country other municipalities have already made the decision to do it internally and I think we could read there from their experience as well, instead of wasting, instead of us using the money here to reinvestigate what they've already done.

Mr. Speaker: That's it. Councillor Swandel your first supplementary.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Do you believe that it's responsible of this Council as overseers of the taxpayer's dollars to ask for business case models of the three scenarios put forward so that we can quantify and assess them and make an informed decision on behalf of the taxpayers of Winnipeg in providing what everybody agrees or seems to agree is a very valuable service to the citizens of the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: I believe it's always prudent of Council to look and investigate all models of service delivery. On this particular point though, I think and we're making a very, very strong case that the internal model is the way to go. You have the people that do it already and they need a better model to deliver better service and I think that focus report is already presented that and why go further into the and dig further around for other models when you know that the best way to deliver that service is from the people that are already working in it.

Mr. Speaker: Your second supplementary question.

Councillor Swandel: If I may answer your question, I'd say because that's our job, Mr. Swanson. We need to assess. Are you aware that regardless of what model is selected there is a substantial need, a cost in using consultants and developing the appropriate software and hardware that will ultimately manage the information that this 311 system has coming into it?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: Yes and we are aware that that would be a costing. I don't believe that the 250,000 dollars, I'm not, don't quote me on this, but I'm not quite sure, I think you're looking at other, yeah, I guess I am. I'd rather see the 250,000 dollars spent on building an internal model because we have to go and you're absolutely right, we have to research the technology and the how we're going to build it, build the infrastructure. It's not just from the call centre; it goes to every civic department and building in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Your final supplementary question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just so I'm clear, you agree that there's a need to spend money on deciding what the appropriate technology and software is that will be used for the provision of this 311 service.

Gary Swanson: Yes, I believe.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Mr. Swanson I thank you.

Gary Swanson: Thank you

Mr. Speaker: Let's get on with the delegation. Nick Ternette. Where is Nick Ternette? Nick, you've got ten minutes.

Nick Ternette: Ten?

Mr. Speaker: Ten, one, zero.

Nick Ternette: I'm half blind these days I apologize. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz and Members of City Council. It's somewhat ironic that there was almost no discussion or debate about downtown redevelopment during the past October civic election. Then out of the blue in January without any public input or discussion, two visions for downtown redevelopment appear. One from the private sector, Lloyd Axworthy, President of the University of Winnipeg's vision of expanding the university without any downtown mandate and the other from CentreVenture.

Now we may quibble over some of Lloyd Axworthy's ideas for downtown redevelopment. For example he wants to buy the bus depot and move it to the airport. Now, economically, people might realize that actually makes sense and the reason why it does is because after all it is freight not passengers that make money for the bus companies. But what happens to the passengers. As you know, many of us oppose that, how are they supposed to find their way to the airport to capture a bus. But at least Mr. Axworthy idea of buying a Travelodge Hotel and making it into student housing will at least help in bringing people back to the downtown.

As well his vision, encompassing, incorporating and I think you should be listening carefully about some of the ideas, incorporate the Sherbrook pool into the university's athletic department. One thing missing from that department is a swimming pool and most importantly, Axworthy understands that the Bay is the lynch pin of all downtown redevelopment. If it collapses, everything else in the downtown will and there is nothing you can do about it.

The university has already expressed a willingness to rent one floor for office space and condominiums. Doesn't that sound a lot like what the Save the Eaton's coalition talked about doing with the old Eaton's building. Mr. Axworthy would leave the food store, cause that's the essence of maintaining residents in the downtown as well as two stores of retail and the rest as I said would be condominiums and office space and the university's kind of committed itself to taking over one floor of the Bay if it gets to the point when the Bay collapses.

And now, low and behold CentreVenture which was long been discredited including having its operating funds cut, has come up with its own heart of gold plan. This plan sounds to me like it wants to spend as much money that has accumulated over the three or four years. 14.7 million dollars in cash, land and loans and an additional 17.2 million dollars in loan repayments which it has collected or is getting back from sales that they have, possibility to be spent all of it in the next three years, all this without public input and no questions on whether these plans can actually do anything to contribute to revitalizing downtown.

What will be left after three years. Basically it's three more parkades, as if we need more parking in the downtown. God help us. Some spruced up parks, not to mention of developing Victoria Park for example which was always part of a plan into a memorial for the 1919 Winnipeg General Strike. There's no mention of that and hey, some flashing neon signs along Portage Avenue in order to make the street more attractive.

While CentreVenture played a significant role in the development of Waterfront Drive and the M.T.S. Centre, Council needs to ask the questions, what of these projects that actually revitalize the downtown in any significant manner. I would say no, as I have argued over and over again for many, many years, there is no way that the downtown can be revitalized until its population rises from

its current 13,000 and that is confirmed by it's own BIZ groups to over 50,000 with a light railway transit system, a system where people will leave their cars at home and take public transportation downtown in a clean and an efficient manner, as well as bringing the DDF to fruition, that is an electric heritage street car circulator system in the downtown which this Council passed by the way if you want to look at the record in a motion in 1999 as part of the downtown redevelopment.

And what about the downtown vacancy rate, there is nothing in CentreVenture plan to address this part, in fact it doesn't even deal with it. But even those on the right and I've been arguing those arguments from the left, those of us on the progressive side or what we consider to be redevelopment, but even those on the right, CentreVenture has openly abandoned its designated loan in revitalizing the downtown. Its mandate was quote, to lead and encourage business investments and development downtown and enhance the use of heritage buildings and land in the downtown area.

Continuing, the city shall promote downtown development to stimulate revitalization by implementing a visionary downtown plan which is what I think we're discussing today, which is what they presented, even though they had up to the end of February to present it as far as understand, February 27 is when their mandate comes out, but they presented it now in January.

Questions that ought to have been asked and haven't been asked anywhere that I've noticed, what type of investment, not a word about what kind of private investment is going to come into the downtown area in the next three years. In fact there isn't, it's all public monies that they've accumulated over the last three, four years that they're going to spend in the next three years. To me that just makes no sense.

What happened for example, some of the ideas that have been discussed in the last three, four years, what happened to the Rock and Roll Museum that was supposed to be planned for the old Metropolitan Theatre, nothing. What has happened to the water park proposal that was floated by the Winnipeg Convention Centre at one time I believe about development, nothing. What has happened to the 38 story condo tower at the 100 Main Street, nothing. All quiet and no discussion about where this is all going to go in terms of redeveloping the downtown.

While I am supportive of improving park areas, the plan doesn't even come close to what Mayor Sam Katz has been talking about lately and touting the so-called in quotation marks world class destination parks. I would assume that term means bringing a lot of tourists into the park area of the downtown. Well quite bluntly, a new stage or the Old Market Square, a skating over Argyle Street and a dark park on Pioneer Avenue are not going to make a world class destination park. That does not mean that I wouldn't support all those, please don't misunderstand me, anything that improves the park facilities in the downtown is helpful but it is not world class destination parks. It isn't going to bring anymore tourists into it afterwards or it has at the present time.

But the most disturbing part of the CentreVenture plan, is a designated dead zone. These dead zones reach from Portage Avenue downtown to Main Street and Higgins and back to Portage Avenue. Hey, wasn't this the area that CentreVenture were initially supposed to revitalize back in 1999, as I remember. The North Main Redevelopment Plan, under the leadership of Mary Richard and Joe Bovo, what an initiative, taking on beyond what CentreVenture wants to revitalise that north Main area from Higgins Avenue to Portage Avenue, which now CentreVenture has included again and if you remember that plan which was a massive document and I remember talking about that, (inaudible) in that area, an urban reserve was planned to be on Main Street and what are the results since 1999, Thunderbird House. A very nice, excellent spiritual facility for the aboriginal community in the core area but that's it.

That's all that came out of that redevelopment. And E.P.C. has revolved consultation of any sort really, endorsed the plan, a vision plan, admittedly when they come back here for the actual spending, they have to come back for every effort to really seriously discuss, but a vision plan has been endorsed with no debate that will result I think in three years that will have even more problems for the downtown than we presently have, all because they refuse to deal, as far as I'm concerned, with the real issues facing our downtown.

That is the issues, that we don't have a decent public transportation system, we don't have a housing policy that encourages people to live in the downtown and that we have to have both of them encompassed within a downtown redevelopment plan, if there's any way to save the downtown and well we'll just leave us all as citizens of Winnipeg, just as I am a citizen, you are a citizen and I have been disillusioned and any thoughts the last four, five years about downtown redevelopment and once again after three years what's going to happen. We'll be disillusioned and even more because nothing will happen; it's just a facade it means nothing because nothing changes. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Ternette. No questions? Thank you. We have two delegations; Mr. Paul Edwards and Shelley Tataryn are coming on the same matter so both will be here. They'll have one up ten minutes, the other have five minutes and then we can adjourn for lunch. Okay.

Paul Edwards: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker, Your Worship Mayor Katz and Councillors. My name is Paul Edwards; I'm legal counsel for Avion Services. With me is Ms. Tataryn, Shelly Tataryn, who is the General Manager of the company, she will not be making a separate presentation today, however she will be available for questions if there are any following my presentation.

I want to start Mr. Speaker by just resubmitting a handout which was part of the presentation at the Executive Policy Committee and I'll continue while that's being handed out. Let me start by apologies in advance for those of you who've heard these comments before. This is the fifth time that this matter has come before a gathering of Council. Many of you will have heard some of my comments before. I will keep it brief.

Avion Services asks to operate a shuttle service between the Winnipeg James Armstrong Richardson Airport and a number of downtown hotels. The application started at the Taxicab Board and was rejected at that board. They indicated that they did not have jurisdiction. That led us to the city which, and I'm going to just take a moment, you'll see on page one of the handout, I think it is important to understand how you come to have jurisdiction over this and the limits and extent of that jurisdiction.

The City of Winnipeg Charter has a heading public transportation and sections 162 and 163 are there. Public transportation is about transit and about the city's interest in a public fixed fare transit system. There can be no doubt. If you look at section 163.1, again this is the first page you'll see the city has exclusive right to, authority I should say to operate local fixed fare passenger transportation services within the city. Taxi cabs are exempted from that as Councillor Steeves pointed out at Executive Policy Committee.

The definition of taxicab then becomes an issue. Suffice it to say the Taxicab Board and supported by your city solicitors, take the view that this service is not a taxicab. And I think and again, I of course wasn't privy to any of the discussions with the Taxicab Board but it flows around this idea of fixed fare as opposed to a fluctuating fare in a cab.

So here we are, this is a fixed fare service and it ends up in your bailiwick under the heading of public transportation. Of particular note please look at section 163.3 where it's clear this is a two-stage licensing process. This, if the Executive Policy Committee recommendation, motion is adopted by this Council would go to the Public Utilities Board and the

Public Utilities Board in sections A and B at the bottom of the page of 163.3 note the power that they have.

A, before beginning to operate the service, the person, that would be Avion in this case must obtain from the Public Utilities Board approval of the agreement and be authorized by that board to operate. So it's an approval of the agreement and authorization to operate. Now look at B, and B, the operation of the service is in all respects subject to the authority and supervision of that board.

So the comment that while the taxicab industry is regulated, this business somehow wouldn't be is absolutely incorrect. This will be a regulated business. The City of Winnipeg Charter which is an act of the province of Manitoba makes it very clear that the jurisdiction lies in the Public Utilities Board and the Public Utilities Board as we well know is a serious board with a standing membership, with a staff and conducts many, many reviews, hearings, so on and so forth on many issues. This then would move to that stage.

It's the suggestion of Avion and clearly was the initial impression of your transit authorities, Mr. Wardroff who wrote the recommendation to approve this application and enter into an agreement, it was certainly their view that this was about transit and he took a look on behalf of transit and recommended that certain conditions be put into that agreement. All of those have been agreed to by Avion. All of those are now included in the Executive Policy Committee motion.

Let me move on to say that I have had the opportunity to review and hear from Mr. Gorlick, who would have thought we'd be seeing so much of each other in this forum and it's always a pleasure and I've had the chance to review the materials put forward on behalf of the taxicab and limousine industry and let me start by saying that certainly Avion takes no issue with members of the taxicab industry with it's interpretation coming forward to speak about an issue of concern to them. Far from it. We understand the reason and the basis for their coming forward, it's also somewhat predictable.

Halifax was a similar situation when a shuttle service was introduced. The taxicab industry is always going to be concerned about different new competition. And Avion clearly is intending to compete for the travelling public's patronage as the taxicab industry does, as the limousines do, as frankly City of Winnipeg Transit does. There are many ways the travelling public can move from and to the airport.

But frankly, ladies and gentleman, Members of Council, it's the suggestion of Avion that really, the city's mandate here authority is not to protect any business from competition. Someone applies for a restaurant licence, certainly the city never asks well let me see your business plan, can you really make it. The city doesn't ask well what other restaurants might be negatively impacted if you're successful. Those aren't questions that the city asks and the reason is very clear. The marketplace is dynamic, entrepreneurship needs to be encouraged, new ideas, new services, no one is protected by government from competition. That's not the way it works.

And note the submission on behalf of the industry. The first half talks about how there's no need. Well, if there's no need, this business won't last, because Avion is in the business to make money. The second half of the submission says but we might lose fares. Well frankly, which is it. If there's no need they'll be out of business and the reality is, Avion is taking a risk and is prepared to take a risk.

This was Avion's idea. They went to the Winnipeg Airport Authority and said, we think there's a need, we're prepared to make the investment, we've done the market research and we think we can make a business out of this. We don't know, neither does anyone here in this room. It hasn't been tried. There are other options for the travelling public. This may have its niche, it may not. The second page of these materials evidences that in the last five years, the number of rides from the airport has gone from 162,000 to

196,000. We've had an over 20% increase in the number of taxi fares from the airport. We've had increasing, over the same period of time increase in the number of passengers deplaning and planeing at the airport. In that same period of time through regulation, the number of taxicabs has gone from 408 to 409, up one. So if it's relevant at all and I don't suggest it is, but the fact is Avion is taking a risk but believes there is room in the market for this.

As for the desirability of competition, I don't know that I need to say much more except that in Mr. Gorlick's materials you'll see the Norquay report from 1990 which went on at length about where the taxicab industry should go. One of the key recommendations was the creation of a higher end service and one of the key reasons for that recommendation was to increase competition in the industry. So no one, Mr. Norquay, no one has ever suggested that the taxicab industry, though regulated, should be prevented or unexposed to competition.

The agreement between the Airport Authority and Unicity has been attached as an exhibit to Mr. Gorlick's materials as well and just a couple of points. Firstly, it's obvious, that expires in two months and secondly, it has no commitment that Unicity would have any protection from alternate forms of service like this. Absolutely none. The Winnipeg Airport Authority, yes, clearly is the owner. Avion is a subsidiary of the Winnipeg Airport Authority but it is a private, independent corporation. Its set up Avion initially to provide security services, displaced a private sector company that had been doing that. The Winnipeg Airport Authority seizes its mandate to maximize the economic opportunity of the asset that it manages. Its primary focus is the safety and the service of the travelling public. It also looks where it can to gain revenues to do things like build a new terminal and provide other services for the travelling public.

Avion came up with this idea, approached the Airport Authority, they've agreed, Avion is going to be paying the Airport Authority for this service, similar to Unicity which is a per ride by the way, it's not a flat fee, you only pay for what you get in terms of ride.

Mr. Speaker: Your time is up sir.

Paul Edwards: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll end at that point, Ms. Tataryn and myself are of course open to any questions you may have. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Edwards. Councillors, Councillor Smith, do you have a question?

Councillor Smith: Yes. Mr. Edwards if we do not support this clause today that will be the end, there'll be no shuttle service, right?

Paul Edwards: Yes it's my understanding that and certainly the opinion of your solicitors that an agreement with the City of Winnipeg is required for the shuttle service to operate, yes sir that is my understanding.

Councillor Smith: I just want to make that clear.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan, your first supplementary question.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the delegation. Mr. Edwards, thank you very much for your presentation. You mentioned that Avion is partnering with Winnipeg Airport Authority which ultimately reports to Transport Canada. My question to you is does the Winnipeg Airport Authority, are they not required to have, seek public tenders for the provision of services?

Paul Edwards: And I want to be very clear, Councillor Pagtakhan, I do not represent the Winnipeg Airport Authority. What I can say is that they are an independent organization as many airport authorities in this country are, and they have in the past and seek here, to independently contract as they did with Unicity when they signed the agreement, without a public tendering process.

Mr. Speaker: Your second supplementary Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. So now I know that there wasn't a public tender called for here. Would in your opinion do you think that it would be wise or it would be beneficial for the Winnipeg Airport Authority to call for a public tender for the provision of shuttle services from the airport to downtown hotels?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Edwards.

Paul Edwards: I believe that's an internal matter for the Airport Authority Board to consider. What I do know is that as far as Avion is concerned, we came up with the idea, they agreed with it and they have entered into an agreement to provide it, subject of course to the proper licensing procedure.

Mr. Speaker: Is that it? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker and Mr. Edwards. Can you tell us who owns Avion?

Paul Edwards: Avion is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Winnipeg Airport Authority which is in turn a separately independently incorporated body with a board. It is a non-profit organization obviously. It has has its mandate and is regulated under the aeronautics act. I don't know the exact name of that act; it's regulated federally but is an independent, separately incorporated entity.

Mr. Speaker: Your second supplementary Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: My first supplementary Mr Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This is your second you had your first, this is your second.

Councillor Swandel: Okay, I'll play the semantics game with you later, Mr. Speaker. If this Council agrees to allow this agreement and I understand it's an agreement, it's not a licence by this Council, it's an agreement between the Council and Avion to go to the Public Utilities Board, the Public Utilities Board if it denies it that's the end of the process, we're done and it can't go back and nobody can argue with the Taxicab Board that it should be under their purview.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Edwards.

Paul Edwards: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. Certainly my understanding and I put the sections in front of you and you have very competent counsel right beside you as well. My view would be that this, going under this act means you go to the Public Utilities Board and they need to approve the, and I think the wording is, before beginning to operate the service, yes the Public Utilities Board must approve it and if they don't approve it, I would think that's it. It doesn't go forward.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: So you are comfortable that if we are here and we are in agreement that it should be some sort of a shuttle service and allowing this thing to go forward to the Public Utilities Board is the best route to go instead of going back and arguing at the Taxicab Board that the shuttle licence or provision of three additional taxicab licences under the auspicious, the moniker of shuttle service at the airport is not a better way to go.

Paul Edwards: Well in the course as I said at the Executive Policy Committee, I'm very fortunate to be out of the business of having to make those policy decisions that, that's your business. However, I can say that the original application was to the Taxicab board. The Taxicab Board made it very clear to us as they did to your solicitors and to the city, Mr. Wardrop I believe, that they did not believe it was within their jurisdiction. That leads us to this process and so we're certainly participating on that basis in this process.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions. Ms. Tataryn and Mr. Edwards, thank you for your presentation. Council will stand now adjourned until 1:30.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of January 24, 2007 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Asking all Members of Council to come to the chambers. In the meantime, Councillor Leipsic will be calling under the B4, Councillor Gerbasi O69. Bingo. Are we ready? Council Swandel, you have a, you had a point you wanted to raise.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker we haven't, we're just closing out delegations at the end, apparently the legal representation from the taxi industry that appeared at E.P.C. Secretariat was not registered as delegation has asked that we suspend the rules to hear them. There's two people; I suggest the same as you did before, two five minute slots with no questions.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. We need two-thirds of the vote for that. Is, are all members in favour, opposed? Okay, it's carried. Five minutes for each one. Mr. Gorlick, please and you have someone with you?

Barry Gorlick: I do. I have Joan Wilson and my name is Barry Gorlick. Thank you Mr. Speaker, thank you Your Worship, thank you Members of Council. I had no intention frankly of making a presentation but then Mr. Edwards mentioned my name as frequently as he did and even referred to the fact that he was happy or surprised to see me as often as he has in recent days, I just couldn't resist. But that's the light note. Let me seriously address in five minutes or less, four discrete topics.

Number one, it became apparent to me in consultation with my client that for example, Councillor Pagtakhan and perhaps Councillor Vandal and a few others, Councillor Gerbasi, those who haven't heard from me already and you know whom you are, I've spoken benign before previous committees, have not perhaps had the luxury and I use that term carefully, of seeing our report. So I do have four additional copies but don't be daunted by it.

There's a single page executive summary which I will also provide. I've made copies of the executive summary for everyone and I do have four extra copies of the report and I know through the Clerk's office has another half dozen copies for those who haven't looked at them recently.

While those are being distributed, let me say this, this Council finds itself in a unique position. It's why we're here. It is only the City of Winnipeg that has a provision providing this Council with exclusive authority to operate fixed public transportation, and that Councillors may I say, begs the ultimate question, why and was it ever intended, ever intended to govern a situation such as this, when a private company through a contract with the city is providing fixed fare transportation of the nature proposed here and importantly, in competition with the regulated fixed fare and metered fare transportation industry.

I've asked the rhetorical question and I'll answer it, it was never intended. But here we are. Here's the point. The Taxicab Board and I refer you to the report behind tab B of our submission, does a spectacular job of regulating the taxicab and limousine industry. My friend Mr. Edwards, quite wittingly said, that then will become the job of the Public Utilities Board in relation to Avion service. Well, the Public Utilities Board has never regulated a transportation model in its entire existence. Why would it have? This isn't a public utility, but under the city's charter, this is where this contract will end up.

The potential mischief Councillors, if the recommendation of E.P.C. is given approval this afternoon, is that the horse will be out of the barn, the Public Utilities Board will not have the tools, why would it. Properly to regulate and when I speak of regulation, I speak for example of what appears behind tab E, the condition reports that twice yearly each of the taxicabs licence in Winnipeg have to submit to, I speak of regulation relative to fares, I speak of regulation relative to insurance, I speak of regulation relative to driver qualifications and let's not forget, which is the third point, we have a model industry in this city. It is owned and

operated by the newest members of our community, the hardest working, most diligent, most committed entrepreneurs in this city. So if you want to talk about free enterprise, the free enterprise rests with the taxicab and limousine industries as they now are.

Councillor Swandel very appropriately reminded everyone in this room that Avion is Winnipeg Airport Authority and while today my friend Mr. Edwards was not representing Winnipeg Airport's Authority, he has in the past, he will in the future. Today his limited retainer was by their other arm, the wholly owned subsidiary Avion.

So let's in a true Winnipeg way, cut to the chase, Avion is the Airport's authority. The Airport's authority says listen, you've only got two months to run on your contract. Let's ignore the fact that we've been collecting 250,000 dollars a year from you for the last four years. Let's ignore the fact that we contracted in good faith and let's ignore the fact that we want to go into competition with you.

This Council, as a policy, functions best when it does precisely what elected officials are invited to do, and that's to take great care to ensure that whatever industry in this city is operating, is operating in a way that makes sense to those involved in it. This is the situation that we have here; the city has done well by our existing taxicab and limousine industry. It's done well by the people who operate it. I respectfully invite the city notwithstanding the thought to want to send this to the PUB, to exercise its authority now. It's a bold stroke; I do invite you to do just that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Gorlick. Ms. Joan Wilson you have five minutes.

Joan Wilson: Thank you. My name is Joan Wilson I'm the General Manager of Unicity Taxi, but I stand before you today to speak to you as an industry, as opposed to a company. I just wanted to make some clarifications of some points that Mr. Edwards has told you earlier.

One of the points was in regards to our contract. All, when we, five years ago when we bid on the contract, the contract and the bidding process went out to every taxi company in Winnipeg, we were not just handed the contract. We also feel that shuttles, if they, if they're required in Winnipeg they should be tendered out and allow both private industries and anyone else to bid on it. We have been told time and time again by Avion and by the Winnipeg Airport Authority that if these shuttles are allowed; only Avion would be allowed to run them. So, the rest of the industry has been shut out.

As well, it has been well documented that shuttles have been run at the Winnipeg International Airport by many companies. The first being Moore's taxi which is one of our companies when we amalgamated in 1971, Greyhound as well tried a shuttle to and from the airport to downtown. Most Winnipeg hotels have their own shuttles. These shuttles are free. They are available for anyone who wants to use them.

So, there is alternate transportation already in the city of Winnipeg. As well, they say that there's only been one taxi licence issued and it's now 409. This in fact is not true. There were the 10 Blue Line licences that were premium and in talking about Mr. Norquay's report, Blue Line was unsuccessful in its bid to create a premium taxi company. These licences were supposed to go back to the province if it was unsuccessful, but instead, they were converted into regular taxi licences. As well, there's been 25 handi accessible vans put on the road. These are also governed and regulated by the Manitoba Taxicab Board and fall under their jurisdiction.

As well, when they talk about a 20% increase in passengers over the last few years, the figures they are using are from 2002. We all know the devastation that 9/11 caused with the airline travel industry. If there was a 20% increase and all this business was coming into Winnipeg, our waiting time should not have gone up from 45 minutes to 46 minutes at the airport for our taxi's to wait for a fare and that's all I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Ms. Wilson. Thank you Mr. Gorlick for your presentation. Councillors will get on with the business now. Executive Policy Committee report of January 10, 2007, Mr. Mayor and also there is a motion on the, motion number three on item two. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 10, 2007

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Councillor Thomas: Two

Mr. Speaker: Number 2 has been stood down and we got number 1, both number 1 and 2. Mr. Mayor. Yes both 1 and 2 were stood down.

Item 1 - General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres – Programming Grant for Community Centres File PR-2

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, this is simply a motion where the G.C.W.C.C. came forward. They have not received an increase in funding for the community centres. They have asked, they made a request for an additional 50,000 dollars, and for us to take that into consideration when we're doing our budgeting which is coming up in the very near future. At that point in time I would just sit down and hear what the Councillor has to say and I will try to address it then.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I stand to rise on this clause. I rise to speak on this clause. I stand to rise, which is not quite over lunch yet. I rise to speak on this clause because it really points out what the issue of the next clause is and that is, programming. In this particular case, the G.C.W.C.C. is come forward and ask at E.P.C. that we consider raising the programming dollars put forward by G.C.W.C.C out to community centres. A lot of that money is not just used for actual programming but it's also used for people who can't, don't have the financial means for children or members of the family to participate in some of the programming that goes on in our community centres.

So I just wonder if in speaking, in closing and introducing the clause further, perhaps the Mayor can talk to us exactly what this 50,000 dollars goes towards so we know what we're doing with this in moving it forward.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Just to, I stand to speak to this motion and put on the record that I intend to support the recommendation from Executive Committee for an extra 50,000.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers? All in favour, contrary? Carried. I did it for you Sam, that's okay. Number 2.

Item 2 - Kelvin Community Centre - 2006 G.C.W.C.C. Community Centre District Plan File PR-2

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Thomas: Mr. Speaker, this was a clause that came from this Council, it was moved by me, I do believe as the mover of the clause, I have the opportunity to open.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, Councillor, just a minute. The Mayor has a right to introduce that. That's what he wants to do. Go ahead Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, this clause obviously in reference, is in reference to a recommendation from the G.C.W.C.C., a group of volunteers that represent community centres across our city, trying to do the best job they can with the limited resources. I know there will be considerable debate and comment and at this point in time, I will sit down and listen

and then I will do my summation at the end Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Now, Councillor Thomas, you have the floor.

Moved by Councillor Thomas
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi

WHEREAS Kelvin Community Centre is located in the area of highest socio-economic need in the Elmwood/East Kildonan Ward;

AND WHEREAS closure of the Kelvin Community Centre would lead to some children being required to walk in excess of 5 kilometers to attend the next nearest Community Centre and having to cross two busy thorough-fares to access Community Centre programming;

AND WHEREAS the neighbourhood surrounding the Kelvin Community Centre recently had a meeting in which over 100 area residents attended and at which a board was elected for the Centre;

AND WHEREAS the interim board of Kelvin Community Centre has implemented programming that is being attended by a large number of area residents, including at-risk youth;

AND WHEREAS the interim board of Kelvin Community Centre has identified and networked with over seventy volunteers for community programming;

AND WHEREAS the Bronx Park / Good Neighbours Expansion Project is given as a reason by Executive Policy Committee for the closure of Kelvin Community Centre, despite the objections of area residents;

AND WHEREAS the Bronx Park / Good Neighbours Expansion Project does not yet have a project plan or tentative completion date, and may not be completed until 2010 or later;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the closure of Kelvin Community Centre should not take place while the Bronx Park / Good Neighbours Expansion Project is incomplete. At the time of completion the Kelvin Community Centre will be reevaluated;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Kelvin Community Centre be granted an AGM for each year until closure;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Kelvin Community Centre continue to sit as a member of the Greater Council of Winnipeg Community Centres.

Councillor Thomas: Well Mr. Speaker I was rising on a point of order because this was my motion that was referred to Executive Policy Committee and I believed I had the right to open and close on the clause.

Mr. Speaker: Well you're opening it now.

Councillor Thomas: I'm opening it now. Okay, then I will do that. Thank you and I have the right to close on the clause because it's my motion.

Mr. Speaker: No, no, no. Councillor Thomas, you're moving an amendment to the clause.

Councillor Thomas: I will move the amendment after I open on my motion.

Mr. Speaker: You've got your motion. You got your motion number 3.

Councillor Thomas: Take the advice of the Clerk please.

Mr. Speaker: Now the Clerk has advised me, this is under the E.P.C. clause, Executive Policy Committee.

Councillor Thomas: It was referred to Executive Policy Committee but it was my motion.

Mr. Speaker: It's an E.P.C. now. It's E.P.C. This is clause 2. You have your motion number 3; speak to your motion to the clause of number 2 that's before us.

Councillor Thomas: I can speak to my motion and then I can speak to the clause after.

Mr. Speaker: And speak to the clause.

Councillor Thomas: After? Is that what you're saying to me?

Mr. Speaker: Well I'm sure Members of Council will not deliberate that too much or it will take us a lot of time.

Councillor Thomas: I will start speaking to the.

Mr. Speaker: Motion number 3.

Councillor Thomas: To the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment. That's your amendment. Councillor Thomas your amendment number 3 on clause 2 that's before us here from the Executive Policy Committee. Okay, proceed.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce amendment to my motion, and you'll have to go on page 106 to find the motion, Executive Policy has changed the motion and it's most unusual that their motion is coming forward. This is not how it's normally done.

I wish to introduce this amendment to my motion. The amendment you will find as amendment number three. It's whereas Kelvin Community Centre is located in the area of high socioeconomic need, where as the closure would lead to some children being required to walk in excess of five kilometers and the neighbourhood surrounding Kelvin recently had a meeting of over 100 area residents in whereas the interim board has implemented programming, attended by a large number of area residents, whereas an interim board has been identified and networked with over 70 volunteers and whereas the Bronx Park Good Neighbours Project is given as a reason for the closure of Kelvin and wherein Bronx Park Good Neighbours does not yet have a plan or completion date and may not be completed until 2010. Therefore, be it resolved that the closure of Kelvin should not take place while Bronx Park Good Neighbours is incomplete and at the time of completion, that Kelvin Community Centre be revaluated. Further, that Kelvin Community Centre be granted an A.G.M. for each year until its closure and finally, that Kelvin Community Centre sit as a member of the Greater Council of Winnipeg Community Centres.

And I was disturbed by the recommendation which came out of Executive Policy Committee on January the 10th, and even more concerned by some of the commentary that accompanied the recommendations. I'm disconcerted by the remarks which portrayed Bronx Park Good Neighbours Project as being over budget and that absorbing Kelvin would rectify this. Bronx Park Good Neighbours have been meeting for close to six years. They had always anticipated their newly amalgamated facility would cost about 5.6 million dollars.

They have been fundraising, having fundraising dinners, a number of raise the roof initiatives and had a long term strategy to bring this project to fruition. It has only been the interference of the Mayor's office which has made this project come off the rail. First when the Mayor redirected from, funds from the rapid transit corridor to Bronx Park Good Neighbours, they were given much less than the project required. It was at this point that the figure of 3.9 million begins to emerge.

It was never the community figure only the amount that the Mayor was willing to give them. Then it was demanded that they reproduce, that they reduce the footprint of their joint facility, then it was further demanded that it not be greater than the space of the two separated facilities enjoyed. And then they were further told that the space that they were renting from the nearby church since Good Neighbours didn't have sufficient space to operate would not be included in their count of the new footprint.

Next, after being assured they would begin construction by the end of 2005, then later told they would have shovels in the ground by the fall of 2006, it's now 2007 and they are being told by motion from Executive Policy Committee that their project must include Kelvin Community Club, a community club with which they had not originally planned to

be involved. If so, why would the Council of Greater Winnipeg Community Centres set an A.G.M for Kelvin on the very day and at the very same time that Bronx Park Good Neighbours had its open house and path process occurring with the full knowledge and cooperation of the Council of Greater Winnipeg Community Centres.

However, if Bronx is forced to amalgamate with Kelvin Community Centres this is not the time. I believe it will be a significant challenge to expect the Bronx Park Community Centre to absorb the children of the Glen Elm Chalmer's neighbourhoods because many of the differences between these communities. However I believe it is particularly unrealistic to expect them to meet their needs at a time when they will have difficulty finding alternative arrangements for their own children.

Bronx Park is about to undergo a complete makeover. Their facility will be closed for a year, maybe longer, while in the end there may be more space, right now, there will be less. Where will the children go for programming, meeting space, activities, drop-in time while their facility is under renovation. Some of them may go to Melrose but some of them are much closer to Kelvin. Whatever may happen to Kelvin Community Centre in the long run, right now, it may be the perfect backup plan for many of the Bronx Park area children. Would this not be an opportunity for the Bronx Park kids to take advantage of the new enthusiasm at Kelvin, to go to the drop-in activities and the specialty programs in gardening, wrestling, et cetera.

What a time to lose an asset. Good business savvy would indicate that you keep the old business location open in the area while a new or upgraded site is being built. Do not leave Kelvin and Bronx with no place to go. To state that the closure of Kelvin Community Club at this time is premature would be an understatement. Kelvin needs to be there at least for the interim, while all this community centre musical chairs is being sorted out.

In order to do this, Kelvin needs to be allowed the opportunity to govern itself. It is not unrealistic to ask that they have the opportunity for an annual general meeting. It is not unreasonable that Kelvin be allowed to speak for their community, in an official capacity with the appropriate official backing, which we all know exists informally for the interim board at the community level. Give them that.

Finally, don't shut them out of the process. Facilitate communication between them and between the other community centres. It is when communication breaks down that troubles begin. Allow them to be a part of that process and give them a chance to show us all what they can do. And that's my introduction of the amendment. I'd like an opportunity to also speak on the clause.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. You know, Mr. Speaker, the representative from G.C.W.C.C. said today that mention three of my community centres but you know, they, I got involved with the G.C.W.C.C and got them to approach the community centres and then I met with the community centres and got them to agree that it would be useful to join together.

So they agreed voluntarily to work together and become one community centre. That's all together different in this case. In this case there's no consultation with the people involved. As well, I can remember Mr. Mayor, you saying that no community club would be closed if there was support in the community for it. Here they've demonstrated clear cut support from the community. Now, you know you can take a second look. You've done it in the past. I think you should do it in this case, too.

The fact is, this community club because of the threat of closure, because of your actions, the whole community has galvanized behind the community club. It is very, very successful right now, with very limited physical facilities. I think you should be supporting it. This is a high crime area. This is an area of low income. This is not rich suburbanites able to go ahead and take over and do something.

These are ordinary people struggling to have a community club and I think you should be supportive of it. I don't think you should renege on your commitment to keep community clubs open. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, for clarification are we now just speaking to the amendment and then the Mayor will introduce the clause, the E.P.C. clause and we will speak to that or are we speaking to them both jointly?

Mr. Speaker: You're speaking to the amendment and the clause. Councillor Thomas spoke to the amendment because she's a mover of that motion. Therefore, she will have an opportunity to speak to the clause that's before us, and then she'll make a summation on her motion as a final you know, and then the Mayor will speak to the clause as presented.

Councillor Swandel: The clause has been introduced.

Mr. Speaker: So just have this understanding that you speak to both, what's before us now. You put a bunch into one. You're speaking to the motion that's before us and also to the clause. Okay next one to speak is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this has become a very charged debate, Mr. Speaker and that's normal in circumstances like this. It was mentioned by a previous speaker this morning in delegations, about an amalgamation that took place in my end of town back twenty years ago with two community clubs and at that time it was very emotionally charged. There was a lot of folks in opposition but there was also folks, a lot of silent folks in support and the benefit of building a new facility, Park City West was what came out of that process that has served the community extremely well today.

I think everybody in the community by and large would agree. And the two sites that actually were former community clubs have been reused very creatively. One become a senior citizens drop-in centre that's very active and used to this day and the other is now actually under construction, a six storey senior citizens housing block on the very site, extremely good reuses of the sites as well a very active community centre.

I think that it's important to put into context why I think, why community clubs are so crucial to our city, and why I think they're so, so many strong feelings on it, Mr. Speaker. Community clubs historically have been driven by just that, the community. You know, my community, it was common just because of the roots of the community, instead of a hall or facilities, we had a boxcar, you know and the boxcar was there with the pot belly stove in the middle of it and that's what served the community for years and many people have fond memories of those days.

The East End Community Club, the old East End Community Club was built by lumber borrowed from C.N. rail and Councillor Lazarenko might know something about that. But, the reality is there's a true history behind the community clubs that is tied directly to the community. I think that's why we're seeing a struggle, so let's be very clear about what we're discussing here today because I think there's been a lot of rhetoric and if we can try to peel back the rhetoric and the emotion and look exactly at what the issue is here before us maybe we can start finding some common ground because I think that's what we're here about is to find solutions.

First of all, the whole community club is not being, all the fields, all the grounds are not being shut down as has been mentioned or the impression that's been given publicly. We've now heard that the two rinks are staying, that there's a soccer field staying, there's two baseball diamonds and there's a plan to reinvest in the playground structure. As well there is a need to rebuild the fieldhouse which apparently is also in major need of rebuilding and also has been identified by

the G.C.W.C.C. that it needs to be replaced.

This would be a major investment in the area especially with regards to the field house, playgrounds and as well as upkeep and maintenance of the fields which sounds like it hasn't been the case. As well there's a major investment taking place just up the road at Bronx Park Community Centre, tied in with Good Neighbours and I think a lot of the points have been raised by the previous speaker, Councillor Thomas who's correct regarding the history and the relation between Bronx Park and Kelvin but nonetheless there is a huge investment taking place in the neighbourhood to the millions that we're not seeing in all parts of the city right now I can tell you that Mr. Speaker.

And the reality is, the clubhouse building is what is being proposed to be declared surplus to the process and to the city. And I think there is, having said what the facts are before us, I think there's a number of things that we do all agree on no matter what side of the issue we're on. I think we all agree that recreation facilities are important to older neighbourhoods and the inner city. I think we all agree the existing state of our community club infrastructure across the city is not acceptable.

I think we all agree that there's not enough money when it comes to reinvesting in our community clubs and our infrastructure across the city. So the question is where is the opportunity to find common ground and specifically, opportunity for the residents of Elmwood and the Kelvin Community Club area. We've now heard again, the fields are staying open. We've heard that the fieldhouse needs to be rebuilt and a playground structure needs to be introduced again and constructed.

We know that the old clubhouse needs a lot of work. There's a lot of dissension about whether, how much that will cost but that's a huge cost. And we've heard now from the community that there's a willingness to raise money towards this project. And we've seen quite impressively, how organized the community is with regards to saving Kelvin Community Club or saving the building really is what it's all about, and saving the status of community club.

So I have a suggestion to put forward for what it's worth, Mr. Speaker, an idea if I may humbly put it that way, that we fully support the G.C.W.C.C.'s intent to keep the fields, the ice rink open and invest in a new playground, but we encourage the volunteers who are here today to go forward in the coming days and months and put together a plan and start to fund raise to rebuild the fieldhouse slash, I'll call it slash clubhouse that in many ways, the foundation of a community club is not so much it's bricks and mortar but the foundation of a true community club is its volunteers and the energy and enthusiasm in the community.

The community, the facility, the fieldhouse facility is 1,266 square feet. It needs to be rebuilt. How it's rebuilt whether it be a field house or field house/clubhouse could be up to the community. But it has to be rebuilt we've heard that from the G.C.W.C.C.

So I can't speak for all members of E.P.C. or the Mayor but I would humbly suggest that without city money and it sounds like they're prepared to do that, we heard this, this morning that the volunteers go out and raise the funds and see what they can do and come back to the city with funds in hand and say here we are, we're ready to go. We got the money in place for a new clubhouse; this is what we've done. Fantastic. You got the support by the sounds of it of one of the M.L.A.'s, Mr. Malloway of the government caucus. I would hope that whatever the cost of the project is to build a fieldhouse, it can't be in the millions that's for sure, but whatever the cost at least half of the cost right there should be covered by the province and they should be able to run and raise the other 50%.

I think that would be a wonderful solution and I think it's something that could work. I think, I'd like to hear from other Members of Council with regards to that idea but I think it's something that is practical Mr. Speaker, that indeed it doesn't give everything that the

community wants right now today. They have said we want to keep the funding in place; we want to have the subsidy annually with regards to the subsidy for operating. Well, first of all, we want to see what you can do. We want to see what you can produce and what you can raise. No different than my community was challenged four years ago and it was said to my community and at that time by the way with a Mayor who was not supportive of the funding project with regards to the Buhler Recreation Park and we went out and started raising money without that support.

They need a number of things to make it happen, Mr. Speaker. They need to go out and get political support for something like that. They need to have volunteers and motivated volunteers. They have that already. They need a plan on the scope of the project to rebuild the fieldhouse. I think there's not a lot of work there to do. They need to do a private fundraising plan, all these things to come together to reach the goal of rebuilding the fieldhouse and seeing a future for Kelvin. They have from what I can see here, about three out of the four key components, Mr. Speaker to a plan that could work.

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

Councillor Wyatt: They have three out of four of the key components that could work with regards to reinvesting in the community and I was encouraged to hear the volunteers speaking today about their willingness to go out and fundraise and to raise those funds and to raise money to invest back in the community and I think that's what we have to do, we have to start doing that across this city because at the end of the day, the community club movement was not built by Council whether it be this Council or other Councils before unicity.

It was built by the communities. It was built as I mentioned in my end of town through volunteer and hard work and fundraising dinners and everything else and maybe that's what we got to get back to have the same kind of pride and ownership that we had before in our community clubs and to ensure that we don't have ten years of rough ride that you know, there's a dispute of course about the last ten years at Kelvin but the fact is, things haven't been ticketeboo there for the last ten years. If we can get back to that, I think it could work. I'd like to hear the Members of Council's comments and I thank you for your time Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, before I delineate the reasons why City Council should not support the motion to file the motion to endorse the role of the interim board of the Kelvin Community Club and to instead support its struggle to turn Kelvin into a viable working community centre, I need to explain about this community and Kelvin's importance to its viability.

I wish to give you a physical portrait of its location and a socioeconomic snapshot of its position. Kelvin is on the eastern boundary of Chalmers and on the western boundary of the Glen Elm neighbourhood. It's a little north of the middle of the north south boundaries of Chalmers and close to the northern end of Glen Elm. So when we're talking about a distance of 1.6 kilometers between the Kelvin and the Bronx Park Community Centre, you've got to realize that at least two thirds of them are south of that location.

Kelvin is just north of the Elmwood business districts, strategically located on Henderson Highway. There is a bus stop right in front of the community centre, which connects the community from north to south and Kelvin is one short block from another bus stop which connects the community from east to west. Parents are able to leave their children for a variety of programs at Kelvin while they walk to the local grocery store, pharmacy and other local shops.

In the evening when the older children wish to go independently for various activities, it is well lit, in a well traveled area, not the least bit secluded. The children feel safe there, the parents feel

comfortable and it is within easy walking distance from any point in these two communities.

It is important that this club be within easy walking distance because taking the bus is only done on special occasions. It cannot be afforded on a regular basis. The catchment area of Kelvin Community Club is made up of two neighbourhoods. One, Glen Elm has over 3,000 people in it while the other, Chalmers has over 11,000 people in it. Did not the RALPH study say that local community clubs should have between 9 and 15,000 people to be viable. I believe the population alone would put this community club in the high end of that statistic.

While most of my ward could be considered low income with the exception of two neighbourhoods, the lowest family income of the eleven neighbourhood which I represent resides in Chalmers, approximately 12,000 dollars less per year than the average income for the city. While the Glen Elm neighbourhood is definitely more well off, its family income is also below the city average. In just about every statistically significant pattern, Chalmers is an at-risk neighbourhood.

31.5% of the families are led by a single parent for the city of the whole; it is a little over 18% or almost half what it is in this neighbourhood. 16.6% have identified themselves as having aboriginal origins or almost 50% greater than the city as a whole. Over 11% have identified themselves as being from a visible minority. 9.5 are struggling with unemployment, double the amount for the city of the whole. 36% are identified as having low income, whereas the city of the whole it is 20%. 31% are living on less than 20,000 dollars a year, whereas the city of the whole it is about 20%.

And while we're speaking of statistics, Mr. Bemrose stated that this community came out 70 out of 71. Please look on line at what the study actually said because there are 7 indicators. Indicator number one was infrastructure, it which was 67 out of 71. Participation was 46 out of 71. Governance, 66 out of 71. Financial management, 51 out of 71. Amenities, 54 out of 71. Location, 64 out of 71. Considering the location, I don't know how they came up with that but it's not 70. And population, 47 out of 71. At least 24 clubs had worse scores. It's not 70 out of 71. Take a look at your data. Mr. Bemrose was mistaken. He may have been confusing it with another area but it wasn't this one. Take a look.

And the children, the children in the Glen Elm Chalmers area combined are over 3,000 children less than 24 years of age or 21.4% of the population whereas the city of the whole has only about 18% in that area. The population which are under the age of 14 and when you consider that 69.5% of these children are actually under the age of 9 and who have not yet grasped how to take bus independently even if they could afford it, you have a high need community with little discretionary spending being forced to walk to another neighbourhood with which they are unfamiliar.

How many 9 year olds do you know who would walk 16 additional blocks by themselves to attend programming in a community with which they were unfamiliar. Yes, these neighbourhoods have struggled in the past in getting volunteers and sustaining programming and why wouldn't they, with over one third being raised by single parents. There's limited time or energy to give to the local community club. However, this community has rallied.

They looked at the Mayor's promise that there would be no forced closures and they rallied to prove that they could do it. They held a general meeting where over 100 people attended. They forged together a working board that has found over a hundred volunteers from within the Chalmers Glen Elm neighbourhood and beyond who are committed to help. They need a chance to prove that they can do it. They need to have the security to know that they have access to the facilities in which to operate their programming. They need to be able to link with other community centres to share the information and to give a chance to prove that they are viable.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I am most concerned about the recommendation that came from Executive Policy Committee on their January 10th meeting and some of the comments made by certain members. When a committee member asked the administration if there had been plans to absorb the Kelvin space into the Bronx Park Good Neighbours Project, the administrative answer was simple. It said no. Why then did the E.P.C. motion choose to do so? Why did they make the viability of the previously approved project which was supposed to break ground in 2005, now contingent upon money being recouped from the closure of Kelvin.

That is not what the Bronx Park Good Neighbours were expecting or even wanted and this is the latest turn of phrase that has put them in a very unpleasant quandary. They are being forced by this motion to provide programming and space for a community which is very different from their own and has very different needs. The Bronx Park community resides in the middle of the Kildonan Drive neighbourhood. While Chalmers has approximately 21.4% under the age of 14, Kildonan Drive has a little more than 14%. In fact, most of its population.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty moves extension of time of two minutes. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Most of its population is senior which is why it is choosing to amalgamate with the Good Neighbours Senior Centre. Their direction in programming is looking more for elder use. Let us compare further the demographic makeup between these two neighbourhoods. Chalmers, 31.5 % single family, Kildonan Drive neighbourhood 10.9% or half of the average for the city and one third of what Kelvin has to deal with, one third of the numbers for Kelvin.

How about aboriginal origin? 16.6 in Chalmers, 9.6 in the city as a whole and in the Kildonan Drive neighbourhood, 4.3%. What about visible minorities, 13% in Chalmers, 11.3% in the city, 2.7% in the Kildonan Drive neighbourhood. How about the incidence of low income, 36% in Chalmers, 20% in the Winnipeg in the whole and in Kildonan Drive 12.7. The incidents of unemployment, 9.5% in Chalmers, half of what it is in Kildonan Drive in the city of the whole.

Over and over these statistics show that these neighbourhoods are very different and it is unfair to expect the residents of the Kildonan Drive neighbourhood to understand and meet the needs of Kelvin community area residents. All this stuff I got from our neighbourhood area program, done by the city. It's online. Most importantly, no one asked them. Wasn't the principles of RALPH that any closures would include the affected communities. Well this has made a bad scenario worse in that neither community has been consulted. While Kelvin has been in this fix for six months, Bronx Park Good Neighbours are just being informed that they're amalgamation plans that they have been working on for the past six years may be scuttled if they don't absorb Kelvin. Please don't do this, it does not meet the needs of Chalmers by now neighbourhoods, it is not what Bronx Park Good Neighbours has planned or how they began their voluntary amalgamation six years ago. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Thomas. Councillor Browaty. You can speak to both the clause and the motion.

Councillor Browaty: Okay, I rise today to explain why I'll be supporting the original E.P.C. motion on the table here today. I think what's important is that the kids in the Elmwood area have the support programs that they need in their own neighbourhood. I believe that the energies of the people from Kelvin rallying around Kelvin during this debate can be leveraged to provide programs that are truly needed in this neighbourhood. I do support Councillor Wyatt's suggestion that fundraising and stuff can be done to in fact provide a better fieldhouse at the current Kelvin site.

The current proposal maintains the fieldhouse, the ice rinks, the soccer fields, baseball diamonds and includes a new play structure. As a satellite facility of Bronx Park which is located only 1.3

kilometers away, 1300 metres, it's, even on a cold day it's not that far away.

So the important thing here at the end of the day is the green space remains. The facility will tap the organizational resources that are proven at Bronx and become a satellite facility and therefore be identified on the inventory of community centres and continue to be fully maintained. So at the end of the day, you have to ask yourself, will the children of Elmwood have the facilities for sports in their area, yes. Is the green space going to be paved over, no. Will a larger, stronger group of volunteers manage the programs that have been lacking in recent years in Kelvin, yes. I would argue that the people of Kelvin area will be better served for the long term under this proposal. I encourage all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Browaty. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just want to briefly say that I appreciate the delegation that came here today, all the delegates that were speaking on behalf of keeping Kelvin Community Centre open. I can really feel their passion, their pleas and their commitment behind their community centre and their communities. I just want to say that last summer we had a situation where there was a recommendation from our administration, from the G.C.W.C.C. to take Boyd Park Community Centre which is in Point Douglas off the community centre inventory, to declare it surplus but to still maintain it as an asset of the City of Winnipeg.

Well there was a rally cry behind that Boyd Park Community Centre and I'm glad to say that I'm actually working right now with the community resource coordinator in the area to try to make that still viable, a viable centre for the community, all right. So I just want to say there is a life after closure of a particular centre, after it's taken off of the inventory. And I just want to say that I will be providing some community grants, we're working with the province of Manitoba to try and get that area designated as a neighbourhood as a live funding and to get some operating dollars.

In fact, that neighbourhood right now supported by a whole host of dedicated and committed volunteers in the neighbourhood have actually secured monies already from the federal government for a two year commitment for a coordinator. So, that's a real success story, and I think that, that can happen here too, because I've seen the commitment, the passion from Mr. Wolfrom and others who came here to speak today and I think that really is a foretelling sign of the future success of this area and I just want to say that I hope that those volunteers don't get discouraged if in fact the decision is today to decide to concur with the E.P.C. recommendation and that it is, that Kelvin Community Centre is taken off the inventory and declared surplus but still maintained as a city asset.

I think there is an opportunity where it could be led by the area Councillor with some of the great community proponents to work with the city, perhaps for a joint use agreement, to work with the local M.L.A. in the area to find some operating dollars and more important to get some funds that are from the federal government who have the hugest purse strings of all.

So I think there's some good things that can happen here. I think this is an opportunity here, we should see it as an opportunity and I want to applaud all the folks who've come out to make this Kelvin Community Centre a real issue, to show, to showcase that there's great things happening within the Elmwood community, around Kelvin Community Centre and I want to congratulate them, Clara Hughes, the Olympian, all the people who come her today, really I think that there really isn't a downside to this, I think anything it really is a positive thing because I think positive revolution can come out of it, I truly do believe it. It is happening at Point Douglas around Boyd Park and I know it can happen here at Kelvin so with that I just want to say that I will be supporting the recommendation

from G.C.W.C.C. to concur with the E.P.C. motion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Wow, I feel like I'm in 1984, war is peace and this is good that, anyway I just can't believe what I'm hearing right now. I'd like to say after listening to the media coverage over the last few weeks I felt compelled to set a few facts straight that have been said about our recreation policies. Councillor Steeves has been quoted through the last few weeks talking about the PUFF study and stating, it has been stated in the public and I just want to clarify, that Councillors did not agree to adopt PUFF's. In fact, PUFF's was never adopted by Council, it never came to Council, it was received as information at E.P.C. in July of 2004 and Council never voted to close a specific facilities on a list that was listed in PUFFS.

What Council did support was the Recreation and Leisure Facilities Policy known as RALPH and an active framework of community consultation. The RALPH policy was supposed to guide us in consolidating some facilities where there has been proper community consultation and where it was what the community wanted. We were all given the impression that closures would not be forced.

And in the light of Councillor Steeves' comments since he represents the committee that speaks to recreation, I would really like to hear some assurance from E.P.C. and the Mayor that there is no intention to go through this list of facilities that PUFF's talked about closing and suddenly start closing them because if this Council intends to close the Cornish Library, Sherbrook Pool, Wildewood Community Club, other PUFF recommendations that were never adopted by Council, you can get yourselves ready to see a whole lot more citizens marching on City Hall because this is only the beginning. I sure hope you're not going there.

Another inaccurate assumption that's been talked about is that all of Council agreed to move to the giant mega centre model and get rid of the little teeny tiny clubs. I heard Councillor Steeves on the radio this morning talking about how mega centres are better than small clubs and that we are going to this new model and he was giving the impression that small community centres are going the way of the Dodo bird. Well, if this was true, then why not close every community club in Fort Rouge except the Fort Rouge Leisure Centre. Earl Grey, Wildewood, Fort Garry, River Osborne, Riverview and Lloyd Roberts would all be closed according to that theory and we all know that's crazy because they're healthy active clubs and I don't expect that to happen, but this is the arguments that we're hearing today.

These clubs contribute to why people want to live in those neighbourhoods and I'd like to hear from the Mayor and E.P.C. today and I think the public would like to hear that there's room in this city for different models for different neighbourhoods where people don't drive everywhere and have high incomes. There can be accessible services to meet the needs of high risk use.

Council never agreed that small centres were no longer useful or needed, only that some amalgamations could happen where it made sense and where there is public buy in which we certainly have not seen today. Perhaps in St. Vital people can just hop in their SUV and drive to the mega centre or the Y.M.C.A. but this is not true in Elmwood and Point Douglas and Fort Rouge and Daniel Mac and many other neighbourhoods.

In many parts of Winnipeg lots of people don't have a car or have money for bus fare. Losing the local community club in many older neighbourhoods would take away the heart of those neighbourhoods. Small community centres are often the main gathering place of a neighbourhood. In Fort Rouge many of the clubs produce neighbourhood newspapers like the Wild and Woodsy and Wildewood Park and the Riverview Reflector in Riverview. These clubs are more than just a facility that run

programs, although they do that. They are the glue that keeps those neighbourhoods cohesive and every neighbourhood is different.

I can understand that at one time it seemed like Kelvin might have to close because of lack of volunteers. However, now the community has rallied and found the volunteers to make it work. Yet oddly, this Council seems unable to acknowledge that things have changed or to give these people a chance. Why are people digging in their heels and insisting on not giving these volunteers from one the lowest income neighbourhoods in the city a chance to try.

The upcoming operating budget will include a nine million dollar business tax reduction. That's nine million dollars less in revenue every year going forward. That's before we get to the total elimination of the 53 million dollars every year of revenue to eliminate the business tax. Will savings from closing a community club against the public wishes in one of the lowest income neighbourhoods in the city help pay for that.

It is, and another point, it is a sad but effective notion to suggest as Gord Sinclair did the other day in his column that kids in Elmwood won't have any problem getting to Bronx Park; they can just steal a car to do it. There's been a lot of talk about increased policing and safety being the number one priority, yet here is City Council about to take away programs from high risk kids, programs that keep kids from getting involved in crime. We should look at the situation that we're in today.

Things have changed and now we have a community that has rallied together with a board and volunteers to make this work and as for Councillor Wyatt's suggestion that if we shut down the community centre, the same people that are working hard on programs in that community centre are going to continue to put their volunteer sweat equity into solving our problems for the remaining, putting in and finding funding for all these capital things, I think you're going to take the wind out of their sails if you don't accept our amendment. I think you're going to just, you know you're going to have a lot of angry, disappointed people and if I was one of them I wouldn't go out and run, spend my volunteer time trying to help the city out if we do this to them today because we're doing this to them today, Councillor Wyatt if we vote for this.

And it seems to me as if there's some sort of blind spot here, an inflexibility that really makes no sense. The amendment is simply asking that we keep this facility open. How much is that going to cost on the scale of the money of the city budget. Keep it open. Let these volunteers, then they'll go out and they'll raise, we heard them say today they'll go out and raise the money to fix up, to build a play structure, to fix up the club with Clara Hughes' support. But we're going to crush them and take the wind out of their sails. That's what we're doing today and if you won't listen to us few opposition Councillors who have the guts to talk about this, won't you listen at least to Clara Hughes, the Olympic gold medalist. She knows how much that club means to youth in her community and how much it contributed to her world class achievement. We could at least respect that if you don't respect certain Members of Council.

Mr. Speaker, it is okay to admit that you've made an unwise decision and that things have changed in the light of a renewed community resolve and spirit, its okay to change your mind. I urge you to consider, reconsider closing this club, support a motion which says that we keep this facility open until the Bronx Community Centre is up and running and then reevaluate the situation at that time. That's completely reasonable and I urge you to consider it, to think for yourself. To look at the reality we're actually in right now, instead of a bunch of consultant reports from years ago. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Next to speak is Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This issue has been extremely tough issue for me as I come from a small

community club background myself, Burkeville Community Club which I've been on the Board of Directors for a number of years fights a lot of the same issues that Kelvin does in terms of volunteers, in terms of programming, in terms of fundraising and an aging facility.

For anyone that's been involved with a small community clubs you know how difficult it is to get volunteers to volunteer to give their time for some, for sometimes with jobs that seem thankless to a certain extent. I've got a very young family and we frequently go to a lot of events that are there whether it be the summer barbecues, the winter carnivals or any other fundraising events that are there and you know community clubs are great resources for young families as well as teens, as a place of positive influence in their lives. So before I made this decision I took the time and I contacted five out of six of my local community club board presidents to touch base with the issue to see what their sense was and there was unanimous conclusion that the decision was a solid one when you look at the facts.

Kelvin is an aging facility. It's 57 years of age and will need huge capital investment over the next ten years; I believe it's in the neighbourhood of 1.6 million dollars. The facility is not accessible or has limited accessibility for handicapped as well as seniors. If we did have a new facility, seniors and everyone from the community would be able to enjoy such a facility.

Volunteers have historically been a problem at the community club and I think if you don't have the manpower to operate a community club effectively you're going to run into the same problems in the future. This is a decision that's been supported by the General Council and they've given the authority to look at the facilities and make recommendations to take the politics out of the equation.

The community centre review task force evaluated every, evaluated the community clubs in a variety of parameters in terms of infrastructure, amendments, governance, finance, population, volunteer participation and location. And as we talked about it before, the report, the reports said that the community club came in 70 out of 71 facilities that are there.

So this is a decision that the General Council supports and believes is a rationale, impartial, practical and sound decision. In terms of some of the travel times, you know this weekend I drove by Kelvin as well as a variety of other community clubs involved, whether be Bronx and also Chalmers and essentially what I found was Chalmers is about four blocks away from the community club in question and also that Bronx is a short, just over a kilometer drive away on a busy bus lane. So I don't think that travel times across the city, like say if this issue was people traveling across the city to another community club I agree with that, but I don't believe that the travel time is going to impact people.

What is important is the amenities that are still there. I think Councillor Browaty and a few others, Councillor Wyatt mentioned the facilities are still going to be there, the rinks are going to be there, the fieldhouse is going to be there, the soccer rinks are going to be there, they're going to be manned, I believe Mr. Bemrose talked in terms of some of the manning in terms of the satellite centre for Bronx will be associated with it.

And at St. James with a declining population, the community clubs have been sharing teams for a number of years. If you're a member of Burkedale Community Club, for instance I believe we've got two hockey clubs that's there and otherwise the parents go the local community clubs that are around. We've been doing that for years and it hasn't been an issue.

In terms of the Bronx facility, I think it's also important to consider that families will not do without a community centre. In fact they'll have an enhanced one and that's something that everyone in around the Elmwood area can enjoy. In fact, a new 25,000 square foot facility at the Bronx will accommodate state of the art equipment as well as other items like that where people from in and around the

community can enjoy. It's my understanding that the Bronx board will include members of the board from Kelvin if need be to keep the spirit of Kelvin alive with the new facility.

So something, sometimes the decision that we make here in this chamber, they're difficult but they're done in the best interests of the citizens to make this a long term goal and keep the community clubs alive and well because I think everyone agrees that it's something that should stay alive, it is a positive aspect. So thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May 3rd, 2004, Councillor Gerbasi as Chair of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, brought forward of her own initiative, the community centre review task force. The task force stated number one that the following criteria be adopted as acceptable standards for community centres to strengthen and balance the city of Winnipeg community centre movement to determine the status and health of individual community centres on A, infrastructure, participation, governance, financial management, amenities, inventory, location and population.

Her report states quote, that a committee with representation similar to the community centre review task force be part of any process where these criteria are applied to make decisions on the future of community centres. It states further quote, we must explore the potential to consolidate resources from our less efficient and under utilized facilities and reinvest those same resources into facilities that have greater potential to meet increasing and contemporary service demands.

Councillor Gerbasi's report demanded that administration consider such things as replacement value, our monthly financial statements submitted in a timely fashion, our year end financial statements submitted in a timely fashion, amenities inventory, number of interior amenities, gymnasiums, halls, multi purpose meeting rooms and indoor sports complexes and it asked to consider locations including community centres with no other community centres within a 2 kilometers radius and those closer. Councillor Gerbasi of course under Mayor Glen Murray received her wish and the process went forward and you've heard the rankings, some dispute, but at the end of the day Kelvin Community Centre did rank number 70 out of 71 community centres.

The PUFF report which was tabled at the Standing Policy Committee identified the Kelvin Community Centre be declared as surplus facilities. The 2006 Community Centre District Plan recommended that Kelvin Community Centre be declared a surplus and be removed from the community centre inventory and that the fieldhouse be retained. It was built in 1950. The building is ancient and in need of upgrading, preservation needs have been assessed at 1.6 million dollars based on ten years and this includes capital and maintenance needs.

This year Yoga and Pilates were cancelled this past, due to inadequate facilities and lack of participation. The centre's had a very difficult time securing volunteers over the past ten years. In 1996 the centre was threatening to close its doors if volunteers did not come forward to sit on the Board of Directors. At the time, there was an outcry and enough volunteers did come forward to fill the open positions. Over a short period of time the running of the centre was left to a few that remain.

Some years, numerous attempts were made to make quorum at the Annual General Meeting and in other years the few volunteers in place just continued on hoping they could eventually find replacements. Through this time period, the administration day to day operation of the centre was left to the paid manager Mr. Don Howard who contacted G.C.W.C.C. in February of 2006 to request assistance. He informed us that he was the only one left with banking authorization and as they required two signatures he was no longer able to pay

suppliers. Mr. Howard assumed the position of the centre's treasury in 2004.

Rep's from G.C.W.C.C. and the city met with Mr. Howard, he informed us he had been running the centre pretty well by himself as a President and was no longer involved with the rest of the board and had been dropping off one by one. Two meetings were called by the G.C.W.C.C., our representatives and the remaining board members. Both of these attempts resulted in no one showing up. Mr. Howard indicated that in speaking with the few remaining board members as they expressed they were not interested in continuing their involvement with the Kelvin Board.

An A.G.M. was advertised for Monday, April 10th. That meeting was attended by sixteen members of the community. Fourteen eligible voters, not meeting quorum for the discussion was held, discussion of closure of Kelvin and the athletic fields and a merger with Bronx Park. The centre has shown an operating loss in three of the past five years. We are told the population in the catchment area is 6,395. We are told the distance between this and Bronx Park is 1.4 kilometers. We are told a light distance between this community centre and Chalmers Community Centre.

A lot of discussion, Mr. Speaker, about whether or not the area Councillor was brought up to speed on these issues and if she knew. I don't know, I wasn't part of those discussions. I will tell you what I've been told. Spoken to the G.C.W. and they have stated that they on numerous occasions, communicated to Councillor Thomas, the intentions and the process and what was going to happen with respect to Kelvin's Community Centre.

It has been suggested that Councillor Thomas was not only aware but that she was in agreement with the closure of Kelvin Community Centre. I spoke last night with our administrator Gerald Mirecki, who confirmed the exact same thing.

There were ongoing meetings, Mr. Speaker at Bronx Park and I submit the following, well I'll make mention of the following. Minutes of the project meetings for the Bronx Park Good Neighbour Centre January 17th, 2006, 7:00 p.m. in attendance from G.N.C., Ernie Gross, Bill Hickerson, Don King, VPCC, Blaine Mooney, Marty Poolman, G.C.W., Marnie Neville, Steve Bemrose, Darren Labiski, Cindy Fox, City of Winnipeg, Gerald Mirecki, Sandra Sawatzky. The following discussion took place, I'm reading from the minutes, they talk about opportunities, one such opportunity maybe to amalgamate with Kelvin C.C. The have a poor facility and no board. Their manager who appears to speak for Kelvin C.C. has expressed interest in amalgamating with Bronx Park, have not pursued talks since last night.

Same meeting minutes February 22, 2006 Mr. Speaker, in attendance Bill Hickerson, Gordon Printer, Terry Duguid, Blaine Mooney, Bob Fabori, Ingrid Jarreson, Marty Poolman, Marlene Hemel, Cindy Foster-Wasaniski, Gerald Mirecki, Sandra Sawatzky, Bob Hrechuk, Mark Lubosch, Karl Kruger, Darryl Livingstone, Executive Assistant to Councillor Thomas. Good Neighbours voiced their concern about protecting their distinctiveness, there was also some questions as to why they fall under RALPH policy, Councillor Lubosch expressed his concern that RALPH policy cannot hinder this project.

Community Services reassured the group that although RALPH policy certainly applies in this project they're not significant concerns here. There will be some latitude granted based on a good business case; logical partners might include Kelvin C.C., East End Cultural Centre, et cetera. G.C.W. has attempted to meet with reps from Kelvin C.C. but there no longer appears to be a functioning board. There is a possibility that Bronx Park could serve as Kelvin's catchment area.

April 13, 2006, Blaine Moody and Grechra Sendmont, you know the people, I won't reread those, read them from the minutes. Report on Kelvin Community Centre, A.G.M, Marlene Hemel, that Kelvin A.G.M was held the same night as

Bronx Park path April 10, 2006, Marlene and Gerald attended however there was no quorum, only three families attended plus a few green team youth.

They had an informal discussion which identified the residents' main concern was a loss of the field and the rinks. They were assured these amenities plus the fieldhouse would remain. The revenue from the sale of Henderson Highway fund will go back to the community centre investment fund. The community realizes there has been little community involvement at Kelvin for many years and no one opposed the closure.

Councillor Thomas has no problem with Kelvin closing but it is currently undecided as to which community centre will capture the Kelvin population. Chalmers or Bronx Park are perhaps a split. Bronx Park is willing to serve the increased population, included a healthy soccer program, Kelvin is currently being managed by G.C.W.C.C. A few residents volunteered to act as liaisons for Kelvin in the interim.

Mr. Speaker I bring that forward only to I guess rebut some of the presumption.

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

Councillor Steeves: I bring this information only to rebut some of the presumptions that have been I guess castigated against the G.C.W.C.C. who work for us on a volunteer capacity primarily, that they didn't do their homework and they didn't consult with people in the neighbourhood.

I do not believe that is the case. I can tell you Mr. Speaker, that I asked G.C.W.C.C. directly, have you ever heard from Mr. Malloway throughout the entirety of this process and the answer was one word, never. Just so we're clear, the process demands that we go through certain things but at the end of the day, I think it is important to remember the field house at Kelvin is remaining and in combination with the ice rink, soccer fields, baseball diamonds and a planned new play structure will form a satellite of Bronx Park and will therefore remain on the inventory of community centres and be fully maintained.

There will be community assets here but I wish to make my position abundantly clear. What we are trying to do here Mr. Speaker is to take scarce community resources and build facilities that are good for the community. There is no nefarious or underhanded attempt to do harm to this community. Everybody in this chamber including every single person on this Council floor has the exact same interest and that interest is trying to ensure that this community prospers.

It is in no one's interest in this chamber Mr. Speaker, to try to do something harmful to this community. I've brought forward some of the nuts and bolts and some of the history as to what we've tried to do. It has been up front and disclosed to the largest extent. There is no way that anybody could say that we haven't been very forward with our ideas on this issue. I support the Bronx Park facility, being the key facility for this area and I think it is going to do nothing but good for these people.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is a very difficult issue. I find both positions entrench the community very involved in what's going on in their neighbourhood. I studied the history, thank you Councillor Steeves for a ten year history summation. I even went to go visit the site a few nights ago, a few days ago. I spoke to some of the residents that were walking by the site and I also spoke to some people that were skating inside the club and took a tour of the facilities and I can say this, that the role, if you believe the role of community clubs is to activate our neighbourhoods, to involve our citizens living in our neighbourhoods, to promote health and wellness, to promote recreation and for people to encourage people to leave their homes, to get out of their yards, to walk down to the community centres and want to contribute something, then the testimony I've heard

this morning tells me that this community is ready to work.

Notwithstanding the ten year history that Councillor Steeves has just described, notwithstanding the difficult times that this neighbourhood has gone through relative to community centres, I believe that the energy that was shown here this morning is genuine and these people want to work to help save this community centre. At the same time, it's bizarre. I received a note this morning, saying that we're going to keep the skating, the skating facility open, two skating rinks, they're staying open. We're going to keep the clubhouse, the dressing rooms for the skaters to change and not freeze while they're changing their skates. That's going to stay open. We're going to keep the green space. We're going to actually build a new playground facility but we're going to shut down the clubhouse which is a fairly modest clubhouse admittedly and I'm thinking well then what exactly are we gaining by agitating, by, it's a negative message that we've sent the community and I'm sure that wasn't our intent.

What, how much are we actually going to gain by shutting down this clubhouse, maybe 15, 20,000 dollars a year, when everything else is going to stay. Then when I read the motion put forward by Councillor Thomas, be it resolved that the closure of the Kelvin Community Centre should take place, should not take place while the Bronx Park expansion is incomplete.

At the time of completion, the Kelvin Community Centre will be revaluated. We know that Bronx Park is not going to be complete for a couple of years, probably two, three years, I understand there's cost overruns, so what Councillor Thomas and Councillor Gerbasi are asking is just don't shut down the main clubhouse for three years. After three years we'll evaluate it.

I asked Mr. Wolfrom this morning, do you have a Board of Directors? Yes. Do you have volunteers ready to provide programming for the community? Yes. Are you ready to fundraise to try to make improvements to what is there now? Yes.

So what's the gain? I'm appreciative of the money for community centres that's being invested by this city. I support it, but I'm just asking myself what's the end game? What do we especially hope to gain by shutting this down for three years. Why not give these volunteers a chance for three years to contribute to their neighbourhoods and I hearken back to a quote, I was fortunate enough to sit in a seminar by Dr. Axworthy yesterday and he said something very interesting and I wrote it down. He said an important entry point into education is sports, recreation and athletics.

He was referencing the plans he had around the University of Winnipeg that were discussed yesterday and how important an entry point sports recreation and athletics were for education. And hearing the description of her community by Councillor Thomas, you realize that there's no better spot for an access into sports, education, recreation, than where this community centre is. And three years down the road, we may be having this very same discussion again. And three years down the road, we'll evaluate it.

Three years down the road, maybe these volunteers will be at Bronx Park, who can say. But what are we gaining by shutting these people down here today. That is why I'm going to support the motion of Councillor Thomas. I'm not going to support the recommendation from Executive Committee and I would challenge, I would hope that the majority of people on this floor do the same. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Leipsic, you're next.

Councillor Leipsic: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just like to begin by saying I understand by going through the history here, there's been about half a million dollars spent on these studies by the PUFF report, the RALPH report, recommendations for future direction of community centres and direction of new facilities.

The Central Council of Winnipeg Community Centres was unanimously

granted by Council a mandate to ensure that these centres were sustainable and given the authority to make their recommendations a reality. Why, to take the decisions out of the hands of politicians and to add to the committee, the impartiality, practicality, sound decisions required. Are we now going to say to the G.C.W.C.C. we take away this mandate, you no longer can make recommendations that will be followed.

We have city money which is taxpayer money that we are responsible for. We have a duty and we're honour bound to use same with the utmost thoughtfulness, honesty and impartiality. We are only 15 Councillors, one Mayor. We represent our wards but I think it's just as important to realize we represent and are taking the city in a direction. There's only so much money available for so many projects.

Tough, difficult decisions have to be made. Courage, conviction, common sense have to prevail. So I can't agree that we now take away the authority and mandate that we originally gave to this committee.

Why do Elmwood residents, why should they be deprived of this plan that could be very progressive. I happen to view it as progressive. Bronx Park Community Centre will become a model investment for youth plus the seniors of Elmwood. Times are changing. This is going to be inter-generational, a necessity today with ageing population, maximum use of space for maximum number of residents of Elmwood.

A renovated centre with an infusion of certainly the 3.9 million and at the same time, Kelvin is keeping two rinks, one soccer field, two baseball diamonds and a fieldhouse, also a new play structure. There is a melding of socioeconomic levels; I would disagree with Councillor Thomas there. I've seen it in my area. That's one of the beauties of Crescentwood Community Club, when I'm there, when I'm at Sir John Franklin, River Heights, people from all over the areas are joining together.

Consider for a moment, a modern multi-purpose centre means access to larger pools of volunteers and more volunteer time, a very precious commodity today. It means a larger circle of friends, diversified circle of friends, neighbours, families, building a community together. There's more variety of programs, costs are reduced, resources are shared and there's more money for people to commit to the centre.

We must do the right thing for the right reasons for the good of the majority. As in our personal and work lives we must live within our means and plan for the future. We have a duty and indeed an obligation to ensure we act responsibly for all Winnipeggers. Therefore, I will support the E.P.C. recommendation Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the E.P.C. clause and not to support the amendment that's been brought forward. I want to start by correcting a few or what I see as items that need to be corrected.

There was a reference made to the score of 70 out of 71 from Mr. Bemrose. That was actually the average of all seven when you put all seven together. The total of those scores divided by seven, overall that community centre came out number 70 of 71, not on each individual items, I just want to make sure that was corrected.

Also with regard to the neighbourhood profiles that the City of Winnipeg has and the census data that is provided on the City of Winnipeg web site, it's actually provided by the federal government not by the city, it's done through Stats Canada and that data is actually from 2001, not very recent data.

But those two items corrected, I wanted to remind everybody where we started on this path and where we started was with the acceptance of the Recreational and Leisure Facilities Policy. And at that time, we accepted Appendix A, which is that

policy and we moved some additional funds for the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centre, immediate funds and on further funds and what was it we were doing at that time, well we get into the report and it says what's in the policy. Well what's in the policy is seven components of the new policy on Recreation Leisure and Library Facilities and those seven components are a facility hierarchy that provides general guidance around the provision of facilities including facility to population ratios.

Two, direction for existing facilities and for the introduction of new facility types. Three, a stronger leadership mandate for the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres to optimize the community centre model in Winnipeg. Four, a commitment to sustaining existing programmable recreational and leisure square footage while encouraging a reconfiguration of facilities over time. Five, a commitment to consultation. Six, a commitment to a managed care level of maintenance for new facilities and where possible for existing facilities. And seven, a reinvestment strategy.

And how were we going to manage this policy, we'd already decided on that, we'd adopt the active policy framework and that would clarify how change will occur. And the policy at the end, the outcome of this policy will be a community empowered to reconfigure it's recreation and leisure facilities in a way that is more responsive to local needs while improving overall financial sustainability. In many ways this policy is a partnership agreement between the city of Winnipeg and the community to work together in finding a solution to the challenges we face. Mr. Speaker, we do indeed face challenges.

One of the active policy, or active policy framework tells us, well in the tactical approach section after stood for affordable, two, community needs base, three, tactical approach, four, integrated service delivery, five, viable solutions and six, effective services. Through the tactical approach it said recreation, leisure and library services and facilities will be provided based on a tiered approach, regional, community and neighbourhood. Regional facilities will be strategically located within Winnipeg.

A set of established decision tools will serve as a framework for decision making to ensure that facility and programs continue to meet the needs of our citizens. That's important Mr. Speaker that facilities and programs will continue to meet the needs of our citizens. An integrated service delivery was the 4th item. The City of Winnipeg will integrate services with every strategic opportunity in order to provide for multi-use and inter-generational facilities and services. The city will actively seek strategic partnerships, viable solutions; opportunities will be provided for citizens input that will ensure that our strategic plans are viable from a community perspective and reflect its values.

So basically what we did Mr. Speaker, was we said we need to take this policy, give it to the Greater Council of Winnipeg Community Centres, let them as a group of volunteers, a small group of paid employees as the stakeholders in this community centre, moving to the city of Winnipeg, driving us forward in our recreation and library facilities policy, we're going to let them handle the ball on this and they have and they've come forward doing the community consultation using these policies and they've put it forward to us and at the 11th hour we're going to turn around and say no we don't like the work you've done, no we don't like what we've agreed to do and we're not going to do it now, we're going to start amending the policy and changing and adapting because we're down to the micro focus of once again looking at a building and a small community as opposed to what this policy set out to do Mr. Speaker and what the policy set out to do was to improve to the community centres and recreational library facilities throughout the city on a regional basis and drilling down into that community and neighbourhood basis.

So for all of those Mr. Speaker, all of those reasons I will not be supporting the amendment and will be standing by the decision at E.P.C.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. No further speakers? Council Thomas would you like to close on your motion.

Councillor Thomas: Yes, I would like to close on my motion. It's difficult to wade through the massive contradictory logic here. I should have done more, I shouldn't interfere. Historically, community clubs have been driven by the community, then let them do it, instead of deciding for them. Kelvin is fine. The community has said that any capital they are committed to find, they need approximately 33,000 dollars for operations.

Well I just heard that the Greater Council of Winnipeg Community Centres, they're going to give them that money for operations but they wanted them to do it from some other facility, instead of right in the middle of the community where they are and it's sixteen blocks not four blocks to the nearest community centres and its 1.6 kilometers not 1.4. And if you were going to school, you'd get a free bus ride. But two-thirds of the community lives further down the road than that as I was trying to explain to people. 14,000 people are being displaced by this and told to go somewhere else. 3,000 children are being absorbed by a community that has 1,000 children. Hello. Does that make sense to you?

It is accessible. There are two ramps, one on the south end and one on the northeast end. Come and look at the community centre before you try to talk about it. And the rating system, guys I read you out all the figures, there's 67, 46 and 66 and 51 and 54 and 64 and 47 and that adds up to 390 divide, you divide that by 70 you get 56. Yes I'm a sociologist. Yes I've got my M.A. in statistics but I think anybody with a grade four education could add that up and get that number!

So how does it come out to 70? Gosh, and a meeting that I'm not at, someone volunteers they've read my mind I guess, they've got their Ouji board out, someone volunteers an opinion that I'm okay with this. That's great. Don't talk to me about it, because you've read my mind. I'm not there at the meeting but you know what I think. Well I'm telling you what I think. I think this is disgusting. I think one of the most vulnerable communities in the area is being gone after by a pack of wolves. Why? Because you're not giving community centres enough money and they're going after the vulnerable to get more money for themselves and you've created this situation because you're not doing enough for community centres and you've created a situation where they're going after the weak and the weak is who you're supposed to support in this community, not be a bunch of bullies. Not go for the strong ones.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker on a point of order, I think it's important at this time to…

Mr. Speaker: What's you point of order?

Councillor Swandel: I think it's time to challenge Councillor Thomas on her reference to some of the members of this chamber as a pack of wolves and bullies. We're getting a little tired of this.

Councillor Thomas: If the shoe fits.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Swandel: Well, at least the shoes not hammering on this table Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: As it was not too long ago in a display unsuitable for this chamber. Mr. Speaker, it's time to challenge this Councillor and bring this chamber back to order.

Councillor Thomas: Well.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: I challenge you on your mathematics; I challenge you on your statistics.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas, Councillor Thomas, please, please, let's get back to reality.

Councillor Thomas: Okay, yes, because we wouldn't want to have the facts out

there because nobody's reading, read the neighbourhood characterizing studies or else they wouldn't have.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas please before I close the switch on you, please.

Councillor Thomas: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Listen. Listen to me. Refrain, Councillor Thomas, refrain from using any words such as a bunch of rats and that you know.

Councillor Thomas: I never said rats, I said wolves.

Mr. Speaker: Wolves, so I said rats.

Councillor Thomas: I don't know how that's parliamentary language.

Mr. Speaker: I'm trying to correct it. Okay.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order, can you put the clock back so Councillor Thomas can have the allotted time she had left before this little.

Councillor Thomas: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The clock has been stopped.

Councillor Gerbasi: No, it already lost about 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker: I'll give it a few minutes. I'll give it a few minutes. Councillors, please. I know everybody is hyped up here. Please. Stop. Use your present, your ability to talk to the issue. Address the issue. What has been said, don't start repeating or trying to correct it. It's been said. What has been said. But try to refrain using such words as wolves or rats.

Councillor Thomas: Yeah. Well, it seems that.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, go ahead.

Councillor Thomas: It seems that when it comes to hearing my opinion that some people feel that if they have a Ouji board, they could get a better point of view rather than actually listening to what's being said.

The neighbourhood area characterizing study has shown this as an area of high need. It's an area of large population. It's an area that has rallied and got itself together. I am not saying that it is a community without problems. I've admitted that. They've admitted that. They've asked for a chance.

The Mayor himself has said there would be no forced closures of community centre. I can't see anything more forceful that this closure, forced by a Greater Council that didn't seem to care, forced by a Council that cared even less and by statistics that don't make sense. By analysis of situations four blocks verses sixteen. You want me to name you the sixteen blocks that are between Kelvin Community Centre and Bronx Park, because I can do it. I can write through it but do you want me to go out there and say, because I went and measured with my car when I heard the statistics that were being bunched around. I drove in my car, 1.6. If you were going to school you'd be taking the bus. Now, two-thirds of the people live farther than that. You've already heard that some of them are five kilometers away. But you're not listening.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas, thank you. Can the Mayor please close, close your clause.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. There's no doubt Mr. Speaker this is a very emotional situation and I appreciate, I thank everyone for coming forward today and making their presentations and I thank all of Council for expressing their feelings and what I would like to do today is just deal in some facts Mr. Speaker.

Fact number one, it was said on at least two occasions, a forced closure. Mr. Speaker, this is not a forced closure. The facts are Kelvin was already without a board and the G.C.W.C.C. was basically running the facility and then they came forward with the recommendation to Executive Policy Committee. That's how it actually went.

Another fact Mr. Speaker, that at every meeting that took place and Councillor Steeves alluded to them, is that there was sometimes representation from Councillor Thomas, she was there on at least one occasion and on another occasion she definitely sent her E.A. but on every other occasion Mr. Speaker, she was also emailed along with her E.A. a copy of the minutes. So everything was available and everybody knew what was taking place. This isn't anything new.

I sat here today and listened to all sorts of delegations come forward and talk about the activities. I heard people today discuss health and recreation. Almost every single speaker talked about hockey, they talked about baseball, they talked about even sponge hockey, they talked about soccer. Mr. Speaker, all those activities for the children are there. They will continue Mr. Speaker, they're not going anywhere and they will be properly manned and they will have access to that.

You heard earlier, Councillor Wyatt talk about these facilities and mentioned they had an old railroad car at some point in time and he referred to the G.C.W.C.C.'s recommendation about redoing the field house and he came forward with an idea. I must confess his idea has considerable merit Mr. Speaker and I say to you, regardless of what happens today is that, there is still opportunity, all right. Nothing in life sometimes comes easy and you know what, if there are people committed in that community to make something happen, I think Councillor Wyatt has opened the door for them and I believe the G.C.W.C.C. would listen.

People should remember one thing Mr. Speaker, the G.C.W.C.C. is a group of volunteers from every community centre, representing community centres across the city. They are volunteers. They do not have a political agenda Mr. Speaker. They are there to do what they believe is right, without political interference, which is why this Council unanimously came up with a policy to make them responsible and to listen to their recommendations.

One of their recommendations which was alluded to a few moments ago was for more funding and they asked for 50,000 dollars and as you can see, Executive Policy Committee is endorsing that proposal, as well as Councillor Vandal I believe said he's endorsing that. Yet I heard Councillor Thomas refer to us with a name I won't use, that we don't care. Well Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that Councillor Thomas has been a member of E.P.C. much longer than I have. We are going forward to increase that funding. Where was that increase for funding when others sat on E.P.C., it didn't exist Mr. Speaker.

For ten years they never got a nickel which is why that 50,000 dollars is more than reasonable. And Mr. Speaker, I've always believed that if you can't say anything nice, then don't say anything at all. But you know what, it's very difficult for me to stand here today and share a little story with you. It wasn't that long ago in the summer of '05, I got a phone call from Mr. John King. He was very discouraged. He was very disheartened. He was very upset that the playground equipment at Kelvin had been removed. He was upset that one, it had been removed, two, the timing of it and three, the way it was done. Unfortunately it was after the fact. There was very little that could be done. But I agreed with him, that it wasn't done the way I thought it should have been done and he asked for some help. Well you know what; they're many people who could come forward to give help. There's the Councillor, there's the M.L.A., he called the Mayor. It wasn't a lot Mr. Speaker, but we made sure right away that there was at least another swing set installed immediately.

And yet last week when I called the M.L.A. for the area to see if there was any money available, there was no money available for community centres, yet mega corporations who are in the media business, there's money available for them.

Mr. Speaker, it's a tough issue, we have to basically make tough decisions and I encourage, I encourage the volunteers to continue their work and I hope everybody will support this motion. I'm finished Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Hold it right there. What is your point of order?

Councillor Thomas: Point of order Mr. Speaker, that money for the replacing of the swings came from my land dedication reserves and also for the courses and stuff like that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas it's irrelevant.

Councillor Thomas: Well it's there as a matter of public record Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, fine. Okay, Councillors let's get on with the business. What I want to say is I used the word rats. I did not use it intentionally, it was just slipped out because you hear so many times, different words are being used, a bunch of wolves or a bunch of rats you know, that's old slang, especially in the north end. But I apologize if any Member of Council feels offended by the word that I had have used because I don't think anyone is.

So let's get on with the voting on the motion number 3, this is motion by Councillor Thomas and Councillor Gerbasi. All in favour, recorded vote has been called for. All in favour would you please rise. Motion number 3, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Thomas's motion and Councillor Gerbasi dealing with the motion that was debated here for a long time, that motion, Mr. Mayor, is on the, whereas that the Kelvin Community Centre retain the citizen member of the Greater Council Winnipeg Centre. Okay, those in favour of the motion will you please rise, a recorded vote has been called.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Leipsic, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel.

Mr. Speaker: And myself.

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

Mr. Speaker: I voted, I voted. No, I voted for the amendment by Councillor Thomas and I voted for the clause. I voted for the clause. I haven't voted for that yet. Okay, so all in favour of the clause who has not been amended. You guys with your arguments, you got me confused here. Okay. Let's get down to business. All in favour of the clause?

Councillor Thomas: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: What's you point of order now.

Councillor Thomas: There is a motion that came from me and the clause is Executive Policy Committee's decision on what to do with that motion. In the past when there have been motions referred back, it has been the motion itself and not the Executive Policy decision on that motion in which we voted on.

Mr. Speaker: We're voting on the issue that's here before us that came from Executive Policy Committee, period. Okay, now on the motion, on the clause, all in favour? I guess it'll be a recorded vote on this one. All in favour of the clause from Executive Policy Committee please stand.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Mr. Speaker: And the vote? All opposed now. Yes, I'm getting rotten here. Too many hours. It's been a long day. Those opposed to the clause, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas, Vandal.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 4.

Mr. Speaker: It's carried. Okay report of January 17th, 2007 Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 17, 2007**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent Agenda Item 1 to 22 Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All in, Councillor Gerbasi?

Councillor Gerbasi: 2 please.

Mr. Speaker: Number 2? Anyone else? If there isn't, the rest all in favour, contrary? Carried. Okay, item number 2.

**Item 2 - 311 Customer Service Model
File GG-5**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would very much like to hear from Councillor Gerbasi and then I will try to address her questions or concerns.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, let's just wait a moment. Please let's just wait a moment until the galleries clear. Just wait, just wait. Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi on clause 2.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Ready to go? Okay, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, go ahead.

Councillor Gerbasi: It's still a little bit noisy in here, but I'll try to make my comments. I was just going to comment that the concept of the 311 system first came up in Winnipeg back in 1999 as a recommendation of the domestic violence working group, those of you who were on Council would remember that, but, and the idea was being primarily looked at as a way to reduce unnecessary 911 calls. It was again recommended by the Red Tape Commission and what I'm really rising to speak about today is that the option of outsourcing the entire call centre staff for the city of Winnipeg is being put on the table.

And I definitely am supportive of a 311 service. I believe there's a great opportunity here to provide a better public service, to reduce demands on the 911 system and to make it easier for citizens to get information. And I have no problems looking at the consolidated model as we've already spent 250,000 dollars looking at that and that's the model of choice that's come forward.

But what I'm objecting to in the clause before us today, is the notion to spend another 250,000 dollars on consultant fees to investigate the option among other options but this is part of it, the option of outsourcing our entire customer service system to the private sector. And I really believe this is a waste of energy and money. It's going to be a complicated thing to look at and I'm going to explain why I think privatizing our public service departments is really whacky.

Are you aware that there are no cities in Canada that have chosen to outsource this public service, not one, and this is just from the report we have in front of us. Furthermore, the only cities in the United States that have done it are New Orleans and post 9/11 New York. We're talking about major disaster areas.

Now our streets might be in bad shape but I don't think that make us a disaster zone like New Orleans. Obviously those cities had special circumstances that prompted them to go down this road. And I wonder if everyone here is aware, if you've read the report, where it says that there is absolutely no assurance that if these jobs are outsourced that they will stay in Winnipeg or even in Manitoba or even in Canada.

On page 14 of the administrative report it says pursuant to the agreement on internal trade it's unlikely that the city could properly require the call centre and data bases to be located in Winnipeg or Manitoba. How is this good for our local economy to give away Winnipeg jobs. Even if we save a few bucks as the private company would likely pay lower wages, we'd still be losing jobs in Winnipeg.

Jobs that allow people to invest in our city, buy a house and raise a family. Jobs that keep our communities stable, healthy and reduce crime. Aren't these the goals that were talked about in the Mayor's State of the City address recently. In fact a new commission was just announced to figure out how to create more investment in Winnipeg. So why would we look at a model that could send existing jobs elsewhere when we're making statements like that. It makes no sense.

Another point is that if we go to an option like contracts workers from some other part of the country or some other part of the world to deal with Winnipeg issues, how well do you think they'll do at dealing with issues like snow clearing and French language concerns. Furthermore, if these jobs stay here, we're still lowering working families' wages which is not of benefit to the economy.

These workers we're talking about are largely our lowest paid employees that the city has and it's heartless and demoralizing to treat them this way and as long as we look at this plan and this outsourcing black cloud is hanging over our staff, they get up every morning wondering if they're still going to have a job, as long as we're looking at this and if it made sense to look at it, I'd support looking at it, but it doesn't. No one is doing it in Canada. No one is doing it anywhere except in disaster areas.

So it is, and also, we'd be required to redeploy all the employees anyway, so it's not even going to save us money or if we don't, if we find some way out of redeploying the employees, then we're doing something even worse. We're trading these decent paying jobs, jobs that allow people to live and raise a family in our city. This is a heck of an economic strategy.

I also think by going ahead with this study to look at outsourcing all of these jobs and let's not forget that's what we're doing today, we're clearly sending a message to our employees that there's a lack of value being placed on their knowledge and skill. There are years and years of experience that would be tossed away. And this long drawn out and expensive process of looking at this will have a very bad effect on staff morale.

Finally, I'd like to point out that this 87 page report on the 311 system was not made public or available to none E.P.C. Councillors until a week and a half ago, yet the report is dated June 2007 which is six months ago, it indicates a, pardon, pardon me, 2006, that's right, it indicates a real lack of interest in having public participation or discussion or to include all Members of Council in important decisions.

When the capital budget also a week and a half process, that it's public, one has to question whether doing this so quickly is some sort of strategy or just a simple lack of concern of including, for openness and transparency. And that sense of a lack of transparency is growing with exactly these kinds of actions, a week and a half budget process and a week and a half to look at an 87 page report that contracts out a huge chunk of our civic service is really disappointing.

In conclusion, I would emphasize that the privatization option is a high risk group that could be very expensive but also has a high human cost that could actually hurt our local economy, have pitfalls to good public service and the very active spending all this time and effort looking at it is going to hurt staff morale.

There are good reasons why no other Canadian city has chosen to outsource this function. Some core services need to be done by city staff who know our city and bring experience and knowledge to the job. A consolidated 311 model could be a very good thing for providing more transparent and efficient services to

Winnipegger, Winnipeggers. But please reconsider this wasteful effort to study outsourcing it, take the black cloud that is hanging over a large number of our staff and look at some options that actually make sense. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. My first comment is that the amount of money that's being wasted on this could fund the operational expenses for Kelvin Community Club for ten years.

My second comment is why study something that we know that we're going to do and we know the answers going to come back that it needs to be in-house anyway, because these services need to have expertise, the expertise of internally operated service.

The kind of thing that we were concerned about when we initially looked at that was that our 911 system was being filled up with three, with calls that we felt were important but not emergency. And if someone is phoning because of a snow clearing issue or because of a dog running at large and they think it's important and those offices are closed after a certain time and they start clogging up 911 with people who want to get people to the hospital or there's a fire going down, that's not good. So that's the reason why we decided we needed to do a 311 service and that's the reason why it needed to be 24 hours.

But if you turn it into a call centre where people say thank you, what's your problem oh, I'll forward it on to someone tomorrow when the office actually really opens, it's not going to be the point. We need someone who can take action at the time who knows who the proper people are to contact. We need our staff who have an understanding of the systems and how they operate. That's not going to be something we can do from a call centre. They're not going to have the expertise.

I'm particularly concerned with the body of the report that says that we won't be able to do it; we won't be able to ensure that it's done within Winnipeg. Now we do have a number of call centres within the city, but if we can't even ensure that it's going to be going to someone in here, we may find that there is someone in sunny California or, is trying to deal with our clogged three foot drifts of snow and not really having a good comprehension of what snow is.

That someone, someone in South America is trying to comprehend our By-laws and find out exactly what the point is with regard to legislation that we have on dogs running at large. We don't need to have to train these people in these long-winded explanations.

So I think the study is unnecessary. I think we should just go ahead and do it. Hire the staff, get the centre up and running and the 250,000 dollars could be utilized to bringing in the phones, bringing in the, reconstructing the facility to house these people on site. It doesn't make any sense to spend 250,000 dollars to study something that's really obvious and we should just do it, do it in-house and do it now. We need it now.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak briefly on this matter. One of the things that's not being said here is you know we've heard the representation that we don't need to do this, you know that looking at this outsourcing option is something that is a waste of time and taxpayer money in moving forward with this.

We hear the example that the only place in North America that it's been done is in in two places that have experienced devastation of mammoth proportions in recent history. What we don't hear is a representation from that argument as to how those two outsourced entities are performing. What sort of value are they bringing to the taxpayers in those locations. How does it compare to their previously in-house operations. And that's exactly what we're asking here Mr. Speaker, is that we go forward and we assess and we look.

My personal belief is that there is a great deal of value in the people that we have currently, the education, the knowledge, the culture that they have, the understanding of the city systems. But is that necessarily the only way to go and you know while I believe that there's that value there, it's probably the way to go.

Perhaps we should be looking at outsourcing of some of the technical and real estate pieces of what comes with a 311 system. But I'm not an expert. If you look at the clauses before us, it's the provision of this money to hire some outside expertise to put together what this business planning process will look like in assessing an outsourced model so that we can compare.

And the original recommendation from the administration Mr. Speaker was that we just look at two pieces, one, doing it in-house, two, outsourcing it. E.P.C. in its wisdom said wow; let's broaden this a little bit. Let's be able to have all the pieces work together. Let's look at outsourcing and using our in-house personnel, outsourcing on the technical and the real estate side as well in a comparative analysis and that's what this is Mr. Speaker, it's a comparative analysis to deliver the best value for the citizens of the City of Winnipeg. It's not a way of just getting get rid of jobs, of union jobs at the city. This is, if that's the best service delivery for the City of Winnipeg, that's where we will be at the end of this analysis and it's our job as overseers of the taxpayers money to ensure that we do a proper analysis before we just go off and say, I'm not an expert but I think we should do this. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Leipsic you're next.

Councillor Leipsic: Mr. Speaker I just want to clarify for Councillor Thomas that when we were talking about outsourcing 311 calls it clearly states, it's going to be, it's going to remain in Canada, preferably in Winnipeg. It's not going to South America Councillor Thomas or anywhere else.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the directed question of the outsourcing which I think is the bugaboo on this particular report, I was hopeful that we might get to unanimity on something today, but I don't know if that's possible.

The, here is the concern with 311 even though we all support it, if we work on the assumption and I think it's a good assumption Mr. Speaker that the moment we implement a 311 system, the demand on our system is going to increase. I think you could probably write that down as a fact and that's based on the Calgary experience who have gone to it.

The moment we make it easier for people to remember our phone number, make it easier for them to access, we're going to have a lot more people who are contacting us and our administration. So if we use that as a fact and I don't think anybody here would dispute that, in fact that's the reason we're doing it and I'd emphasize again, the 311 system is not a cost saving enterprise. That's not the reason we're doing it. It's to increase service.

So, if we take it as a fact, there's going to be increased demand on our service, the obvious next question is how are we going to address that increased demand. Right now, we have x amount of employees that are working for us and they're good people by and large and do their best, they're not perfect but heck, neither are we and we do the best we can. But if the demand increases, what then, how are we going to fill that gap. I think that is in essence the question this report is trying to answer and we're looking at a couple of different options.

I mean and who knows what it's going to look like and I guess that's my concern. We're talking about filling that demand gap for the new people and the increased people that'll call on and make a call on our services. We better be prepared to address that or we're going to have more problems than benefit with this report. I think it's responsible that we move

forward with a plan that's going to present some options as to how to increase that demand.

Take issue, Mr. Speaker with Councillor Gerbasi's implication that somehow at the end of the day this is going to mean less people working for the city of Winnipeg. I can't imagine how that's going to happen. Its right in the report and everybody here around this chamber admits this is not a cost-saving mechanism. We're not trying to spend less money on this. I'm certain at the end of the day, we are going to require all the people we currently have, who knows maybe more, I don't know how we'll pay for that exactly, but they might require the assistance of another entity and that's what we're exploring and I think that's probably responsible to do that so that when the time comes to make this decision, maybe we can have that information on the table so people can say, you know what, maybe we want to take our staff and get them doing something else so we cannot just answer calls, we can address the issues on the street.

That's what's going on here and I think it's a decent plan and I think we'll all be pretty well served at the end of the day if we come back with a report that has that piece of information that people can review. That's just my thoughts Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Councillor Vandal, you're next.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I remember this issue came up five years ago with the domestic violence subcommittee that Councillor Gerbasi was a part of and it was recommended then and I think everyone supports 311. I know I certainly do, although I'm really not sure if I support it at 10 million dollars.

About a year ago there was a consultant's report that recommended certain options. This recommended this report essentially, this report is recommending 250,000 dollars to hire another consultant who is going to come back on different options of business, using a business model, costing out different models and you know at the end of the day, that, the tab is going to be fairly huge in the report. It says from five million to eight million dollars not including a facility with the city estimates will cost approximately two million dollars to retrofit.

We're up at ten, let's budget high. We're up to ten million amortized over twenty years, interest rates; we're getting up there in the millions. I'm wondering if there's not room for consolidation with some other facilities we may be building. Notwithstanding the financial aspect of this, I have concerns with the community I represent of knowledge and expertise, French language services is something that is essential for the community I represent, it's in the City Charter. We have to take that into consideration when we are doing the business cases.

I want to be assured that we're not buying a voice mail jail sort of system so that when people call, that they end up hitting 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, all the way to 9 for which department they want. I want, when I read first call resolutions on issues, I think that's a great goal, shoot for the skies, but, shoot for the stars, but a lot of the questions that come across our desks are difficult to resolve on the first call.

So those are the concerns I have. I'd be appreciate it if the Mayor could address the concerns relative to the French language service, to the type of, are we going to get a person answering the phone each and every time that someone calls or we going to get a voice mail type system and those are my concerns. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Vandal. There's no further speakers? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, 311, quite simply, burning building, call 911, burning question, call 311. We all know and it's been referred to by two other Councillors here today what has happened in the past with calls to 911 and how this has been talked about I believe since 1999.

The key thing right now is I'd like to believe that the majority of Council

believes and understands this is about servicing the public. Far too many calls needlessly tie up the emergency operators at 911. They may get phone calls for where to buy the best pizza, they may get phone calls I need to know how to get somewhere, they get phone calls for everything but what they're there for.

The purpose of this is to provide service and hopefully, save lives in cases of emergency because these lines are not being tied up. On the issue that came up earlier about the 250,000 dollars, that is a first call, okay, on the budget to basically implement 311 Mr. Speaker and we do require funds to implement and Councillor Vandal is correct when he says that there is a significant capital cost required. Approximately ten million dollars, I would agree is a very reasonable amount.

But when you look at the big picture of what this is all about Mr. Speaker, what could it accomplish and maybe save lives, I don't think anybody here wants to put a value on that. I think we all want better service for our citizens and I believe they deserve better service. This has been done in many cities Mr. Speaker, in many languages, okay. New York I believe has about 150 languages that they do 311 in. I had the opportunity to tour Gatineau, there are live, real people who answer the phone on a regular basis in both languages, French and English. And in the end I believe the reason we need to go out there and do our due diligence is to make sure we're doing it right.

Unfortunately you can not have the expertise on everything Mr. Speaker. Sometimes you do require expertise from outside. This will be good. You know, Councillor Gerbasi I thank you for supporting it, I think Councillor Gerbasi would agree, it's long overdue. And the key thing is, is that from my point of view, I have no interest in supporting something that takes jobs away from citizens of our city. I think Councillor Leipsic has already said this will not be outside of Canada and we have the power to give preference to someone who is inside our city, if it were to go out. But as Councillor Swandel made mention earlier that with the presentation that came forward from Mr. Swanson and Mr. Manzik of CUPE we added a third option which I think makes a lot of sense.
So, I think doing your due diligence, you would look at all options Mr. Speaker and I certainly hope that everybody will support the implementation of 311. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. All ready for the vote? Recorded vote.

Councillor Thomas: Clause by clause please, clause by clause. There's separate clauses to this.

Mr. Speaker: What clause? Where are they? Four clauses? You want to deal with the four clauses separately?

Councillor Thomas: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Okay all in favour, let's see clause number 1.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, would you please read out the clause or at least give us an idea of which one but I'm just.

Mr. Speaker: Madam Clerk, would you read it out.

Recommendation No. 1 - That the report by the consulting firm AtFocus Incorporated entitled, "City of Winnipeg Final Report 311 Project: 311 Business Plan" be received as information.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Those opposed.

Recommendation No. 2 - That the Administration be directed to prepare business cases for three consolidated service delivery options of 311 service: a City of Winnipeg internally operated service, one which is outsourced to the private sector, and one which out sources infrastructure (technology and facility) and utilizes city staff, and report back in May 2007.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary?

Councillor Thomas: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas recorded in opposition. Councillor Gerbasi. Okay number 3.

Recommendation No. 3 - That expenditures in the amount of $250,000.00 for the 311 project, including external expertise, be authorized prior to the adoption of the 2007 Capital Budget as a first call against the 2007 Capital Budget.

Mr. Speaker: You heard the number 3. All in favour, contrary?

Councillor Thomas: Nay. Record me in opposition please.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas, Smith and Gerbasi in opposition. The last one, that's it. Okay now with the clause, all in favour, contrary? It's carried. October 24th, and this morning's.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker if I may, I have one more.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, go ahead Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 24, 2007**

Mayor Katz: Thank you. Mr. Speaker I'd like to move that the rules be suspended to introduce the report of January 24, 2007 and move clause 1 that is on the Soccer Complex, I'm hoping everybody does have that report.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, everyone should have it here. It's on your desk, Item number one. You've heard the Mayor's moved that clause. All in favour, contrary? Carried. Now we get into, I'm lost here on my, not By-laws. There's motions, isn't it.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: Two motions. I'd like to get to call oh, Councillor Pagtakhan. Motion number 1 and that's moved by Councillor Katz, seconded by Councillor Leipsic appointing Councillor Nordman to the Convention Centre. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

**Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz
Seconded by Councillor Leipsic**

WHEREAS Council on November 8, 2006, appointed Councillor O'Shaughnessy and Councillor Swandel as the two council representatives on the Convention Centre Corporation Board of Directors;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Swandel submitted his resignation from the Convention Centre Corporation Board of Directors effective January 4, 2007;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Councillor Nordman be appointed to the Convention Centre Corporation Board of Directors for the balance of the one year term expiring December 31, 2007.

Mr. Speaker: Motion number, no, motion number 2.

(Councillor Pagtakhan in the chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion number 2, moved by Councillor Lazarenko, seconded by Councillor Smith.

**Moved by Councillor Lazarenko
Seconded by Councillor Smith**

WHEREAS Council at its meeting of January 25, 2006 referred a motion moved by Councillors Lazarenko and Smith pertaining to a report on civic employees and salary requirements to Executive Policy Committee;

AND WHEREAS Council at its meeting of February 22, 2006 adopted that the motion be amended and that the report be made directly to Executive Policy Committee in thirty days;

AND WHEREAS Executive Policy Committee at its meeting of September 21, 2006 received as information the respective report dated May 26, 2006 from the Acting Chief of Human Resources and Corporate Services;

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

the number of employees for each civic department reporting to the CAO, as a whole for the years 1995 through 2006, both inclusive, distributed by all bargaining units or associations, including WAPSO Exempt and Senior Management

the total salary requirements, including benefits and bonuses, for each civic department reporting to the CAO, as a whole for the years 1995 through 2006, both inclusive, distributed by bargaining units or associations including WAPSO Exempt and Senior Management

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this report be provided to all Members of Council by March 1, 2007.

Councillor Clement: Notice.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm moving suspension of the rules to deal with the motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right then, Mr. Speaker do you wish to speak on that?

Councillor Lazarenko: Yes I moved that. Vote on suspension of the rules Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. I'll call suspension of rules, all those in favour, contrary? It's carried.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thanks Bill. Mr. Speaker I, this motion number 2 that was moved by myself and Councillor Smith, this is a motion that was before Council on the 25th at 2006. Mr. Speaker, this is just a simple request asking the administration to provide a report of the number of employees for each civic department reporting to the sale as a whole for 1995 through 2006 both inclusive distributed by all bargaining units, associations including WAPSO exempt and senior management, the total salary requirements, including benefits and bonuses for each department.

Now, this is not to be debated on Council, this is asking that report is available now. But that report did not leave the Executive Policy Committee when this motion was made back in the beginning of 2006. So in all essence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is asking for, that the, that our sale provide all Members of Council by March 1 of 2007, that report is available. It's just to provide that report to all Members of Council for their own perusal. It's not to be debated at Council; it's just to get that report. I'd like to call the question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, all those in favour, contrary? Carried.

Councillor Lazarenko: Bill, you know it doesn't have to be anything, it's there already, the reports.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, E.P.C. Consideration of By-laws, His Worship Mayor Sam Katz moves the following By-laws be read a first time.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd move that By-laws 21/2007, 28/2007 and 29/2007.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 21/2007, 28/2007 and 29/2007.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: His Worship Mayor Katz moves that By-laws No. 21/2007, 28/2007, sorry that's you.

Mayor Katz: Would you like to be me for a moment. Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. I move that By-laws 21/2007, 28/2007 and 29/2007 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 21/2007, 28/2007 and 29/2007.

Mayor Katz: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 21/2007, 28/2007 and 29/2007 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour, contrary? Carried. E.P.C. question Period. Councillor Gerbasi.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. My question for the Mayor is concerning an article in the Free Press is where I heard about it, that the Chair of the Protection, or I'm sorry, the Chair of the Property and Development Committee and a member of the Mayor's staff spoke about plans to eliminate or to do something with the railroad line to Shoal Lake that services our water supply and there's been no, and I wrote a letter which I emailed to all Members of Council and the Mayor on January 4th, 2007, asking that a Council seminar be scheduled as soon as possible in which the Water and Waste Department could be present to brief Members of Council. I think that it was an issue and as well, that there be meaningful public consultation before any Council decisions are made around an issue of this importance which is an issue of public health and the safety of our water supply and I have yet to receive even an acknowledgment of this letter, so first of all I'd like to ask you if you received the letter and if you would respond to it, Mr. Mayor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Mr. Speaker I have no doubt in my mind I have received the letter and I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever that we will not be dealing with such an issue until the administration comes back to us with the options that are available, and until one does their due diligence, nothing will be going forward. And when we get to that point, depending what the information that comes back from the administration, I would have no problem whatsoever making sure that Council is aware of the information that's out there and also if a Council seminar is required, I am certainly open to that as well. But at this point in time it would be totally premature because the administration has not completed doing their homework and we are waiting them and as a matter of fact, they have just commenced working on this in probably the last week or so, no the last week for sure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Gerbasi: My second question. Mr. Mayor would you be willing to have a seminar in order to, not to come up with the options and decide where we're going with it because I realize they're doing that work but simply to, for Councillors to have an information session to understand what this rail line is for, what it currently does and some of the issues around the existing situation, before a whole bunch of work and effort is done on this other project, or whether it is or not, I think we just want some background information and an information seminar on that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, It sounds to me there may have been several Councillors not even aware that we have a railway, but the bottom line is I think it would be more prudent to let the department do their work and then when they come back with the information and what if any options may exist, then we can discuss it amongst Council and I certainly would have no problem with that whatsoever.

Councillor Gerbasi: Would the Mayor assure Council that there will be a long period of time, not a week and a half as there's been with several issues where before the rest of us hear about them, where there's some kind of a report forward and a decision made within a week and a half. I would like to be assured that there will be a period of, you know reasonable amount of time, weeks or months, to make this decision and not a week and a half.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I do not have a crystal ball and know what the time

parameters will be. The one thing that I certainly can do is make sure that everybody has as much time as is possible that's out there. Sometimes circumstances change, I know Councillor Gerbasi referred to earlier, the capital budget, we all know this was a unique circumstance because of an election. I can't control certain things. In this situation I am happy to make sure that as much time as possible is given to all Councillors.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Mayor, will you release the DBF Limited Lease Agreement between the city tomorrow morning, because you know this is on the Charleswood Bridge, the lease agreement, so we can evaluate the public private partnership and how it's gone with the Charleswood Bridge before we leap into more, similar projects in the same financial way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Councillor Smith I thank you for that question. I must confess I haven't seen the lease of the Charleswood parkway. You may find down the road it doesn't really have a lot of value, because every, I think you're referring to the P3 if I'm not mistaken. Every P3 is different. What I'm sure that we will have to do is when it comes to P3's which we talked about in the capital budget, we've already gone on the record saying that they will be completely transparent, we are putting safe guards into place and I think that you would have to assess every single P3 on its own merit. I don't think one that was done a year ago or ten years ago or ten years from now would have any impact on a specific one. They are all different.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Smith: But Mr. Mayor, would it not make it easier for us to evaluate future public private partnerships by looking at the one that we have and where we could alter it or change it so that it's more useful to the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I believe that, you know many people are not very familiar with P3's. And there are many different forms of P3's. There could be ten or twenty, so the point I guess I'm trying to make, is that Council will definitely have the opportunity to examine any P3 we're looking at doing in the future which I think should be the concern and the right of every Councillor and I appreciate Councillor Smith bringing that up. We'll have discussion. Certainly we'll have debate and we will certainly judge it on its merits, but I think you're comparing apples with oranges and I don't think that's a good thing to do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Okay, Councillor Steeves followed by Councillor Vandal and Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Smith: Could we not have a copy of that lease. Why are you keeping it secret?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Smith, I'm not keeping it secret. It's been there. I don't know Councillor Smith has been here for many, many years. I wonder if he's asked for it before. I'm not keeping anything secret. If he wants something I'm sure he could probably ask the administration, they'll give him a copy of it, okay. I don't know why he's making an issue of it today but I can assure you on future P3's, that this Council is part of, everybody will have the opportunity to have their input, examine them thoroughly and make whatever comments they so desire either positive or negative.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Speaking of secrets Mr. Speaker, just so I can sleep tonight on that crucial issue of the swing set at Kelvin Community Centre, who actually paid for that, Councillor Thomas or the Mayor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Steeves for that question, I think. Mr. Speaker, I have never ever in almost three years, made a comment on the floor of Council as the Mayor of the city, that wasn't 100% accurate and honest and truthful. The monies for the swing set came out of the Mayor's budget. I have a copy of the quotation and the bill right here. It was approximately 4,800 dollars. I will just for the time being, assume that Councillor Thomas just made an honest mistake. Thank you.

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

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Mayor, it's been reported that your office has been in possession of a, of the actual proposal for Mr. David Asper on the stadium for some time and I wondering if you could share with us the status of the negotiations between the three levels of government, Minister Toews, the Premier, and yourself, on the feasibility of the Asper proposal for the stadium.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Councillor Vandal it would be my pleasure to share with you whatever information I have. Number one, is that I think it's all on the public record of the Asper proposal for the new stadium. I think all the media has covered it very significantly, as well as the feasibility study which was, I believe, released last Friday by the Winnipeg Football Club. Number one, negotiations are taking place between Mr. Asper and the Winnipeg Football Club, neither the Mayor or Council has any real involvement in that. That's their decision to make, what they want to do. As far as funding, I think it's on the public record what has been asked for in the Asper proposal from both the federal government and the provincial government and to date we've made them very clear of the fact that the city has given everything it has and there is nothing left for us to give as far as any financial assistance and I do not believe any financial assistance has been asked of the city from the Asper proposal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Second supplementary, no.

Councillor Vandal: I'm going to zoom to the other side of the city. I'm wondering if there's been any discussions between your office, Hi-tech, and what the status is of the OlyWest proposal in St. Boniface.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Vandal. I have had no conversation whatsoever regarding, with anybody from Hi-tech and at this point in time, I really don't see a need to, until they work things out with the province and C.E.C. We have many other issues to deal with at Council.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Third supplemental. Yep, one more.

Councillor Vandal: Given that the Centre Venture Heart of Gold Plan was unanimously adopted here today, I'm wondering if you could share with this Council your position on the reopening of Portage and Main to pedestrians.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Through you Mr. Speaker to Councillor Vandal, my position on Portage and Main has not changed since day one. I have stated unequivocally that I will not go to court to challenge an agreement that we and certain stakeholders entered into in good faith. But if the stakeholders on their own unanimously agree, then I am more than happy to work with them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. It's delightful to know that I'll be getting some money back in my land dedication reserve. My question is with regard to P3's. I heard Councillor Smith's questions but I have to say that I did not get the Mayor's answers and can he tell us whether we're going to have access to the information on the P3 that we have before we vote on establishing another P3 so that we can do it from a basis of knowledge and not ignorance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Once again I will reiterate the answer that I gave to Councillor Smith, is that he never made me aware of the fact that he's asked administration for it and did not get it. At some point in time in the future if he does do that, I'd be happy to look into it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Second supplemental Councillor.

Councillor Thomas: How interesting. Will we have this information before we vote on P3's tomorrow or will we be expected to vote from ignorance and believe that it's a better way of doing things without having the information in front of us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: My response would be, I'm wondering if Councillor Thomas has asked anybody for that copy, I don't know, she hasn't said anything so I'll wait to hear from her.

Councillor Thomas: Mr. Speaker, for the third time I am asking the Mayor, will we have that information for the vote tomorrow? Will we have it? Simple question.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I will try and speak a little clearer this time, okay. If anybody requests something they should let me know, if they did not get satisfaction, I haven't heard that. Number two, I've already said that if there are any future P3's and I think Councillor Thomas is very much aware of the projects we are looking at. As a matter of fact I believe the Disraeli Bridge for approximately 90 million dollars is one of them and when we go out and get a response, okay, then every Councillor will have the opportunity to assess that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Anybody else for first round, Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Mr. Mayor, I don't know what the legalities of the agreement with the numbered company and the city was on the Charleswood Bridge, but if in fact we have the information from that here in front of us tomorrow, could we also get information from the Public Works Department as to how much it would cost us for maintenance on that bridge over thirty years which was actually included in the deal but we would have actually had to spend so that we can get an accurate costing in front of us so that we don't have some kind of phoney number in front of us and the reason I'm asking that is because I've heard a number that was thrown out by somebody in the Finance Department but it didn't include the cost, the actual cost of maintenance during that thirty year time frame which far exceeded the amount that the finance person thought we were going to save.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Clement. Number one, is if a request is made to the administration they certainly would make the Councillor and hopefully the Mayor aware of the fact that they can or cannot if there's reasons for doing it or not doing it. No request has been made. I can not answer that until someone makes that request. Number two, is that I think it would be incumbent upon us to give as much information as we can because I think everyone knows a little bit of information is a dangerous thing. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Second supplemental Councillor, okay. Second round will go to Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sent an email requesting some information to Bill Larkin, the Chair of Public Works, six days ago, requesting some information about the Charleswood Bridge because we are faced with, within a week and a half time frame, to deal with the capital budget, we're faced with some decisions about P3's, 170 million worth and I wanted to know what had happened in the past. I've received no answer to that email. I didn't copy it to you Mr.

Mayor, I didn't copy it to Annitta until now because I just thought I could email the head of a department and get an answer in time for a meeting a week later but apparently I can't get information, I'm not sure what the route to get information is. I have to make and all of us have to make a very important decision tomorrow and what I had asked was similar to what Councillor Smith and others are asking for, is to really have an understanding of how this P3 that we've already done on the Charleswood Bridge has worked, what the financial implications are. I think that's reasonable to have for tomorrow and I'm a little frustrated that an email a week ago doesn't even get an acknowledgment and I don't know if people been told not to answer or what but I think I deserve, I think we deserve an answer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. I'm not sure whether you told them not to answer but I don't think anybody else here has told him not to answer number one. Number two, now that you have made us aware of this request if it's been six days and you were disturbed that it took more than two or three days, it's unfortunate, you never contacted myself or the CEO but you've now made us both aware of it and I can ensure you we will look into it immediately.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Second supplemental, any further questions? Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Our master planning document, Plan Winnipeg I believe is close to two years overdue for a review. Can you tell me Mr. Mayor, whether or not that is something on your radar screen in the immediate future. Thank you.

Mayor Katz: Yes. No, it's absolutely on the radar screen and we're actually looking into that right now. So that is something that will be coming up in the very near future and the answer is really a simple yes.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? If not, let's commence with the agenda. The next on the agenda is Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development. No report. No motions. Consideration of By-laws none. Question period, no question period. Okay now we come to the big one. Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, report of January 9, of 2007, Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JANUARY 9, 2007**

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development for January 9, 2007 and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 to 33.

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

Councillor Swandel: That was far too easy, Mr. Speaker. Consideration of, where am I now.

Mr. Speaker: No, there's no motions. Consideration of By-laws. Second reading and third readings.

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

Councillor Swandel: I would like to move that By-law No. 220/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 220/2006.

Councillor Swandel: I'd like to move that By-law No. 220/2006 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Councillor Swandel: Under Consideration of By-laws, Mr. Speaker I like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 1/2007, 2/2007, 3/2007, 4/2007, 5/2007, 6/2007, 7/2007, 8/2007, 9/2007, 10/2007, 11/2007, 12/2007, 13/2007, 14/2007, 15/2007, 16/2007, 17/2007, 18/2007, 19/2007 to 20/2007 and By-law No. 30/2007 and 31/2007 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 1/2007, 2/2007, 3/2007, 4/2007, 5/2007, 6/2007, 7/2007, 8/2007, 9/2007, 10/2007, 11/2007, 12/2007, 13/2007, 14/2007, 15/2007, 16/2007, 17/2007, 18/2007, 19/2007 and 20/2007, 30/2007 and 31/2007.

Councillor Swandel: I would like to move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 1/2007 to 20/2007 both inclusive and By-law No. 30/2007 and 31/2007 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: Second reading. It's the second reading. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 1/2007 to 20/2007 both inclusive, 30/2007 and 31/2007.

Mr. Speaker: This is for the final, third reading Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: My apologies Mr. Speaker. I stand corrected. Councillor, that's me, moves that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 1/2007 to 20/2007 both inclusive, 30/2007 and 31/2007 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. None. You're lucky. Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services report dated January 8th of 2007, Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JANUARY 8, 2007

Councillor Steeves: I'll move Items 1 and 2 as consent items.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Steeves. I'm wondering if there is some sort of evaluation in the works on red light cameras, photo radar and when we are going to know if they are achieving what they're supposed to be achieving.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Well I guess the first thing that pops into my mind Mr. Speaker in response to the question is the audit process that we've gone through. So I don't know if that was Councillor Vandal was yet on Council, I guess he probably wasn't, so I'd point him in that direction. Obviously, I'll be happy to please provide all that information. I'm not sure if that is the type of evaluation he would be looking for. It's pretty comprehensive, so I'll throw that out and await any further questions to see if there's further information required.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Vandal your second supplementary.

Councillor Vandal: More specifically I'm wondering if people are slowing down where they're suppose to be and if people are running fewer red lights than before the red light camera.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Some of that information was contained in the auditor's comments and reports. I'm having a bit of trouble remembering exactly whether,

what was in the presentation, the information provided verses what's provided in the written report. But we did look at those types of issues and the numbers surrounding them. So what I can do is I can get everything we've got to Councillor Vandal and if he requires more information we can continue to dig on that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, Councillor Clement, report of November 21 of 2006.

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

Councillor Clement: Actually, I was going to move the report of January the 9th, clause 2, which is what comes up first.

Mr. Speaker: Well I have here November 21 first.

Councillor Clement: We can use that one if it works better for you, its clause 2 then.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, go ahead. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED JANUARY 9, 2007

Councillor Clement: Then I'll move from the minutes of January the 9th, clauses 2 to 8 as consent.

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

Councillor Clement: And clause 1 was not actually dealt with at our Standing Committee, it went to Executive Policy Committee. I wasn't there, I'll move it forward and put it on the table, I assume somebody might want to chat about it. I already know that, I'll move it.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: Number 1 Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan?

Councillor Vandal: I need to know whether he's moving the Executive recommendation?

Councillor Clement: Yeah that's the only recommendation there is. There was no recommendation made at Public Works. It was simply referred back to Executive Policy Committee with no recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement moves the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee is here now.

Councillor Clement: I just explained I wasn't there, so I don't know what the discussion was or how they amended it exactly. I'll put it on the table for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement, who wants to introduce that clause that's before us?

Councillor Clement: Well, I can introduce it.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, go ahead.

Councillor Clement: I'm assuming everybody's read it, so I thought I just did that. I said I would move it and put it on the floor for discussion. I wasn't planning to speak to it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan you had your hand up, you wanted to speak?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Item 1 - Avion Services Corporation - City Connect Shuttle Service File TE-1

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes thank you Mr. Speaker. Basically I just have some concerns with this recommendation that's coming forward and I was trying to do a little bit of research on it. It's a little bit confusing, where the Taxicab Board is

and the jurisdiction of the Taxicab Board and the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Board and how that all interfaces with section 163.1 of the City of Winnipeg Charter.

I understand that the 163.1 of the City of Winnipeg Charter provides the city with exclusive authority to operate local fixed fare passenger transportation services within Winnipeg. I get that. I also understand that section 163.3 allows the city to enter into agreement with a person who wishes to operate a local transportation service that falls under the exclusive authority of 163.1, I also understand that.

But I also, there's this last thing here that says that Council must authorize the city entering into such an agreement. Well, what does that mean. I think that the right choice needs to be made. While I agree with the recommendation that's coming forth from the Director of Transit, I fully understand where they're coming from, I realize it doesn't impact on Winnipeg Transit, there is also an interesting dichotomy here because it's about the issue of regulation Mr. Speaker and deregulation.

The taxicab industry is a regulated industry and the reason why that is from what I understand is because it's about customer service, providing really high customer service with regards to fares, tidiness of vehicles, up keep of vehicles, the manner in which customers are dealt with, all those high standards are there for a reason to provide the citizens of Winnipeg and all the clients who use our services in Winnipeg in the taxicab industry with the highest of standards.

Now the shuttle service that's being proposed by Avion isn't going to be upheld by those types of standards. There isn't a level playing field here. I'm not even sure Mr. Speaker, if the Public Utilities Board can equalize those services. So the fact that Council must authorize a city entering into such an agreement and by virtue of the fact that the Winnipeg Airport Authority reports in my understanding to Transport Canada and Transport Canada being you know part of the federal government, then to me there should be an opportunity that gives people an opportunity to bid on this type of service.

I mean the Winnipeg Airport Authority owns Avion services from what I understand and you know I think that there has to be an opportunity for the Winnipeg Airport's Authority to put out a public tender, the provision of shuttle services so that perhaps indeed you know the city of Winnipeg can apply for it, perhaps some people from the cab industry can come together on a cooperative basis and form a co-op and provide there own, provide a bid for that type of service as well and perhaps even Avion can bid on that service as well. And it should be evaluated and until such a time as that comes forward to us at City Hall, at City Council through Winnipeg Transit Departments prevue then I think that our due diligence has been exercised.

But in this case we're just getting a proposal coming in from Avion which is basically reporting to a public body, Transport Canada and without giving others an opportunity, the public at large the opportunity to bid on this type of opp., to bid on this type of service. So I have a real concern with that and the level playing field that it causes. So I have more questions I guess than I guess there are answers to, but at this point I'm not going to be supporting the recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Yes, I too have more questions than answers. I am a member of the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee and I was very disappointed by the information asked for and not received. I believe it was yourself Mr. Speaker that asked shouldn't this matter go before the Taxicab Board and which the answer was this is not the jurisdiction of the Taxicab Board.

I later found out it went before the Taxicab Board and was refused. And so, if it's not within the jurisdiction why did

they go there in the first place. If they went there and was refused, well then they do have some sort of jurisdiction so I find that comment most confusing.

And then also, I was told that this was an independent corporation. I later find out this independent corporation really isn't that independent at all. It's an arm of the Winnipeg Airport Authority, the same authority that charges the taxicab drivers for parking there and for picking up fares and dropping them off, they have a fee that they pay, is going to go in competition with them. Now, I have no problem with competition but I like competition to be on a fair playing field and it seems to me that if you're going to put up a whole bunch of booths in a craft fair, but you yourself who are charging everybody a fee to run the craft booth are running your own craft booth as well as getting a fee from everybody else for their tables, you're putting up your own table and you're in competition with the other people who are selling their crafts, well you've got a definite monetary advantage over everybody else and I thought that was very discomforting. And I didn't take great pleasure with saying that; I didn't want to move a recommendation at all on this one.

I felt that I didn't have the information. Well I still don't have the information and I'm not in the habit of supporting something that I don't have the information for. And I have contradictory information and misinformation and it's not got my vote. Thanks.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I didn't support this clause at E.P.C. because I believed it was broken legislation. To a certain extent I still believe that, but I have a conundrum. I believe that there's nothing wrong with having a shuttle service at the airport and you know, Mr. Edwards made a good point. What we're doing here is, we're not here to legislate competition, we're not here to control competition. What we're here to do is to say that we give our blessing to this agreement under our exclusive authority and that the Public Utilities, it be forwarded to the Public Utilities Board for their consideration.

And I think what needs to happen is we need to have it go to the Public Utilities Board because it can't go back to the Taxicab Board and if we kill this now, then we're basically saying no to there ever being a shuttle service at the airport. And what I think happens as a result of us moving it forward, that an argument is made at the Public Utilities Board, saying that when you look at this as a provision of public transport or a method of transporting the public, they can make a determination that the public needs to be protected in this endeavour by the application coming from the Winnipeg Airport Authority who would have an obligation to make it a public tender and this is where the argument needs to be made.

I'm at this point willing to support the clause coming out of E.P.C., sending it on to the Public Utilities Board, but encouraging those who go to argue at the public hearing that the caveat be made to the Public Utilities Board, that they not accept the application from Avion but they accept an application from the Winnipeg Airport Authority with a proper process of public tendering and therefore some protection of the industry in the transport, in the ground transport services at the airport. So, that's where I stand on the issue Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker, I don't support this clause. Very clearly you know, taxis provide a service, a public service. Sure they're a business, but the fact is, aside from the transit system, they are the only other way of getting around unless you have your own car.

It is a system that is useful for the city of Winnipeg. We have not been fair to cabs, we have not, we have very few for example, cab spots for them in the city, taxi stands. Almost none. We have been very, very sloppy and not supported the taxicab system.

Now let me tell you this, it is important to have these taxicabs. Now for example, Avion, the Airport Authority could stop having cabs there at the airport and their shuttles would have a complete monopoly. I want competition. All these independent cab owners are competing with each other for business. So we should be supporting the cab drivers and not Avion especially when we have the Airport Authority.

Especially, when we have the Airport Authority wanting to go into business against the cab drivers and charging them, it doesn't make much sense. We depend on cabs an awful lot in this city and I think we should be very supportive of them. They have families; just think of all the people connected, involved with taxis that are dependent on taxis. You know, let's be fair. Let's not support the E.P.C. recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Chairperson. I supported the clause before at Executive Policy Committee but based on the presentations today, I feel that there is a need for us to not bring this forward at this point in time. As far as I'm concerned Mr. Speaker, who's won in this huge debate here, is clearly the lawyers on both sides. They've made a fortune off of this issue and why do we need lawyers here arguing in front of us. As Councillors, I think it's quite clear why the lawyers have gotten involved with this Mr. Speaker, is because of the fact that the legislation is very vague with regards to what is taking place here today.

The legislation was written with one thing and one intent in mind and it wasn't the intent of what we're dealing with here today. It was written with the intent of protecting the monopoly of the rapid, of the transit system that we have in our city and that Winnipeg Transit would have the ability to comment and to say yea or nay on whether or not we should have a transit system, another operator competing with Transit. I'm sure the report coming forward from Transit would be quite a bit different if in the event somebody came along and for example wanted to offer a service between downtown and Polo Park. I think their comments would be quite different than what it is from the airport to the downtown.

So I believe that the legislation before us and unfortunately as we all know, we are animals of the province with the city of Winnipeg. The Minister can snap his fingers and Council could be finished, creatures, thank you, not animals, thank you, animals or rats earlier, yes. We're creatures of the province and thank you, coming from a lawyer I appreciate that, and you know the fact of the matter is, they can change the legislation any time if they so choose. And clearly, I think this is something that really should be taken up with the Minister involved.

The Minister has to show some leadership here and to say yes there is an issue here, even before it goes to the PUB because if I was on the PUB I wouldn't want to be dealing with this item as it comes forward as it stands right now hearing the debate and discussion that's taken place at city hall. I mean, it's really a hot potato runs from here over to the PUB, great, but you know what, that's not the decision making Mr. Speaker.

I think the Minister has to get involved here and start to resolve the issue when it comes to this industry. Clearly there is an issue here. We have the Taxi Board agency regulating virtually everything else; you know regulating when it comes to the issue of limousines and other services.

I'm not against the discussion or the debate on whether deregulation or not. I think that is a genuine debate and discussion that should be held, but this is not the time nor place. That is something that has to be, that is within provincial jurisdiction and should take place at the province of Manitoba and maybe it is a discussion that should take place, but to have the discussion now and be making the case on the private sector verses public sector, what we should be determining which is clearly I think the legislation before us under the Charter was not written with this intent in mind. In my opinion I feel very uncomfortable

voting on this today even though I supported E.P.C. So, those are my comments Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Easy, we're not finished yet. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I rise today to explain why this has been a very, very difficult decision, a very difficult debate for me to deal with here today. Taxicab services are regulated by the provincial Taxicab Act and overseen by the Taxicab Board as directed by that act. At present time, taxis do not open, operate in an open market.

The number of licences is set by the board. Entrepreneurial owner operators, many of them new immigrants typically borrow the 200,000 dollars to purchase an existing taxicab licence to get into business and then borrow more to often get the vehicle. So based on the four hundred cabs that are out there in the market today, the value of the licences is something in the neighbourhood of eight million dollars.

The definition of taxicab in the provincial Taxicab Act includes motor vehicles quote have kept garaged under repair used intended for use or operated for the transportation of persons for compensation in the City of Winnipeg except under such motor vehicle or class of motor vehicles as the board may exempt from this definition. Based on my reading of this, the Taxicab Board itself, the group that suppose to be taking care of the interests of the taxicab industry has excluded fixed fare rates such as the Avion shuttle. That's my interpretation of it. I'm not a lawyer, that's my interpretation.

That said, I don't see how City Council with it's very narrow jurisdiction to deal with transit and the fact that it's not going to compete with transit, can stop this at this point here. So I urge the PUB to look at the bigger issue of the entire taxicab market that these shuttles operate out. I believe that the Taxicab Board should have one, issued new licences perhaps for shuttles. I'm not against the idea of a shuttle. Issue new limo licences or forces Avion to purchase or anybody else for that matter, to purchase licences that are out there in the existing market, say two to three per shuttle so that market conditions, you know the artificial market conditions are maintained.

So again, it's not within our, in my opinion it's not within City Council's mandate to determine if the service is needed. It's not within our purview. If I was the taxicab company with the operating licence for the airport, I would personally put a big ad's on either side of the terminal building pointing out that in Winnipeg the difference between the cost of a taxicab ride verses the shuttle ride is almost inconsequential. If you're showing up in Toronto where its 15 dollars for the shuttle verses 45, if I'm paying for that out of pocket, I'm certainly going to take the shuttle if I'm travelling alone. Where's in Winnipeg when you looking at the difference between 9 and 14 dollars, for 5 bucks you have to wait for an extra 20 minutes till the next shuttle comes, until the multiple stops that you have to make, the taxicabs do provide a good service here in Winnipeg. I'm encouraged by the number of hybrid vehicles that are being put on the market, I rode in a couple this past weekend and I am very encouraged by the progress that's being made.

So again, I think that the taxicabs can do well if they do this properly and again I do, I don't, I urge the PUB to make the right decision on this one to make that sure that you know there is proper regulation put on the airport shuttles if they go forward.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thanks Mr. Speaker. Difficult issue in that it's exceedingly complex I think and I think as we try to weed our way through this, there are a lot of unanswered questions, which begs the question, where do we exactly go from here. Now I want to thank Councillor Clement for his robust and clear introduction to the clause which appears to have set a great tone for the debate, but I guess we have to try and weed our way through this.

We've had the benefit I think on this one of having good counsel, lots of lawyer jokes and plenty around here but I think on this one, it's been very beneficial and I say that as an unbiased sort of purveyor of lawyers in the community.

The section 163.1 and Jeff has said some of this stuff already, but I just want to be clear, 163.1 states pretty clearly that we have exclusive authority to operate local fixed fare passenger transportation services within the city, except, there's five exceptions, four of them don't apply, but B does apply, except taxicabs and school buses as those expressions are defined in the Highway Traffic Act. Right and then if we look at the Highway Traffic Act, the definition of taxicab means a motor vehicle had kept used intended for use or operated for the transportation of persons for compensation includes such vehicles when garaged or under repair but does not include the following six things, five don't apply but F does, a motor vehicle or vehicle of a class of motor vehicles that the Taxicab Board established under the Taxicab Act excludes from the definition of taxicab under that act pursuant to that act.

If we go to the Taxicab Act, the definition there reads, taxicab means any motor vehicles as defined in the Highway Traffic Act had kept garaged under repair used intended for use or operated for the transportation of persons for compensation in the city of Winnipeg except such motor vehicle or class of motor vehicles as the Board may exempt from this definition.

So it looks like the Taxicab Board does have an unfettered discretion to simply not deal with things even though we think they really ought to and we have some information that because it's fixed fare they say it doesn't apply, so it falls back into our lap which I have to admit, I don't necessarily think is really reasonable or fair. It would seem to me that in this type of debate a Taxicab Board should be dealing with this type of thing.

In any event, it does fall back to us, I guess because the Taxicab Board has sent us a letter saying, hey we're not going to deal with this. Is everyone okay here, Mr. Speaker. So if we look now at 163.3, it reads despite section and I won't, just the body of the statute, if you look at the preamble, the body of the statute, it talks about our authority to enter into agreements and I think this is where we kind of have a bit of a rub on this file.

We do have the right to I guess, offer the licence up to a, to this type of business going forward. I mean there's no question that we have that right. I think pursuant to 163.3, but, if you look at the body and then you look at A and B, it says A, before beginning to operate the service, the person must obtain from the PUB approval of the agreement and be authorized by that Board to operate a local transportation service in the city and B, the operation of the service is, in all respects, subject to the authority in the supervision of that Board.

So I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's why there's a lot of confusion on this report. The report before us talks about only really how the operation of this shuttle would or would not conflict in this case, would not conflict with our transit service. That's all it really says in any detail. Hardly the information required to undergo a comprehensive and detailed public debate.

So what Executive Policy did with this clause is we looked at the statute and made the determination that all, we have to make a decision as to whether or not this gets out of 163.3, the body of the statute and we came to the conclusion that well based on a report and our administration telling us that really our authority is limited at the aspect of we can only deny it if it conflicts with our transit operations, I mean that's our, that's my interpretation and given the spirit and the intent of A and B, the conclusion that I've come to personally is that this does require public hearing on the merits.

This requires a full and public hearing on whether or not this is a legitimate or not a legitimate competition for a taxicab industry. So we put the clause in there to say there should be that full and public hearing at the Public Utilities Board.

Because the spirit and the intent in section 163.3 A and B seems to clearly contemplate that that board has ultimate authority over the day to day operations.

In fact, I really don't see how anybody who reads subsections A and B could come to any other conclusion. I mean, again, I'll read them, before beginning to operate the service the person must obtain from the PUB approval of the agreement and be authorized by that board to operate a local transportation service in the city and B, the operation of the service is in all respects subject to the authority and supervision of that board.

These are the people who are going to be watching over this, regardless of what direction it goes. This is their issue to deal with long term. That's why in Executive Policy Committee we're saying well of course it doesn't conflict with our transit operations. I mean, no one's ever asserted that. So we'll send it, first of all we'll say Taxicab Board, we don't really necessarily agree with you sending it to us. Not sure that was the right thing to do but given that you did that, I think we have to send it on to the PUB and I know we have members of our taxicab community in the chamber right now, many of whom I know, many of whom are my friends, nobody here is saying that we're not, we're not saying there should be public hearings on the merits of this issue, it's just our interpretation of this statue, at the statue and based on the report we received and our information that it should happen at the PUB.

That's our assessment, my assessment and maybe there is some disagreement but this is not an issue where we're passing philosophical judgment on the competition aspect. It's a lot different than that. It's us trying to do our best to sit in legal judgment of the statutes that are before us. I hope people understand.

(Councillor Pagtakhan in the chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. All day long I couldn't help but stare in front of me and stare behind me and see anywhere from 20 to 50 small business people, who unfortunately were here all day today as opposed to maybe getting some sleep or maybe working because I know they usually work on 12 hour shifts and it's unfortunate Mr. Deputy Speaker that this item has been to Infrastructure and Public Works twice, has been to Executive Policy twice and now it becomes, now it comes before Council.

It's the 5th time and I think many of us here are trying to figure out why are we dealing with this issue. Well, some of us probably think we're dealing with this issue because the Taxicab Board decided not to. Some of us believe we're dealing with this issue because there is a matter to do with transit and transit has given a positive report saying they don't believe this is conflicting and gives it their blessings.

I'm not happy to see people walk away from a decision that they should be making, either positive or negative. But the bottom line is, is that the Taxicab Board did not deal with it. Now it's with City Hall. And I had the opportunity to ask questions at Executive Policy Committee, and I can only tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that from my point of view, I know the concern that the taxicab drivers have. It's already been explained, the cost of a licence.

I had a meeting with several people who own licences, a taste of India just the other day, and quite often they will share with you all they're doing is buying themselves or a family member a job. It's not an easy life. But here are the realities.

If anybody came to Council, I believe that transit would make the same recommendation, okay. Whether it would be Unicity, whether it would be Duffy's and I know at E.P.C., their lawyer, Barry Gorlick expressed some genuine concern about whether the Public Utilities Board is going to deal with the real issues. That is why you will see the recommendation that comes forward from Executive Policy Committee is for the Public Utility Board to deal with all of the issues and to have

public hearings and for once and for all, that someone has to make a decision.

And as I say to you, this is not easy for any Member of Council. As a matter of fact, Councillor Smith was with me at Public Utilities Board when we talked about a tendering process. That would have been a wonderful thing, whether more people would have come forward we'll never know, but the bottom line is, is that Council cannot tell the private sector what to do. If this were Council's decision it would have gone out to a public tender because that's how we deal with these matters but I think what we should be doing at this particular point in time is making sure that we do everything to protect the investments of all the taxicabs and all the drivers, to protect their long term security, and that's to make sure that an open and transparent process takes place at the Public Utility Board and to make sure they deal with all the issues.

Not just the issue of what the fare should be, but to all the issues. But I believe Council would support anybody who came forward, because our job is one thing right here, okay. What impact does it have on our transit. Transit has spoken and said they have no problem with this but somehow we decided to make a recommendation to make sure that the real issues are addressed by the Public Utility Board.

I don't know what more we can do. I don't know why we're dealing with it but it's here and this is the 5th time and I think sooner or later a decision should be made that it go forward and people dare, deal with it honestly, openly and take into consideration all of the aspects of it and I can tell you that is what the lawyer asked for, because that was their key concern that this not get rubber stamped. This not just be dealt with on one issue affair, that everything and that is their mandate and that's what I believe they should be doing and that's what I will support Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mayor Katz. We have Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. I as a member of the Manitoba Taxicab Board, been on there for a number of years now representing, representing the City of Winnipeg through Winnipeg Council. When this was discussed with at the Taxicab Board level, they felt that this was not within their mandate because you're talking about a shuttle bus services going from point A to B, A to B from the airport to the hotels.

So, they had said, this was not within them, so this was sent over to Winnipeg because the City of Winnipeg provides public transportation through the, throughout our Winnipeg Transit system. Now the application was made to the City of Winnipeg, Winnipeg Transit prepared a comprehensive report that they did not have no objections as the Mayor just stated, that there was no objections because they're not going to be interfering with the services that the City of Winnipeg provides to the people of Winnipeg through the transit system.

Now when that came to the Public Works Committee, I had moved a motion to send it on to Executive Policy Committee, but then at Executive Policy Committee the Chair of Public Works, Councillor Clement was not present so this came back to the Public Works and what happened, we had a huge delegation, people had come, tried to address the issue to say that it would be a benefit to one and all.

The delegation then appeared with their representatives had said one thing, the same thing as what I felt was to take a look at Avion, is owned by the Winnipeg Airport Authority, therefore in all essence, you'd find that there was a possible conflict. Now, I didn't use it was, but I said possibly, could be looked upon, could be perceived as a conflict because what some of the delegations had said, it would be unfair practice because if they are at the airport, Winnipeg Airport Authority, they work for the Avion, they, people that are working for the Winnipeg Airport Authority they decide who to get the taxis to come pick up people would be telling people to go to Avion. That in itself would have been looked like, would be taking

the business away from our taxicab industry in the city of Winnipeg.

Now at the Public Works I had moved a motion with no recommendation back to Executive Policy Committee. E.P.C. dealt with it and now it's here before us. We have a large delegation here of concerned taxicab owners and operators that feel that this may jeopardize and touch on their businesses that they may loose revenue. As you know, the Taxicab Board now issues licences for up to 200,000 dollars, used to be 60, 70,000, 75,000 and now it's up to 200,000.

New owners and operators find themselves at an unfair advantage because not only do they have to pay a higher rate on their borrowing when they buy that vehicle and the licence, but when they see that their revenue is being diminished, they will no doubt retaliate to a point of saying look, this is affecting our business. It's my livelihood.

The shuttle services that are being, or will be provided or recommended to provide, any airport is entitled to have a shuttle vehicle to transport from one hotel to the other hotels, other cities do it. But one, it has to be looked upon here Councillors as, I've noticed that some of the Councillors on Executive Policy Committee changed their views because once you hear a delegation and it just keeps to be like a repeat and I would not be one who'd like to make a decision hastily and say no I'll be doing something regardless what.

I as a member of the Taxicab Board, I have a commitment. I have a mandate and I cannot just go blindly and say, as I represent Council in the city of Winnipeg all the services that taxi's provide in Winnipeg is, in the vicinity, jurisdictions of the city of Winnipeg, but it's still a Manitoba Taxicab Board, it doesn't go into Lockport, it doesn't go into Selkirk, it's strictly Winnipeg and we used to have our own, the Winnipeg Taxicab Board but now the province decided to change that mandate.

The provincial government now has the power, through the Utility Board to hear application and say yes, you have it or no you don't have it, but subject to what will be coming out of the, out of Council. So they're putting us on a hot seat. And I can tell you that this is just no way that we should be put into a situation like this. It's so unfair to the Members of Council. We service, provide services and we represent all people in Winnipeg, all 15 of us and the Mayor and the Mayor represents the whole city of Winnipeg in his role.

So, to have this go before the Public Utility Board, they'll say it was no problem because Council had no problem. They have approved it and for us to say no, that application, what I would assume, dies after this, after the vote here. I stand in a position, I didn't think this would be such a big issue, but it is, you can see the number of people here, they're concerned. They're very concerned. And I am concerned also because I'm not going to go and say that yes I'll do it not because I have to work with them through the Taxicab Board but a proper decision has to be made, a proper representation has to be made. Due diligence has to be presented.

So it's not to say that this will go to the Public Utility Board. I can imagine what will happen there. But I as one, I cannot support this recommendation from the Executive Policy Committee. That may not help you. So what happens is when I cast my vote, I don't know what direction Council will go, but at least I will voice my opinion and my, which we have the respect from me to say that I'm doing my due diligence is to see that all fairness is put into play.

Avion was not able to respond to a question Mr. Deputy Speaker that I introduced at the Public Works Committee, I asked them, would you be willing to have this go before as a public tender. The answer I received was that, no. I asked them why. Well who is going to be monitoring that? Well it's the same thing, who's going to be monitoring you. It just told me right there, that the Winnipeg Airport Authority will be monitoring Avion. So there's the unfairness of providing public services. And let me tell you one,

there was nothing to stop the hotels. The hotels themselves Mr. Mayor, to put up a shuttle service of their own, some hotels are providing services. Canad Inns are providing services with their hotels.

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

Councillor Lazarenko: So, hopefully Mr. Deputy Speaker, that regardless which way it goes, but you know this has to be on a more level playing field than presently the way it is now. This in itself is not right. We had lawyers like Councillor Wyatt had said, lawyers came, sure they can put up a good argument, that's what they're taught to do. That's why they go to take a course for seven years. They learned that. I'm not referring to Councillors who are happen to be within the legal profession here and I'm not pointing fingers either but this is really what their responsibility, responsibility is.

And they did one good job, both sides. But they left that problem to us and I just, I'm not ready, so Mr. Deputy Speaker I was not going speak to this at all, but since my role as a Member of Council to the Manitoba Taxicab Board, I have to, I had to put that into this respectable place because the Taxicab Board did not deliberately send it here. It was not within their mandate of dealing with shuttle services from point A to B.

If it would be, even like we have our own services, like this Handi-Transit, the Handi-Transit services. But when it comes into this, they just felt maybe the law should be changed. Maybe the province should take wind of this. The provincial government should take wind of it and say just a minute, we're going to change the responsibility and roles of the Manitoba Utility Board and to say just a minute certain things will be within the mandate of the Taxicab Board, such as this. They have the power, we don't. They have the power to do that. Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lazarenko.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement I understand you had introduced this clause. Do you want to close, there's no further speakers.

Councillor Clement: Well I thought I'd close because I didn't open it.

Mr. Speaker: Well I gave you the option to close it, be thankful you can do that.

Councillor Clement: That's a very interesting issue Mr. Speaker and I think it's been discussed. I knew there was no point in me making a long dissertation at the start because I knew my good friend from St. Vital had his encyclopaedia and would read from it for six or seven minutes and give us a lot of information.

The bottom line is that when this came to, I mean and I guess to clarify for Councillor Thomas because she was sitting at the same meeting I was the first time. This went to the Taxicab Board; my understanding is the first time, because that's where Avion thought they had to go. And although the Taxicab Board had no jurisdiction over it, they turned it down anyway.

Then it was discovered that it actually had to come to the city of Winnipeg, when it got to our administrative people and they looked at it, it seemed to fall under Transit as opposed to anywhere else, so it went to the Director of Transit. The Director of Transit brought it forward to Public Works and frankly didn't provide a lot of information, it didn't seem like it was much of an issue to be honest with you. We looked at it, we approved it, went with their recommendation and in doing so we also because of the fact that we thought that it was the right thing to do, it was moved as a separate motion that the Taxicab Board be made aware of it and they were by letter, that was, that came from the committee.

It went forward to Executive Policy Committee and of course some of those folks showed up and in fairness to Executive Policy Committee, they didn't have a lot of information either. So they

referred it back which didn't really solve anything at that point either except it got it off the agenda that day.

When it came back, there was a lot of information that would have been interesting to have the first time. I, you know, we had ten minutes for delegations, I gave Barry Gorlick ten minutes, he took thirty one and that was interesting. We didn't have lawyers from the other side at that meeting but it was an interesting meeting and I listened to everybody. It was, there were a lot of different opinions, no different than there is today and it's not a clear issue Mr. Speaker, really.

But that's not our fault. The, you're probably right, I think we should let this go forward today to the Public Utilities Board and that takes it out of our bailiwick, I guess, but there's no trees to hide behind in here either and where does it go if we don't deal with it. How is it going to get corrected and I think that the Public Utilities Board can do two things, they can either turn it down or they can lay it over and they can go to the provincial government who actually appoints them and get the legislation altered so that they can actually deal with it in an appropriate manner, which is, and/or the Taxicab Board one or the other. But it really shouldn't be here in my view, from that aspect.

So, I think in fairness if you really took the time to read what's in front of you and I wasn't at this meeting of the Executive Policy Committee, but Executive Policy Committee added, well they not only put forward a recommendation, they went quite in depth in doing it. They talked about the public hearings. They talk about a significant liability insurance. They go on in a number of different areas to try and clarify the city's position so that there's no mistaking that we're taking the issue seriously.

But on the other side of the coin we don't really have the authority to deal with it in my view, anyway. And so I'm going to suggest Mr. Speaker that we do let it go forward which is what we did at Public Works the first time and I know that it's kind of gut wrenching to everybody, because there are, I mean you can stand here, you can take one position, you can take the other one and I think you could make a good argument for either to be honest with you.

But I don't think it's going to serve any purpose because it's still left in limbo at that point and the only way this is going to get resolved is if it goes forward to the Public Utilities Board so that either they can deal with it and make up the rules as they go or they can lay it over and go to the province which is what I believe they will do and then the provincial government can alter this legislation that we have and that the Taxicab Board has to try and resolve this in a little longer term Mr. Speaker. So I will move the clause. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour of the clause, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Leipsic, Nordman, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Smith, Thomas, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

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

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried. I.R.P.W. motions if any, none. Question Period or By-laws I should say, pardon me. By-laws William, Councillor Clement By-laws.

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

Councillor Clement: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-laws No. 22/2007 to 27/2007.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Do you want me to wait until that gentleman is done.

Mr. Speaker: Just wait a while.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-laws 22/2007 to 27/2007 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 22/2007, 23/2007, 24/2007, 25/2007, 26/2007 and 27/2007.

Councillor Clement: I would move that By-laws No. 22/2007 to 27/2007 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 22/2007 to 27/2007 both inclusive.

Councillor Clement: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 22/2007 to 27/2007 both inclusive be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Question Period. Councillor Vandal.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a question around the 2007 sewer utility rates, given that this was not on the agenda, it was walked on and that you spoke after about the importance of having them approved quickly. Why was it laid over?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement

Councillor Clement: I wasn't at the E.P.C. meeting so I actually don't know all of the ins and outs, but I think that it has something to do with it being quarterly then and I think, there was, the simple answer to this whole thing was that, when we first looked at the, as you know, we've been asked to do a lot of work on our sewers over the next twenty five years. That mostly came out of a report from the Clean Environment Commission. That report talked about numbers in the 400 million range, they went up to 900 million, now they're at 1.3 billion and the report also very clearly stated that all three levels of government should share equally in the cost. What's happened is that the governing body has, in fact, introduced licenses to the city which direct us to do things, but they didn't send any cheques along, they not only read the report and moved it forward, they altered it and changed some of the timing of the requirements within the C.E.C. report and then introduced some very tight guidelines in the licensing and so we've been increasing our sewer rates, as you know, for the last three years or so to accommodate the cost because that's the only place we can get the money and the basic principle of this is it's structured so we would set the rates over ten years to pay for it over twenty five, unless they're going to give us some money, which is our fervent hope to keep these numbers down. And frankly, all we've been getting told is well the reason for the jump is because of the C.E.C. it's because of the C.E.C., et cetera. But in actual fact, and that's where Public Works came from frankly, the first time around in November, and we passed the water rates but not the sewer rates because we were of the view that it was time for the province to have a look at this and we wanted to get their attention because we didn't want to increase the rates at nauseam without getting, I mean as long as you keep doing it, they're going to just keep ignoring it. So we were of the view that the increase was as a result of that. Subsequently, I had a meeting with Barry MacBride, and we went through the information a little different because when we were at Public Works, the rates were combined, they were difficult to understand. They had a cookie cutter presentation that was

difficult for us to get into and I don't think I have to explain it to anybody how many different items you have on agendas from time to time and it was a long day. The fact of the matter was, however, that the rates last year were I believe $3.87 going to $4.46 per hundred cubic feet and in that 59 cents, not one cent of that was going, was for C.E.C., that 31 cents was already built in to the first number. So the long and the short of it is that the, there was a little bit of misunderstanding, not only at committee level, but beyond that and so it's my view that they have to go forward, and that's why we did it the way that we did it. We walked it on and we sent it back forward. The layover for the month I think, has got to do with the fact that because of the second clause we put there that kind of, notwithstanding that we made some pretty general statements and were of the view that the Premier wasn't, I don't think knowledgeable actually of what he was really doing to us with this, they didn't write any of that kind of stuff. They talked about having guns stuck to people's heads and silly things like that they made up but in the end, the reality is, is that there are discussions taking place between the Mayor and the Premier on this issue and hopefully a third level of government on funding. And so because of the way the clause came forward, they laid it over for one month, and that actually dovetailed with the quarterly billing anyway because if we deal with it at the February Council meeting, they will be able to implement it on April 1st, which is the second quarter, and that worked better for the people in the Finance Department and Water and Waste, so I know that's a long answer, but that's where it's at. I guess you're glad you asked, eh?

Mr. Speaker: That's a smart long answer. No further questions? Bill you're losing it because nobody will be asking you questions. Okay the Standing, well, we learned that a long time ago. The Standing Policy Committee on Finance, Mike O'Shaughnessy, I know you're watching us now, here you say there's no report, there's no motions, no By-laws. Mike, you take a good rest. We'll see you when you get back. There's no report on the Finance Committee. There are no motions and the Consideration of By-laws are none. Mike, you have been doing a good job and Finance, question period, if there's any, someone from within that committee might be able to respond. Is there any questions? None. Okay. So what we do now is that Councillor Browaty moves adjournment. All in favour, contrary? Carried. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council Adjourned at 5:04 P.M.