COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday June 20, 2007

The Council met at 9:31 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 Steeves.

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.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy entered the meeting after roll call.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves, that's the reason I asked for roll call to give you a chance to, you're reading the opening pray, would you please. Would everyone please rise.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Pages with us today, we have Bryce Brousseau who is not present, he will be late. Simone Jaman of Miles MacDonnell Collegiate resides in Elmwood - East Kildonan Ward is present, but Simone will be leaving us, it's her last meeting here with us. She'll be going to Switzerland for a month and a half to learn and study Japanese.

Welcome guests and announcements, I recognize Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take the opportunity to acknowledge Jack Ewatski, the Chief of Police who's served our city for thirty four years, eight of them as the Chief of Police who will be retiring at the end of this month. I would like to congratulate him and thank him on behalf of all of Council for his years of dedication. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. I too would like to echo the fine job that he made, the Chief of Police of the City of Winnipeg. I've known him for many years and I'd like to congratulate him on his retirement. I'm sure all Members of Council are the same, same page with us. So with that, Jack Ewatski enjoy your retirement. Councillor Nordman, you have an announcement.

Councillor Nordman: Mr. Speaker one of the pleasurable things about being a City Councillor is from time to time you get to attend certain social functions and I represented the Mayor on behalf of the City at the 125th anniversary of the Salvation Army this past Sunday. And at that time they presented the city with a very nice memento of the event and I would ask Simone to come and take this and pass it to the Mayor and we can put it on display at you know a prestigious place here in the building.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Nordman. I believe you have a second announcement.

Councillor Nordman: On a second issue and something else, I'm proud to announce. The Mayor has asked me to sort of be the liaison Councillor with the H.M.C.S. Winnipeg, our ship in the Canadian Navy and there's been a change of command there and a former Manitoban and a graduate of the University of Manitoba, Commander Craig Baines is the now the Commander and Chief of the H.M.C.S. Winnipeg. So we offer him our congratulations and we look forward to speaking with him when he's here on his annual tour with the ship's crew next spring. So, congratulations Commander Baines.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Nordman. Councillor Pagtakhan I believe you have an announcement.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to recognize members of the Manitoba Chapter of the Knights of Rizal who are joining us here today to commemorate, yesterday was Dr. Rizal's, Dr. Jose Rizal's 146th birthday, the members of the Knights of Rizal who are here present today are Sir Felino de Jesus, Dr. Romu Magsino, Sir

John Gano, Rev. Neil Parado, Sir Les Crisostomo, Sir Clara Venzon and Sir Ed Kean who are here today and the Knights of Rizal, they espouse the doctrines and the principals of Dr. Rizal who is a peaceful advocate and also fought for the independence of the Philippines in 1898, so just wanted to welcome here today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, welcome to Council.

MINUTES

Councillor O'Shaughnessy moves the Minutes of the meeting held on May 16, 2007 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour, contrary? Carried.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Speaker: And then communication, Councillor Swandel moves that the rule be suspended and communication which was received too late to be placed on the regular agenda be received as information. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Delegations, Mr. Ternette in support of the Executive Policy Committee notice of motion, regarding the National Transit Strategy. Mr. Ternette you have ten minutes.

Nick Ternette: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz and Members of City Council, as you know, I have rarely if ever in my thirty five years of activism at City Hall, stood before Council fully supportive of any motion. However, I'm here today to fully support the motion by Councillor Jenny Gerbasi and seconded by Mayor Sam Katz dealing with the issue of public transit.

As you are well aware the majority of my presentations concerning public transit have concerned the nickel and dimeing of citizens of yearly increases in transit fares, which have directly affected transit ridership. As I've always said, it has decreased ridership.

I've also publicly significantly disagreed with those who advocate for bus rapid transit as opposed to light rail, railway transit. I have however been known to support and have always supported public transit as an alternative to the car culture and I've always been supportive for any improvements to the public transit system in order to achieve a true alternative.

So, this motion is important in the fact that I think City Council if it passes this, will for the first time acknowledge the importance of a public transportation system in the development of a modern city. By recognizing that public transit provides essential and I want to quote the word universal, this is the essence of the motion, mobility within Canada's urban areas.

If this motion passes, Winnipeg City Council for the first time I think will be acknowledging that public transportation is not a ghettoized system. Not a system just for the inner city or a system for seniors, students and fixed income, but a fundamental philosophical change from the decades that I have observed City Council on this issue. The word universal says that public transportation belongs to everybody including suburbanites.

The notion of universal mobility has expanded in this part of the motion that says that public transportation increases roadway capacity by offering people a transportation choice other than the automobile. I have argued for years that no matter what public transportation system you have, you will find that when you have a real public transportation system, which we still don't have here in Winnipeg, that there would be ultimately probably less cars on the road during rush hours, therefore increasing roadway capacity as this motion suggests.

This has been proven as I've said in places like Calgary, who have adopted light railway transit system and any other major city that has a true public transportation system. An acceptance of this statement by City Council, counters the arguments and this is the key, by those like columnists Tom Brodbeck, who

insists if you have read his recent columns, that we need more parking lots in downtown Winnipeg, tear down the heritage buildings and build parking lots because Winnipeggers will continue to use cars no matter how much you improve the transportation system. By supporting this motion, Council for the first time will be admitting that we don't need more parking spaces for cars especially in the downtown, but an improved transportation system that will reduce the number of cars, especially in the downtown period.

And by suggesting and by supporting the motion that public transit reduces greenhouse gas emissions and pollution, Council at least shows that you believe, begin to believe in a real green city which is what the original, original budget was that we were talking about earlier this year. Even more significantly, with this overall motion, Council recognizes the significant deficiency in the transit infrastructure in Canada as a whole which the Federation of Canadian Municipality estimates to be 20.7 billion dollars between the years 2006 and 2010. This motion clearly recognizes that municipalities including Winnipeg have inadequate revenue tools to finance the full cost of transit infrastructure.

Therefore, as an advocate for public transportation, that's why I'm here, I fully endorse a national transit strategy put forward by the Big Cities Mayors Caucus of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities which calls first of all for an increase in public transit in the form of sustainable federal funding in the amount of two billion dollars per year. In fact and this is where I would like to go beyond that, I would suggest that this investment should be significantly higher, I would suggest it should be double that amount per year if we are to actually have a significant impact in reducing our car culture.

Also, for the first time ever, this motion shows that cities have a commitment to integrate land use and a national public transportation policy which we lack or municipalities will be required to work together to determine which of the various forms of public transportation are needed throughout the country, be it subways, BRT's, LRT's or just improved regular public transportation systems.

This commitment is shown in the part of the motion that calls for information sharing in innovation among transportation systems, which I have just recently mentioned and identified policy approaches that all government can use to increase ridership and again, the word here first significant word universal, second most significant word, increased ridership. Increased ridership is so important that all governments are showing a commitment to reducing the lines of cars and addressing the environmental crisis facing us very soon and there's a fact already fixing us.

I am obviously fully supportive of any federal tax incentive for transit users. As you are well aware, in July of last year the federal government did offer a tax incentive to monthly bus pass holders, which I as a monthly bus fare holder, took some advantage of. Here I just have a minor critique and I would like maybe as part of the motion to review this thing, unfortunately, the bureaucrat, bureaucracy associated with this tax credit was a nightmare and I can tell you for those who take bus passes. Not only did riders have to keep their bus passes for the year, as well as the receipts, the monthly receipt which created nothing but mud way because a lot of people will loose some of the bus passes, they're not going to always keep them, they weren't always aware that this happened, so many people were not able to claim the full amount on the tax credit page.

So, this inaccessible system became more of a deterrent I thought than an incentive. So, what I would suggest, just I'm suggesting, what would be useful if a registry was maintained by transit and as they do with Handi-Transit for example, of who uses it and then at the end of the year, a statement could be issued out to the bus pass holders for use in obtaining the tax credit. That way it would simplify the matter, you'd be able to go the tax, the person who does the taxes and file it simply instead of having to do it and maybe it could recommend that this

change be done with the federal government, because obviously it's the federal government who has to implement it.

And if you are sincere, furthermore if you are sincere in developing a national public transportation policy, I would think that this Council should as part of the motion, suggest that the level of tax credits should at least be doubled for those who use bus passes then what is presented because on the average, it comes out if you use the bus passes for the whole twelve months, you get about a two month tax credit which is about seventy or about one hundred and forty dollars. I would suggest, the taxpayers should be at least an increase of two hundred and eighty dollars for the year if you're using monthly bus passes and I think that should be looked at.

If all of these strategies were endorsed, pressure could then be put on the provincial governments to take an interest in public transportation which we know that this provincial government here is not in any way, shape or form, by also providing a tax incentive to bus pass users from the provincial level. So, if we have a federal tax credit, giving the bus fare, bus passes at a certain level and the provincial government gives credit, then that would make a significant impact on more and more people using the busses and not only using busses, but using busses regularly and say hey, we want to get a bus pass instead of using the car to go to work or go to entertaining or whatever and to increase the funding of the infrastructure of this public transportation system. In fact this year, they have started as I say, the provincial government has started doing at least some infrastructure money, but we need a significant more of it.

So what I am simply saying, the motion is so positive that for once, I have to speak fully supportive of it because it exemplifies a public transportation system so it doesn't have to define what system we have, but it talks about increased, billions of dollars being put into the infrastructure, recognizing that we got to get out of the car, we got to use public transportation, thus universality, which is fundamental in this city because suburbanites, everybody keeps on arguing suburbanites will not use public transportation and that we care about having a national public transportation policy.

We have not had a national public transportation policy in this, the wording as it is, that the major cities have agreed to work together to share information when else shows the notion of developing a national public transportation policy and that is so significant in terms of future use of public transit, whatever form we have and so therefore I encourage this motion to be unanimously endorsed by this City Council. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Ternette. Any questions? None, Mr. Ternette thank you. Next delegation is Jim Jaworski on the same subject. Mr. Jaworski you have five minutes. Is he present? He's not here. Tom Kynman, on behalf of Parks Canada, in support of Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Is Mr. Kynman present? You have ten minutes.

Tom Kynman: Mr. Speaker and Councillors, good morning, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak at today's Council meeting on behalf of Parks Canada. Our field superintendent Don Bronson had the opportunity to speak at the Standing Committee on Property and Development and is extremely encouraged by the discussions that happened at that committee. These are not easy issues and the engagement of the Standing Committee and the efforts they have put to finding solutions is commendable.

I just like to reiterate why Parks Canada has such an interest in the Exchange District. The district was designated a national historic site ten years ago. Parks Canada is the lead federal agency for national historic sites and we try to work with the owners, operators and stewards of these important places for the benefit of current and future generations.

In the Exchange District, Winnipeggers have one of the largest urban historic

districts in North America. It's comprised of twenty city blocks, contains over a hundred heritage buildings. The district is indeed a national treasure and its significance extends beyond our own city.

A number of years ago, the city, province and Parks Canada took the time to describe the heritage values of the Exchange District. It was a joint initiative and it resulted in a document entitled, The Exchange District National Historic Site of Canada Commemorative Integrity Statement. On the basis of that report, I'd like to highlight two key values associated with the King Building.

The building has a direct association with the reason the Exchange District was designated as a national historic site. It is an architecturally significant warehouse dating from the period of 1880 to 1913. Secondly, due to its key corner location, the King Building is an anchor to both the King and Bannatyne streetscapes. In essence the King Building central position in the exchange has established it as a prominent landmark across the street from Old Market Square. This popular place for celebration is also the site of the historic sites and monuments forward plaque. It is from this location that visitors have the opportunity to observe a key panoramic view of the values that comprise the exchange. The complete loss of this structure would be profound.

The recommendations from the Historic Building Committee supported by the Standing Committee on Planning and Development demonstrate a full understanding of these values and show responsible stewardship and action. This is the second time in the last five months a request for the purpose of demolition in the exchange has reached City Council. We should consider the cumulative impact a serious of individual decisions about buildings can have on a place like the Exchange District.

It has in the past been compared to a jig saw puzzle. A few pieces can be removed and the picture can still be seen, but at some point the removal of pieces creates an image that cannot be recognized. We have not yet reached that point with this National Historic Site, but if we do, it would also be a piece removed from our national system of commemorations.

Change is inevitable and should be part of the district's healthy evolution. It can occur without ruining the districts integrity at all. The change is simply needed to celebrate and reflect the district heritage values and increased activity in the district provides this opportunity. The national historic designation of the Exchange District is now ten years old. It may be time to take stock of the changes that have happened and our goals for the future. It is time to conduct a review to ensure that those elements that define the integrity and national significance of the exchange are being maintained.

I also understand that there's an interest in developing a secondary plan for the Exchange District. This would be a valuable exercise that would describe for all parties future vision for the district and set parameters for change. Parks Canada would be pleased to work with the city and other stakeholders on such an exercise.

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 Plan and Development Committee and support the continued efforts to preserve the heritage values of the Exchange District. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, questions? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. One quick question Mr. Kynman, the federal government you know is a great participant in the Exchange District and we all recognize that, doing some of the work in the Exchange District and in particular giving some of the tax credits and some of the reserve monies or reserve grants that we have available is a very costly endeavour. What funding sources can the federal government provide to assist us in helping to maintain the Exchange District

in the historic nature that we attempt to maintain it in right now?

Tom Kynman: You're absolutely correct, at this point I do not have, there is not a program in existence, although I am aware that submissions have gone to the Treasury Board of Canada to renew programs to help fund investment in heritage buildings, but at this point you're correct, this is no help.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question.

Councillor Swandel: In other jurisdictions, does the federal government have funding sources, I'm thinking in particular of Quebec City or I can't think of anything else of the top of my head, perhaps in Halifax there's some areas or St. John's, Newfoundland that might have heritage monies from the federal government, are there other jurisdictions that have monies associated to projects like our Exchange District?

Tom Kynman: I'm sorry I'm not aware of them, but I could certainly, I'd certainly be willing to investigate that, I don't have that information.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all I just wanted to acknowledge the federal government's million dollar contribution to the Royal Bank Building right beside City Hall and I'd also like to ask if you're aware that this City Council recently adopted a motion, adopted a motion to urge the federal government and the F.C.M. and other organizations to urge the F.C.M to help us urge the federal government to re-establish the Historic Places Initiative. So this Council is trying to help you as one of the bureaucrats or people working for the federal government, I'm sure you'd also love to see those programs restored that were unfortunately recently capped by the Conservative government. So that, I wanted to ask if you were aware of that? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Kynman.

Tom Kynman: Yes, we are. We are in full support of it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Thank you sir. Next delegation is Cindy Tugwell on the same subject. Ms. Tugwell, you have five minutes

Cindy Tugwell: Thank you. Good morning Mayor Katz and Councillors. Thank you for allowing me to address you this morning. I'm just going to give you a brief excerpt of when I spoke in delegation at Property and Development and sort of follow though on the presentation by Parks Canada so I don't repeat anything.

I stand here before you today as Executive Director of Heritage Winnipeg which I've been involved with for over thirteen years and certainly we've been following the King Building issue for many, many years and I just wanted to start from the outset to say that this is a very costly case of demolition by neglect and certainly the process itself, we're here to be proactive, I'd like to say thank you very much to the Property and Development Committee and E.P.C. for their vision and their leadership in recommending and following through in favour of the recommendations from the Historical Building Committee to not de-list this building until we can figure out what can be done with it as far as redevelopment. There's a lot of monies that should have been invested in this building.

Previously I had the pleasure yesterday, I thought I would add this, I had the pleasure yesterday of attending Dr. Axworthy's media launch with the funding, the capital funding for the exterior of Wesley Hall and the interior. They've invested between three levels of government, they've invested I believe it'll be up to eighteen million dollars on that flagship building and I think what that shows everyone that heritage preservation is hard work, its a lot of investment, but I think that's the key, is that we've had the heritage designation for just over ten years. We have to be good stewards of the Exchange District. This is fairly new to us in the 21st century

of having to take care of this gem that we have and certainly as my role as Manitoba Governor of Heritage Canada, what I wanted to bring today was sort of a response to Councillor Swandel's question that we look at the good stewardship of the Exchange as being a proactive issue, not just reactive to stand before you and try and save these buildings, the building owners have and can't invest in or won't invest in, for whatever undue circumstances.

So there has to be a commitment by all levels of government since these replaces this initiative has been sort of, the commercial grant itself has become defunct of the federal government. Heritage Canada now, you know in our last meeting in Ottawa, last month is working with Parks Canada in Ottawa to put together possibly a federation which would look towards a national trust and that would be the federal government's investment into build heritage across the country, to be able to put together an endowment fund, so that's these kinds of situations don't happen.

So, the ultimate end of it is that possibly, you know, we need to take ownership of some of these buildings, if there's no business plan in place and we have to be the stewards, my understanding is this building is still developable and its not just saving the façade, it could possibly the whole entire building. It is at this point workable for working with CentreVenture Development Corporation and hopefully the building owner, so I urge you today to vote in favour of the recommendation from the Historical Building Committee to not de-list this building. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel you have a question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. You mentioned support from all three levels of government, we have a bit of sense here at City Hall of what we contribute in and around the heritage, we've heard Tom Kynman on the federal side of that. Can you give us an idea of what the province does for the City of Winnipeg in the area of heritage?

Cindy Tugwell: Well, that's something else, as part of my address a few weeks ago at Property and Development that we need to address that issue with the, and lobby the provincial government. There are nominal heritage grants right now, capital grants but I understand that's provincial wide. We did a story last year; the average grant from the province that directly goes into towards capital projects that aren't specific what the legislative building or Wesley Hall is about 4,500 dollars. I think there's about a capital fund of about 180,000 dollars from last year.

So, it's not a significant contribution and certainly looking back from core area initiative days, the investment by all levels of government is critical and that's probably one of the key roles that our organization can play, to lobby the provincial and federal government for more incentives because we know now that heritage preservation is economically viable and its an investment in your city, historic districts make good sense, heritage buildings are assets, not liabilities, so that would be the kind of lobbying we would do.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions, thank you Ms. Tugwell. Ken Reese who is to appear has cancelled out, so the next delegation, two members of the CUPE union, would you please come forth, first is George Jacques who has ten minutes in his presentation, followed by Mr. Gary Swanson, who will have five minutes and then we'll have a ten minute question period for the both of them.

George Jacques: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mayor, Councillors, administrative staff, I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today on the Assiniboine Park Conservancy Model that's being proposed and I stand in opposition to this motion and to this model and I'm not going to speak about all the ways that I'm opposed to it and CUPE's opposed to it as there are many. What I'm going to speak to is how it affects the members and what our members, what's important to our members.

Now when this conservancy model was originally toted about two years ago, a year and a half ago, it was, it was unfolded as a model that would include all the stakeholders in Assiniboine Park including Friends of the Conservatory, Partners in the Park, the Zoological Society, the Province of Manitoba was to be on the board and CUPE, the members were to be included in this process. And that's how the conservancy model was sold to our members and to the people who have interest in this model.

Now I'm standing here telling you that CUPE was not included in this process as far as the guide levels concerned. We were told what the conservancy model was going to be. We were told what was going to happen with the conservancy model, but with all of our hundreds of years of experience in CUPE and our members, we were not asked one iota of what we think it should be. We went to meetings with the C.E.O., there was travel, I call it a travelling road show where they were going around to the workplaces, the Zoo, our maintenance staff and we were told at certain times not even to ask questions.

How is that including CUPE in this process? Our members are standing up asking questions about their pensions. Well we don't know about your pensions, what's going to happen if the new board comes in and you'll be negotiating with the new board and to placate the members, the travelling road show said all of your contracts will be honoured. Well, indeed they will be honoured, to the end of the current contract. The next contract, these silent off members in part of Assiniboine Park Conservancy will be negotiating with the new board.

This new board will be made up of people that have been chosen by the administration and the Mayor and now with a new amendment, the players in the park will also get a choice on who will be on that board and who will be negotiating our new contracts with. The travelling road show told our members, you will be in a better off position with a smaller unit negotiating your contract with the new board.

Our members are upset about this. Our members are up in, they are so worried about this and I can tell you we are telling our members if this Assiniboine Park Conservancy model goes through, to not stick with Assiniboine Park because we have so many unknowns in this process. What about their pensions, what if the new board comes in and it decides that well it's a little too expensive for benefits, little too expensive for sick time and they're negotiating on their own. They've been soured off to maybe fifty members here in the zoo, forty five members here in maintenance. They're completely; we've been completely left out in the dark in this. We've been participating the whole way along.

Now, I don't want to get into all of the ins and outs of it, but public service members provide a valuable service to this city and public service members do many things in that park that can't be bought. You cannot hire a contractor; you cannot get some part time worker that will know enough to drive a little girl home that she has a flat tire at 9:00 at night, walking out of the tail end of Assiniboine Park that lives in St. Boniface.

That will not happen. We have evidence of that in a backlane with a private contracted garbage collector and a perennial lady with two kids couldn't get over a snow bank. Stuff happens, but public service workers have a vested interest in keeping the public happy. That's what they've been told from orientation every year. You have a public image, you have a public responsibility, you have a duty to the public, you have a responsibility to take care of them. It's not simply cut the grass, keep your head down and go home, take care of the animals, keep your head down, go home.

When the little people ask about questions, we, public service workers have a vested interest in keeping the public happy because you are our bosses. You manage us and from my perspective when you're selling off this park, you're saying we can't manage the park. We have fundraisers, we have managers here that could manage that park, that could raise funds for that park

and we've thrown up our arms and said we can't manage Assiniboine Park. We can't raise funds for Assiniboine Park.

Well, at CUPE our members are completely against this the way it sits. Now, and the reason we're against it, on what happened during this process. We were not consulted with a dialogue. We were told, we were dictated to, we were you know just preached to about what this conservancy model is. We wanted to be a stakeholder. We tried throughout the process to be at the table. Originally all the stakeholders were supposed to be at the table creating this new conservancy model and we are in favour of user groups. We want user groups to be a part of it. We want the public to be a part of it.

We know it's a public's park. We know it's the crown jewel of the park system. We've got hundreds of years in that park as public service workers and I stand here in opposition to that conservancy model. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. George can we just wait for any questions. Mr. Swanson you're next. You have five minutes.

Gary Swanson: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of Council, Your Honour or Your Worship. First of all, George and I are both former Parks and Recreation employees. We have a long history with the former Parks and Recreation Department. We have a legacy that was passed down from us from one generation of workers in the park to the other.

And that history, it seems to be ignored consistently. We have issues as George has relatively said, he's very passionate about the park and I share his passion. I don't express it the way he does, but I share his passion. That park is like tearing our heart out and this motion to move it out of the civic system is going to tear a big hole in the civic structure. That park is well integrated within our system.

Many, many services that are internal are tied to that park, insurance, legal, used to be some marketing, many other systems that integrate into that park system. Our workers in the Public Works Department, there's a stable number in the park but when there's big events, there are others shifted into the park and then moved out of the park when the need arises.

So, our main concern is because of the legacy that we've had as Parks and Recreation employees because there's a history of park development. The major parks, the regional park system in the City of Winnipeg did not happen by chance and there's two successful models that helped build that system.

One was the parks board which we proposed to you and that has been successful in the City of Winnipeg and the other one was the department that looked after all the parks and again that was a successful way of operating business to maintain the parks. Both those systems through time have been passed over and then it leaves you with what we are here today because we have user groups and we have citizens that want to be involved in the park system and that was taken away from them when the parks board was disbanded.

We have civic structures and you still have that problem today where you have three departments that look after park structure throughout the City of Winnipeg and there's been no addressing of that problem and there continue to be a problem in all the regional parks in the city.

The real problem here has been under funding to the parks system for many decades. I mean the Zoo; the last major capital in the Zoo was what in the 1960's. That's the problem and I don't see how this is addressing it in, from a civic structure point of view and especially when we have other major parks like Kildonan Park, St. Vital Park and Kilcona Park and we're not addressing that problem, we don't even, I was at Kilcona Park, which is a fairly new park about a month ago and I was shocked to see the state of disrepair at Harbour View and my understanding is that Kings Park which George has worked out of, again a fairly new park, again it is in a state of disrepair. So we have a huge problem

across the city and we're not addressing it.

We have a number of issues that we'd like to propose and one of them is, if you're not going to increase the operational dollars and I believe when this new board actually gets its charter from Council, the very first thing they're going to turn around and say we need more operational dollars and I, and we know that they're under funded. We know that. So, how, if you're not, if they're not going to be funded appropriately through city funds, then they have no alternative but to raise funds by alternative needs and that includes increasing user fees, permit fees, entrance fees to different amenities and other sources of revenue that they can think of.

What about conflict resolution, there's a new proposal to add a community council that would be an advisory body to the new board. What if there becomes conflict between the two identities, how does that get resolved. What if there's conflict between the board and the city, how does that get resolved, because we've seen another jurisdiction that can get quite ugly. Interaction of the part with the civic structure, how is that going to all materialize and it is quite complex, how the park system interrelates to the whole civic structure.

I again oppose, how can we tear our whole system apart because that needs to start happening and I know that's a daunting task but we've got to build a plan. That's the only way we're going to be able to do it. We have to build a plan and we're here to say to you as civic workers, we're willing to help build that plan. We want to be part of that. We want to be part of the solutions. We won't want to be here in criticism; okay and I need to wrap up.

And finally, there's two labour issues and George has addressed them. And we want to say to you that we want to continue to work with Council. We want to continue to work with the administration, but we have these serious issues in front of us. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillors, questions of the two delegations. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Just to who, George or Gary?

Councillor Swandel: I think either one can respond.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, first question.

Councillor Swandel: You made a lot of representations here and I'm a little bit puzzled because I'm reading the recommendation and the recommendation suggests that we establish the board and within six months we, they provide us with a strategic plan and within a year they provide us with a management agreement that would go through the process. Seems to me that at that point there may be an issue, can you just comment on that, that like to date we don't really have an issue with CUPE because we haven't seen what the strategic plan is and we haven't seen what the management agreement may be.

Mr. Speaker: Who's going to answer that, George?

George Jacques: Well I'll take a stab at it. Well, I understand your question. Now, we wouldn't have an issue if labour, the maintenance of that park wasn't on the table here, but it's on the table. We have not been given assurances that we will stick with CUPE our members in that park and we won't be negotiating as a whole unit. So, that's when it becomes an issue for us.

Twelve months out there is a new management agreement, yeah we don't know what's going to be but we know we don't have assurances. Right now with this new conservancy model as it sits that labour or our members will be part of that new park. And that's why we're standing here today. We're not standing here on you know, pie in the sky, we think this, we think that. We see what's on that

conservancy model and it doesn't include assurances for our members that have been in that park for a long time, committed twenty five years and more to keeping the zoo and maintaining the park and we understand that it's the infrastructure that's declining, the zoo. But our concern is the maintenance. So, to answer your question, no, we don't know what that new management agreement is but we know we don't have assurances at this point.

Mr. Speaker: Your second supplementary question.

Councillor Swandel: Just for clarification, it's your position that we shouldn't be able to take a look at this unless we give you an assurance that you will be there?

George Jacques: No. We don't need an assurance. We would have liked to have been included in the process. And that's now, we've, you've, since we're not included, we're taking the step of we better take action. So we were supposed to be included in the process that was promised to our members then, members of this Council when the C.E.O. went around and told us about this conservancy model. So that's the position we're taking now. We don't need assurance.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I just wanted to make sure you didn't actually, weren't suggesting that you needed assurance. But just one final question, to date has anything happened in this process that is contrary to our collective agreement with CUPE 500?

Gary Swanson: There's been nothing that's contrary to the present collective agreement. I'd like to respond to your former question which, the problem is and what we've read from the consultant's report, is that they will look at everything and they will look at a management agreement with the City of Winnipeg and there's no, there's no focus on maintaining that agreement with the City of Winnipeg, in the consultant's report. And if you're going to have an independent board operating the park, I think you'd want, I'm speaking for the other side now, but yeah you'd want that complete independence.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves, your first.

Councillor Steeves: Thanks very much Mr. Speaker. Thanks to the delegation for their presentation, I just want to be clear about what the issue, because I think the challenge here is, your asking us to, you're concerned about something that doesn't yet exist, which I understand the concern and you're asking us to kind of respond by putting in place assurances for something that doesn't yet exist. That's the challenge I think that exists here. And I guess, but my question is, are you saying that there's no way you could ever see a conservancy model working for Assiniboine Park?

Gary Swanson: Any system will work. I mean we've made the changes that were made in 1998, the workers of the city have made it work, despite all the governance issues related to having three different departments in that park, we made it work and we continue to make it work if we're part of the process.

Councillor Steeves: Right, okay, so,

Mr. Speaker: Your second supplementary question.

Councillor Steeves: To follow on that, Mr. Swanson, if as Councillor Swandel outlined, if there's sort of a six month expectation on this strategic plan, that a twelve month expectation on the management agreement is there room within that time frame for all parties to be involved and potentially come up with something that works?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: I believe we would and we would consistently express that we want to be part of the process. If you're going to manage change in a work place it's great, the most effective way of doing that is to involve the workers in that process.

Mr. Speaker: Your final supplementary, Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Has anyone told you, you can't be part of this process ongoing?

Gary Swanson: Yes in September of 2006, we went to a meeting that supposedly was to develop dialogue and we were told, succinctly that we were there to listen to what was going to be happening over the next six to eight months.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Do you feel that this Council has fallen short in the process of consultation and that if we had talked out these issues with you there might be some way to move this forward in a more positive way?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: Yes I believe so and I believe George wants to speak to it, too. I believe that if we, we have members that have decades of experience in that, and George told me a story yesterday that there's a water lines into the park that haven't been mapped and only three people in our complement know where they are. Our concern is that, and we will you know because of so many unknowns, we would be irresponsible to not say to our members, I think you have a choice here and our recommendation is to go to the known, which is to stay with the civic structure. And I'll let George speak.

George Jacques: Yeah. As far as consultation with current Council, I can tell you the day before E.P.C. was presented with this model, we had consultations with one Councillor and it came up that why would maintenance staff be on the table here if there's no problem with the maintenance staff. So, we have been saying that to the travelling road show and then we got that same from a Councillor. Now, we're all for consultation. We want that active dialogue, we had active dialogue for an hour the day before E.P.C. and we were quite happy to have that consultation and we appreciated it. So, there has been some, but we feel we should have been part of the whole process instead of here is our model, what do you think of it. This is what's it going to be. Six months a year out it could be changed so, thank you. That's.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi your second supplementary question.

Councillor Gerbasi: And you've also, I know, Mr. Swanson you alluded to the issue of concern of potential, if there's a real need for revenue within this structure that there might be user fees and other things that would make the park less accessible to citizens so that's more of a, rather than just the interests of your own workers, are you also raising the social justice issue of access to the park and concerns of that could change under this system, another unknown. Is that what you're suggesting?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: I believe that was addressed a year ago at committee level and I believe there was a motion to ensure that public access to the park would not be affected and so we're quite comfortable that, that would be part of the document. But what we're saying is that if you build a new Conservatory, you're going, in order to recover the cost or maintain the operation of that new facility you're going to have to increase user fees in order or entrance fees into that. Same with the zoo, you know we're looking at, you know if you go on the Calgary model you're looking at about one hundred and twenty dollars for a family of four to afford to come in and take in the zoo.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Katz your first question.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all, Gary and George thank you very much for coming today. After your presentation at E.P.C. last week which I appreciate you coming and you left and unfortunately I'm not sure you're aware of the fact and that's the question, there was also presentation from the stakeholders. When I say the stakeholders I'm referring

to the Zoological Society of the Conservatory and the conservancy and the Partners in the Park. Are you aware of the fact that they stated on the record that they would like to sit down and work and communicate with CUPE? That's my only question.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Swanson.

Gary Swanson: Yes, we were made aware of that and we've never had a problem with the Zoological Society, Partners in the Park. That's not our, we would like to work with them, we would like to be around the table with them. We would like them to fix up, work with them to fix up the park. I mean our members work there and we want to see the park improved. It's just the process that we've been under been stifling I guess is the way to describe it.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary question, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Just to take that a little bit further then and what you refer to as the travelling road show and you said you've never had problems with these then, who are you referring to? Where does the problem exist? Let's just put it out there for everybody?

Gary Swanson: Well.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Swanson.

Mayor Katz: No time to be shy.

Gary Swanson: Well, yeah we both can speak to it. It's a level of frustration that we've had and we've been consulted with, no question. We've been consulted with all the way through. But we're a stakeholder as well, our members are a stakeholder, they again, generations of workers have been there and they need to be heard as well. And I don't think there's, there's not been a meaningful way to sit around the table with all the stakeholders and say okay, let's build a plan that's going to fix up this park. And we haven't been a part of that process and we represent those members and there are a number of labour issues that would make us feel a lot more comfortable if we were around that table. And it just, we've been siloed off in the process.

Mr. Speaker: This is the end of question period.

Gary Swanson: Do you want to know, well, I don't want to, it's been part of the administrative process let's put it that way.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, George would like to just sum up.

George Jacques: If I just point out one thing, you asked for a specific answer and when that conservancy model was brought out to us and we read it and it said CUPE is going to be a part of it and we weren't, red flag goes up for CUPE, we're not part of it. Later on in the process, we get consultation with a Councillor the day before E.P.C. We get the travelling road show changing their story saying well maybe the new board won't be part of maintenance.

Well these are red flags for us that are like ambiguous things and we're not dealing with a voluntary board or people that want to work in the park, we're dealing with families, people that work in that park that depend on that income and now we're representing them, so that's where our concern comes from. We need to know that our members are, at least will be heard in the process and you know we give full credit to the Councillor for late in the game, coming and hearing what we said at the Standing Policy Committee. Because I think that was the first real time that we were heard.

And that that was our concern, Mr. Mayor, that throughout the process, that conservancy model threw up some red flags. Another one was that the province was going to be on the board, we contacted the province, they had no interest in being on the board. So there's a couple of things that came up and that's why we were opposed to it, but we appreciate the consultation that happened at the 11th hour, so, and going forward we hope to be part of the process and that was very encouraging to have that late dialogue. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you gentlemen. Thank you.

Gary Swanson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Thank you for coming. Executive Policy Committee report of May 23, 2007, Mayor Katz please.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MAY 23, 2007

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of May 23, 2007 and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 to 6.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. The report of June 13, 2007 Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED JUNE 13, 2007

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 to 8.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. E.P.C. Notice of Motion.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: Moved by Councillor Gerbasi, seconded by Mayor Katz. It's on the table Councillor Gerbasi. Would you like to introduce it?

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz

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

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

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

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

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

AND WHEREAS, in response to these challenges and opportunities, the Big City Mayors' Caucus of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities has developed a National Transit Strategy containing the following key elements:

a) investment in public transit in the form of sustainable federal funding in the amount of $2 billion per year;

b) a commitment to integrated land use and transportation planning by participating municipalities;

c) federal tax incentives for transit users;

d) research that promotes information sharing and innovation among transit systems and identifies policy approaches all governments can use to increase ridership;

e) appropriate accountability measures;

THEREFORE BE IT IS RESOLVED THAT City Council:

1. Endorses the National Transit Strategy put forward by the Big City Mayors' Caucus of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and;

2. Directs the City Clerk to forward copies of this resolution to:
• Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada
• Lawrence Cannon, Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
• all local Members of Parliament

•the Federation of Canadian Municipalities
• the Canadian Urban Transit Association

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to introduce this motion in support of the adoption of a national transit strategy. The strategy has been endorsed by the Big City Mayors Caucus of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and by the board of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. I'm also very pleased that the motion was seconded by Mayor Sam Katz.

I think that his support for this strategy is very important. And I would also like to acknowledge his support this year to fund the detailed design studies for the busway in this year's capital budget. And recent statements on Council, he has stated that rapid transit is a priority, so I'm taking his word and very appreciative of his support on this and these other initiatives.

Building a modern transit system is not an easy thing. It is hard to get the public engaged in the topic of transportation planning. Furthermore, there's a range of views on what type of systems should be built. Within the community of transit advocates, there are portion that want different kinds of systems, whereas the city plan to build designated busways has been adopted by the city and I don't want to engage in that debate today, so I think it's important, and I also, and I did just want to put on the record though, that our city plan has been endorsed repeatedly by committees that have studied this of all views and they have adopted our plan for the separate busways with bike paths, that this is the thing that makes sense. So, I just wanted to make that point.

I think, I wanted to ask the question, why is this important to have a national transit strategy, because all cities that have transit systems need more investment in these systems. Because we are in a global climate crisis and we must evolve our transportation systems so that there are alternatives to the automobile that are efficient and practical and because cities can't afford to do it alone and the federal and provincial governments need to get involved.

This strategy before us today has been developed thoughtfully and provides a range of approaches to supporting public transit. The two billion dollars in dedicated federal funding for transit is essential. And I'd like to, I emphasize the word dedicated. Many so-called green infrastructure programs are spread across a range of other priorities and end up elsewhere than public transit. Without dedicated transit funding it is unlikely that there could be even close to adequate support in place.

There is a part of the strategy that focuses on integrated land use and transportation planning by participating municipalities. Proper planning is a key tool that cities and provinces have to build sustainable communities. The fact that we in Winnipeg are moving into a review of our city plan, Plan Winnipeg, aligns well with the adoption of this strategy. As appropriate land use policies and transit friendly development must continue to be part of our city plan.

Other parts of the transit strategy promote a variety of incentives for transit users, policy approaches to increased transit ridership, research and innovation. I recently heard the federal Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, the Honourable Lawrence Cannon, speak at the F.C.M. conference. Lawrence Cannon, Minister Cannon is very aware of transit issues as he used to be in charge of the provincial transit authority in Quebec. Now, is an important time to make the needs and desires of cities clear to the federal and provincial government.

This strategy will also be useful in demonstrating Winnipeg's renewed commitment to public transit to the province and the federal government. It will go far in erasing any doubt that Winnipeg intends to move forward in joining other major cities in Canada in building a modern and rapid public transit system. So again, I thank Council for their support and particularly I thank the Mayor. Thank you.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the motion and to begin with, I'd like to congratulate Councillor Gerbasi and Mayor Sam Katz for finding an issue where we can work together on for an important issue, an incredibly important issue for the future of not just Winnipeg but all big cities throughout Canada.

There are so many reasons why Winnipeg needs a modern rapid transit system, albeit there is debate on the modality. It's good for the environment, whether we, the talk is reduction of greenhouse gases, air pollution. It's excellent for our infrastructure and we all know about the infrastructure challenges that Winnipeg faces. If we can get more people to get out of their vehicles and use rapid transit, that helps address our infrastructure deficit and that's positive and it goes a long way to promoting compact urban development in the downtown.

Rapid transit systems originate, their destinations are the downtown. That is a tool. It's not the only tool but it's simply a tool to help convert surface parking lots into more productive uses such as housing or such as commercial buildings. So I whole heartedly support this motion.

And I actually think it's a shame that in the year 2007, Winnipeg is one of the only cities that does not have some form of rapid transit. We've all been to Calgary. Many of us were there two weeks ago. Well we took, some of us took the C-train and we were at the zoo in ten minutes. That's another; the zoo is another issue, another debate. Whether you go to Calgary, whether you go to Edmonton, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto, Portland, you name it, there is a modern rapid transit system and this city has to provide the leadership that is necessary in order to actually get a rapid transit system implemented. So I'm proud to stand up and support the motion and I congratulate the mover and the seconder.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions, no speakers. On the clause, Councillor Gerbasi do you want to close. Councillor Gerbasi? Do you want to close?

Councillor Gerbasi: No, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. On, all ready for the question. All in favour, contrary? It's carried. E.P.C. motions, there is none. E.P.C Consideration of By-laws.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: There's an additional E.P.C. report is there, no?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Speaker: No, no, its not. E.P.C. Consideration of By-laws, Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 129/2007, 132/2007 and 134/2007.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 129/2007, 132/2007 and 134/2007.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-laws No. 129/2007, 132/2007 and 134/2007 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 129/2007, 132/2007 and 134/2007.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 129/2007, 132/2007 and 134/2007 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. Councillor Smith.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Mayor, why is Winnipeg not joined Saskatoon, Windsor, Toronto, Calgary, Halifax, Montreal, Edmonton and other cities in joining the Canadian Coalition of Municipalities against racism and discrimination. Even when urged to do so by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, with our new President Gord Steeves, why?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I want very much to thank Councillor Smith for that. I'm not aware of the request coming to us but I certainly will look into that, but I appreciate that and I will get back to Councillor Smith.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Your second, you have another question Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor as you know, we spent 943,000 dollars on the new way finding signs. Should not the information on them be accurate? Why has the way finding sign in front of the MTS Centre listing the Millennium Library as under construction, when the library was officially opened in November of 2005?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Smith, I think we would all agree that all way finding signage should be accurate. The logical answer to that would probably be because the way finding signage was delayed by a few years and obviously they had, I should constructed something that was a few years late and then was put up and now that Councillor Smith has pointed that out, I'm sure we can rectify that situation and I thank him for doing so.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor. On Friday morning, Councillor Fielding, the business tax elimination report will be shared with this Council and I'm wondering Mr. Mayor, in light of the fact that there were, there was not a multi-year budget for discussion in last years budget deliberations, can you share with us how much business tax is scheduled to be eliminated for 2008?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Vandal, I most definitely can share the information. There was none. We had made a commitment in the first year to eliminate approximately twenty percent in the downtown from 9.75 to 7.75 Mr. Speaker. We stood by that the following year. The next year, we eliminated and made it even right across the board, so everybody now got a saving of approximately twenty percent from 9.75 to 7.75. That is where we stand right now. Our goal is to phase out the business tax. We also know in order to do that, we have to find ways of doing that and that's what the committee and Councillor Fielding have been doing, to basically supply us a menu of options. I'm sure myself and Councillor Vandal will be waiting for it and will review it when it comes.

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

Councillor Vandal: So as of today there is no goal for the level of business tax reduction in 2008?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Not to my knowledge Mr. Speaker, as has been said over a period of years, the objective is to phase out the balance of the 7.75. It'll be up to the commission to determine what is realistic and to provide us with this menu of options and until that point in time, no further action has been taken.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Oh, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor as you're probably aware, there's been a great deal of noise made in the media regarding Devils Lake and the Devils Lake outlet and its potential impact on the Red River. Years ago local entertainer and at that time I guess he would have been a protestor, an activist, Tom Jackson had a phrase and a song to do with the Garrison River Diversion and went something to the effect of, you know please Mr. Garrison, I don't want your dam water in me and it was largely in part because of the impact that it was going to have on the city of Winnipeg. Right now we have the province taking this issue to court in the states and I'm wondering what if anything our intergovernmental relations are doing to address this concern that could potentially have a devastating impact on the Red River and our city.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Through you Mr. Speaker, first of all I very much understand and certainly appreciate the concern that Councillor Swandel is showing. I can tell you that one of the first things that I did after being elected in '04, was met with the delegation from Devils Lake and I certainly understood their concerns about overland flooding. They showed me a video of what was going on there and it certainly was devastating and I'm sure that I stressed to them the concern of our water quality here as well and how we intend to protect it. As we all know to date, the Premier has certainly been doing due diligence, taking action in court as well as through any diplomatic processes and I believe the problem that exists today, is that the standards that we had in place are being lowered by our neighbours south of the border and that is the real concern and I can assure Councillor Swandel that both the provincial and federal government will do everything they can, whether its through legal course or through diplomatic channels and as soon as I have more information, I would be happy to share that as well. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Assiniboine Park is a little further down in our agenda this afternoon or maybe this morning depending on how many questions are asked. An issue that you were an advocate of last year was condos in the park. Can you share with this Council what the status is of that initiative from your perspective?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I want to thank Councillor Vandal for that question. The realities are for many years and there has been a problem in Assiniboine Park, and we all know about the infrastructure that's falling apart. We all know the monies that are required for the zoo, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And to be very frank with you Mr. Speaker, there has been nothing but inaction. I think what I did a few years ago, for the first time, is put Assiniboine Park at the front of everybody's minds, the citizens, as well as Council and for the first time people started realizing what a jewel we had and we're speaking eloquently about it, although, for a decade no one was doing anything. So the bottom line is, we now have a situation where Assiniboine Park is at the top of the agenda. We also as Councillor Vandal pointed out, will be dealing with a governance issue in the very, later on in the agenda, and if that governance goes forward, it'll be up to this new entity to decide what they're be doing. So as far as I'm concerned, there has been no progress whatsoever on an old issue at this particular point in time Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Vandal: So essentially what I'm hearing is that it's up to the new government, the new governance entity to decide whether or not condos are appropriate for the park?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: No, what you're hearing is that I have no intention of pursuing that and it will be up to this entity if we go forward and as was stated earlier, this process will take about a year and a half, if it proceeds and everyone will have to have a business plan and there may be all sorts of ideas that come forward from this new entity and I think all will just have to wait and see one, what these ideas are and two, it's always up to Council to approve them.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Okay, Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, there's no report: Motions, if any, there isn't. By-laws, none. Question period, Councillor Nordman.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Nordman: Mr. Speaker, thank you. Through you I'd like to ask the Chair of the Downtown Development Committee a couple of questions. Over the past month, I've received more phone calls and email comments and parking lot and soccer game comments about the issue regarding 100 Main Street.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry Councillor Nordman, that's, I can't allow that, that is an In Camera Item; it's being dealt with right now. He's not going to get a response because Councillor Wyatt will not be able to respond to that.

Councillor Nordman: It's still In Camera is it? All right, well thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Nordman. Any further questions? None. Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development report of May 22, 2007, Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED MAY 22, 2007

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce the report of May 22, 2007 and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 to 9 and 11 to 16.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Leipsic, which one.

Councillor Leipsic: Mr. Speaker, I ask that Item No. 1 be removed from consent agenda.

Mr. Speaker: Number 1. The rest, all in favour, contrary? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 1, Councillor Leipsic.

Item 1 - Riverbank Stabilization of Private Property within the City of Winnipeg - Cost Benefit Analysis File PR-4.5

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Leipsic.

Councillor Leipsic: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I whole heartedly support the importance of,

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Leipsic, Councillor Swandel, I'm sorry but you had the opportunity to open that.

Councillor Swandel: Certainly Mr. Speaker, I will look forward to hearing Councillor Leipsic's comments on this matter as stated, this is an item to look at the cost benefit analysis on the provision of riverbank stabilization on private property. Many properties in the city of Winnipeg, some in my ward, I know Councillor Gerbasi has a significant issue in her ward on Riviera Crescent, which is where this piece was brought forward and we thank Councillor Gerbasi for doing that and I'd like to hear Councillor Leipsic's comments on the matter.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Leipsic, continue.

Councillor Leipsic: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you Councillor Swandel. I'd like to say I whole heartedly support the importance of riverbank stabilization however, it's been urgently brought to my

attention that in my ward of River Heights - Fort Garry there's a particular property that has a critical issue with riverbank disintegration. I refer to the Rehab Centre for Children at 663 Wellington Crescent.

The erosion of the riverbank is so frightening that staff, parents of children using the services, many members of their volunteer foundation, ask that I see this property and view the deep-seated bank erosion. So much property has fallen away at the rear of the building. The garage at the back of the property is now condemned and roped off plus parts of the parking lots. A mere snow fence is all that keeps the public off the riverbank. The implications for the safety of 15,000 children from across Manitoba using these facilities, their families and the staff is most serious. The future services they must are also of concern.

I would like to advise Council that this property is on provincial property, and is within the W.H.R.A. mandate. As such, I have written the provincial Minister of Water Stewardship, Minister Christine Melnyk and passed along these high priority concerns. In my letter to Minister Melnyk, I referred to the fact that riverbanks can fail without warning and leave six to eight foot crevices. I asked if anyone is monitoring the deteriorating riverbank at the Rehab Centre for Children and suggested that bank movement must be monitored by qualified riverbank engineers.

Especially there appears to be an acceleration of riverbank deterioration and more problems coming to light throughout Winnipeg. I asked Minister Melnyk to reply and she'll advise concerned stakeholders, plus our own riverbank stabilization board and Council accordingly. Of course, I submit the recommendation to develop a policy for the, I support the recommendation to develop a policy for the establishment of a city of Winnipeg funding program for riverbank stabilization of privately owned properties.

But, I want all concerned parties to remember that erosion and river movements are not discriminatory. They attack equally, private and public riverbanks and a public building servicing 15,000 Manitoba children must absolutely be made safe and secure or another site should immediately be sought. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I want to thank the Standing Committee and E.P.C. and Council for supporting this or anticipation of their support and I'd also like to acknowledge Councillor Leipsic's particular situation.

One of the things about this proposal is that it wants us to define a policy and to look at how we can deal with these various types of issues we're facing and this could be one of them, that it could look at, I don't know. Also, this is part of this is that we approach the provincial government and work with them on these issues and considering this is provincial property, that makes it all the more important. This can be part of what we bring forward to the province.

So I thank Councillor Leipsic for that. I'd also like to mention that there's a huge amount of publicly owned property that is in serious condition and threat from riverbank issues. We've prioritized the top twelve of them and its millions of dollars and although, and I would like to acknowledge that Council has put more money in riverbanks in the last few years than I can recall. So I think we do have to take a little bit of credit for that although unfortunately it's not enough and we need all levels of government to participate more and so that's certainly another point.

But I'd like to emphasize that because we have a huge problem with public riverbanks, you know we really don't have the capacity to deal with our riverbank problems. This proposed policy would have us using our local improvement tool and tax increments, financing as well as partnering with the residents as an approach so that it's financially, should be workable. It's also, sorry I just lost, lost my train of thought there. So, in any case, I appreciate everyone's support. This is something we need to explore, and it's a complicated issue, but I think this initiative

will get us moving in terms of talking with the province and it's looking at tools that we can afford as a city within, oh, I just remembered, my last point I wanted to make, sorry. Not enough sleep this week.

My last point I wanted to make has to do with the issue of part of this policy would be to define situations that are of particular need and particular crisis such as the Riviera Crescent folks. They have houses falling into the Red River in the next year or so and this is where you know we really do as a government have to look for creative ways to try to solve these problems and work with people. They're willing to pay their own, obviously a significant amount of their own dollars but it just isn't solvable on their own in this case and these circumstances do arrive such as when we've had flooding or other issues where citizens and government have to work together and that's what this is all about. So I look forward to seeing this report come back and I thank Council for your support. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on this, I want to thank Councillor Swandel, Councillor Gerbasi and also Councillor Leipsic for their comments and also specifically, Councillor Swandel, through him, as Chair of Property and Development, I've learned more about riverbanks than I had known before and his understanding of it is quite extensive.

And what amazes me Mr. Speaker, is just that the challenge that we have ahead of ourselves and the cost and for a very small portion of riverbank to shore up that riverbank, you know, you're looking at not just hundreds of thousands of dollars but millions of dollars. It's a huge cost and so I want to just point out in the motion and thank the Standing Committee of Property and Development for incorporating, I raised in the motion and we made an amendment that the City of Winnipeg explore with the province of Manitoba this is point number three, the option of utilizing the newly expanded floodway for the purpose of mitigating and preventing erosion.

And I think it's pretty clear. We just got to, actually it was very timely, just yesterday or the day before we got a circular came through all of our offices from Mr. Ernie Gilroy, the Manitoba Floodway Authority and many of us know Mr. Gilroy and talking about the expanded floodway and the fact that they've now moved eight million cubic meters of earth, has been moved and the floodway protection now is one in 300 year level of flood protection with their goal being a one in 700 year. They've spent 110 million and plan to spend another 341 million on this project.

And we have this amazing piece of engineering surrounding our city, Mr. Speaker. Originally, the first construction, the original floodway moved more earth than was moved in the entire construction of the Panama Canal believe it or not. It's an amazing piece of engineering that is remarkable for this province and for our city.

So the question arises, why aren't we using it more effectively? And I think we have to ask that question, considering the fact that we have potentially tens of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars in costs associated with riverbank re-stabilization. We could be losing not only private lands but public lands, parks that we have taken for granted in many ways, that we know they're there, we expect them to be there in the future, but indeed based on the flow of the river and the rising waters, well even today you can go and you can see the rising water levels of the river which keep going up and down, and that just completely destroys and erodes the banks literally on a daily basis.

We definitely could look at options I think and I think the time has come Mr. Speaker, for us to push the province to look at options to utilize the floodway gates and to start diverting the water around the city on a regular basis, maintaining a status level for flood, for waters flowing through the city, Mr. Speaker. It would reduce our liability and costs with regards to riverbank erosion. It would allow us to enjoy the many pathways and walkways that we are now developing around the city, that are

constantly covered under water, then or are subject to cleanup and the expense that goes with that.

The time has come Mr. Speaker that we broach this issue with the province and we put this on the table. We have the technology. We have an amazing piece of engineering that surrounds our city. Why aren't we using it? It's there for flood protection but it also could be there to prevent a huge cost, massive amounts of dollars on taxpayer's backs with regards to riverbank stabilization and all the liability that goes with that. So I welcome this motion here today and will be fully supporting it whole heartedly Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers. Just before I call on Councillor Swandel as Chair of Riverbank Management I want to thank the committee for the input into what we have here today. Councillor Swandel, your comments.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. There's a few points that were made here, maybe I'll start just by following along with what Councillor Gerbasi was speaking to that everybody needs to be cognizant of we what we are trying to find is a cost neutral way for the taxpayers of the city to address this property.

Property owners would be, would certainly be in involved in paying a significant contribution into the remedial works. When you look at these properties, in particular Riviera Crescent, a number of the people have already appealed their taxes due to the erosion. In one case, the erosion is within a foot of the house and you know they've received substantial decreases in their assessments, appealed their assessments, not their taxes pardon me and so we can see the loss of revenue for the city as a result of these works. So that's just one area and in particular on Riviera Crescent if the houses are, you know end up going into the river, well the next thing that will go is the roadway itself which will be a significant cost to the city of Winnipeg.

Also, it's not just the municipal taxes that are being affected by this riverbank erosion. There's also the taxes that are being generated for the school divisions along the river. And so the province certainly has the need to be at the table and to be preserving the tax, taxes that are generated from these properties so that in their future they can be delivering to the coffers of both the city and the province in the way that they have been in the past.

Councillor Leipsic mentioned the issue on Wellington Crescent, the Children's Hospital. Certainly it's one I think we have to ask our administration to take a look into. I don't know how the ownership of that land works, whether it's, well if it's provincially owned, I thought it was operated by a not for profit organization, I know it was the Shriner's Hospital, now it's W.H.R.A. So I don't know if we have any tax benefits to the city out of that but we'll certainly have our administration take it up and where there's sick children involved I'm sure that we will do everything that we can in our power to address that concern.

Relative to Councillor Wyatt's comments around the floodway, I thank him for his kind words. I think it's important to certainly ask the question, right now we're at times of high water levels in the City of Winnipeg and really what has this impact more than anything else is the sustained high level of water. If it goes up quickly in the spring and down quickly in the spring it doesn't have a very great impact on erosion, but when it comes up and it sits there for two, three, four weeks at a time, that's when we see the most significant erosion happen within the City of Winnipeg.

We all know and we all have to be aware in asking the question that there are a great deal of other stakeholders when it comes to the floodway, in particular the municipalities around the city of Winnipeg that are impacted by the use of the floodway or, both from its backing up and also its drainage around as there are water table issues, where the floodway goes around the city.

So certainly, I would agree that we have to ask this question and it's a good question to ask, but we have to be willing to work in co-operation with the other stakeholders that are affected by the floodway and likewise at the other end there is the Lockport, the damn at Lockport that is a control structure as well that can be used to mitigate the impacts of sustained high water levels on the riverbanks in the City of Winnipeg. So with that I will ask that Mr. Speaker you ask the question and hope that we can get unanimous support for this cost neutral project.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? It's carried. Report of June 11, 2007, Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JUNE 11, 2007**

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, before I just, we move to the report of June 11, I just wanted to mention that Item No. 10 on the agenda of June, where am I here, Item No. 10 of May 22nd was laid over by the Executive Policy Committee to get further information. Report of June the 11th, 2007, I'm pleased to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Item 2 please.

Mr. Speaker: Item 2. Councillor Swandel, do you want to introduce Item 2?

Item 2 - King Building (formerly Ryan Block) - 104 King Street - Request to Remove from Buildings Conservation List File G-3.1.1

Councillor Swandel: Item number 2, I need to find it here, just a second. Oh Main Street, the King Building, I will look forward to Councillor Gerbasi's comments and then respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Thomas: Should we vote on the consent agenda first?

Mr. Speaker: What was that?

Councillor Swandel: Good call, vote on number 1 first.

Mr. Speaker: Item 1 yes, all in favour, contrary? Carried. Item 2 Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much. I'm pleased to rise today in support the decision of the Property and Development Committee, Executive Policy Committee, who have supported the Historic Buildings Committee recommendation not to remove the listing from 104 King Street as a designated historic building and I'm confident and hopeful that Council will do the same today.

The situation that we are seeing here with 104 King Street was mentioned earlier by one of the delegations is the same situation we recently saw on Albert Street which is becoming, which is an unfortunate thing when we see it in Winnipeg and its called demolition by neglect. Another example by the way, is the Chelsea Courts building on Assiniboine Avenue that unfortunately Council did remove the designation and those buildings have been lost and it's actually been a very bad situation for the neighbourhood because it's sitting empty. It hasn't been developed even though they have permission to demolish.

But that's another example of it and I'm only mentioning it not to be negative on a wonderful day like today, but to point out this is an ongoing problem with a small number of lands, of property owners. And unfortunately, those small number of property owners that have allowed buildings to deteriorate have then been in a sense rewarded by being able to establish undesirable land uses such as surface parking lots and that is an unfortunate thing.

We all know that there are far too many surface parking lots in downtown Winnipeg and the last thing we need to do is allow it to get worse. We also know as was eloquently spoken earlier by Parks Canada and by Heritage Winnipeg that

we have a national historic site and we need to maintain that integrity of the site and I'm very pleased that Council has been doing that. A number of recent decisions in that have been very, very positive.

It's my understanding that Councillor Wyatt and Mayor Sam Katz strongly supported this decision and I want to thank them for that. Their leadership is very important. It takes patience and creativity to preserve heritage in a city. It can take a long time for an appropriate redevelopment opportunity to come to fruition. A good example of this is the Princess Block, it sat empty for well over a decade and if the will had not been there to preserve the buildings regardless of their poor condition, the opportunity to create the new Red River Campus would not have been there. So, it isn't always easy to preserve these sites.

I was recently in the city of Halifax and I was very impressed with their downtown and the heritage that they've preserved there. I sent all of you Members of Council this week a picture of a building in downtown Halifax in the heart of their historic streetscape. It had no roof but the walls were all intact and it was held together with metal bars and had murals painted on it and was being preserved, the facades were being preserved at least and I would also just like to comment that facade preservation is sort of not the ideal, it's the last resort, but it's certainly better than just tearing things down and losing the streetscape, losing everything. So it's something that sometimes has to be considered when things get to a very sad state.

Winnipeg, I also wanted to put on the record that Winnipeg has been a leader in developing innovative heritage tax credit programs. CentreVenture is also an important player in providing support for property owners who wish to redevelop buildings in the downtown. Winnipeg has played an important role by providing these significant incentives and we've seen a huge impact on that, I don't have the numbers with me but you've all heard them. The millions of dollars of levered money and projects that have proceeded to preserve a lot of our buildings that have been empty in the past are now alive and I think the city deserves a lot of credit for that.

But it's also true; the other levels of government in the past have been supportive. The federal government as I mentioned earlier has provided a million dollars in grants from the former initiative that now unfortunately has been cancelled by the current federal government.

As you recall, this Council passed a motion to encourage the F.C.M. and we have now have the President of it there, so we're counting on you Gord, the F.C.M. to lobby the federal government to reinstate the commercial tax incentive. Tax incentive programs don't cost us anything in the end, they actually make us money, that's what's so crazy about it, that the other levels of government haven't got on board with this because they reap the tax benefits, they reap, it's an investment that we get back and it stimulates other developments in neighbouring properties. So we're not only not spending money, we're making money and we're making our city better and Winnipeg has understood that which is why we still have our heritage tax credit programs, but we need to get that message to the provincial and the federal government.

And property owners, who buy property in a national historic site, have to take some of the responsibility. It's hard to say that because we all want to be business friendly and we are business friendly. We're providing business with significant incentives. Their taxes have been reduced, but they have some responsibility to take care of these buildings and to try to take advantage of the initiatives that have been offered to them and if everybody works together we can make our downtown more beautiful and successful and a place for the future by valuing and recognizing, valuing and recognizing our past.

So again, I'd just like to thank Council. You've made the right decision not to de-list this building. Stick with your decision.

Stick with your decision and do not allow the walls of this building to be demolished. We got to preserve that streetscape. It can be done, other cities do it. In other cities, property owners do not expect to be able to get away with demolition by neglect and we can't allow that to happen here. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel closing.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just on that item, you know it sort of, it was obvious what we needed to do in this case. You know I'd like to say that there's still quite a bit of work to do here. I don't like the words demolition by neglect being battered around when we're at the table working with the owner of the building trying to find solutions. As we all know there's a great cost to these remedial works whether they're done by the private sector or are done with our assistance.

So we're at the table, we're working, we have CentreVenture there working along with us as well and we hope to be able to in the not too distant future, see something wonderful done on this site. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of item, contrary? Carried. Motions, there isn't any. Property and Development, Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-Laws No. 117/2007, 118/2007, 119/2007, 120/2007, 126/2007, 127/2007, 128/2007, 133/2007 and 135/2007.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 117/2007 to 120/2007 both inclusive, 126/2007 to 128/2007 both inclusive, 133/2007 and 135/2007.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. I will move that By-laws No. 117/2007 to 120/2007 both inclusive, and By-Laws 126/2007 to 128/2007 both inclusive and By-Laws 133/2007 and 135/2007 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 117/2007 to 120/2007 both inclusive, 126/2007 to 128/2007 both inclusive, 133/2007 and 135/2007.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, I will move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 117/2007 to 120/2007 both inclusive, 126/2007 to 128/2007 both inclusive and 133/2007 and 135/2007 be read a third time and same be passed in ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Question period, none. Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, Councillor Steeves the report of March 5, 2007.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MARCH 5, 2007

Councillor Steeves: Yes Mr. Speaker, with respect to that day, I'd like to move the report of the Governance of Assiniboine Park, I anticipate there might be some discussion.

Councillor Gerbasi: I think it's been pulled off by Councillor Thomas.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas. You want to introduce it Councillor Steeves.

Item 3 - Governance of Assiniboine Park File PR-7.1

Councillor Steeves: Sure, I'd be happy to. Thanks Mr. Speaker. I'll try not to take up the full ten minutes. I think there's going to be a pretty fulsome discussion about this, although I might not be genetically capable of doing that. All right, I want to set things up a little bit Mr. Speaker in terms of discussion. This is important enough.

I think everybody on Council has been, I think by and large, working, has been by and large, working in concert with the Assiniboine Park over the last several years. This is, the issue of Assiniboine Park, with the exception of a couple of issues that have arisen kind of to the side has been I think fairly stated by and large an item that Council has been working in concert towards. There hasn't been a great deal of disagreement on Council on this issue in terms of moving through the framework, a plan that was developed, moving into the new entity that exists for Assiniboine Park that was headed up by Patti Sullivan.

There's been a significant amount of consensus moving through that and I think people realize now that pursuant to Council's direction, we're talking seriously about the new governance structure and what that might mean for this park. If you look at the recommendations, just there's about seven or eight items there and the new governance structure, in number 1 it calls for the new governance structure to be approved for the Assiniboine Park and Forest pursuant to the amendments made at Standing Committee or where the end forest part has been taking out, so we're now talking only about the park property, not the extended forest to the south of Assiniboine Park and I think people are aware of that.

We're asking in number two the corporation to assume responsibility for the management of the park on a phased in approach and actually, you know I might actually now that I just see that there, that the end forest also appears in item number two that should be removed as well, in a phased in approach contemplated. And number three talks about the board of directors and the composition there of.

There's a new item number four that's been placed in that reads, the new governance structure include provision for the establishment of a community advisory committee comprised of individuals from various sectors of the community to provide input to the new governing body on matters that will affect public, affect the public which appointments will be made by Council.

The items four through seven now are numbered down, five through eight I imagine and items number four and six are two of the items I want to bring to specific attention of Council again this morning. I think Councillor Swandel in his questions alluded to it. Item number four, the old item number four, the new item number five reads and I quote, that within six months of incorporation, the corporation presents its strategic plan to Executive Policy Committee for review and referral to Council for approval.

Item number six reads quote, that within twelve months of incorporation, the corporation negotiate a management agreement with the City of Winnipeg for approval by Council. So while this might seem in some ways final to some people, I really don't think it is final in the larger sense of the word. There's still obviously two very big steps that have to be borne out by this Council and of course, it will be dealing, if this passes today we'll be dealing in six months or maybe a little after that with the strategic plan and then twelve months after that with the management agreement, both of which should be on the table before E.P.C. and then before Council. So that's the model.

The issue here as everybody around the table knows, is the idea of conservancy and I think this wonderful Council has characters on it from all parts of the political spectrum. Those on the left and those are the right and the more enlightened who are kind of in the middle. A little joke I threw in there for you. And we've been banging around the idea of a conservancy model Mr. Speaker because there's principles and there's an idea that we want to flesh out development as a Council.

We are concerned about this park and there isn't a single Councillor and Mayor sitting in this room today that isn't concerned about this park, concerned about where it is today and where it's going to be. I think there's an acknowledgment; there's an acknowledgment around this table that

we want to move ahead with a model that is going to advance the interests of the park. I don't think there's anybody in this room who disagrees with that. And I think the question is, what is that going to look like and we feel I think, at least some of us feel, that by putting together a conservancy type of model that's let's face it is mirrored in a lot of other cities with their marquee parks in their particular cities.

By putting forward that model, it's going to release that new entity to do all of those wonderful things that only a new entity can do in terms of fundraising, raising profile, coalescing and kind of I guess, getting a singular path for the main events in the park and kind of, I guess, highlighting this park and potentially and hopefully finally making this park the jewel that we keep on referring to it as within the root work and the framework of our city proper and that's the idea.

Without that, without the conservancy model I think there's probably a general concern around the table here that if we don't do that we're going to stay mired where we are today in that, even though we all care about the park, we're not going to be able to take that next step and really bring this park to where we all want to see it and that's the challenge I think. All of the partners involved in this, despite some ripples at the outset, support it and I'll leave CUPE aside for now, I'll talk with them in a moment but all the other partners, including Partners in the Park, the Zoological Society, the conservancy folks are all fully on board with this plan. They want to move ahead and they've said so categorically and I don't feel bad about saying that because I think we've all heard that from them directly from their mouths if you've been at Council or at committee. So there's no question about that.

We have heard concerns from our partners at CUPE and those are fair enough. I guess that's going to be maybe the challenge we have today because they're obviously valued partners in the park and I think there's a lot of sympathy around the table for the concerns that they advance. The problem Mr. Speaker, is to a certain extent we're being asked to sit in judgment as it were, to something that doesn't yet exist. That's the challenge here. CUPE and the representatives today, I think had a difficult time articulating and fair enough, it would be difficult because the final product doesn't yet exist. Trying to articulate challenges that may exist in ultimate products, so I guess the decision we have to make today Mr. Speaker is what are we going to do? Are we going to have enough faith in this process to release it to the sixth month strategic plan and then to the twelve month management agreement where we can finally sit back in absolute and final judgment and hear concerns based on what's written or are we going to cast aside the entire process right now, because we're afraid of what we don't know?

That's really where we're standing and that's a challenge and I appreciate the future unknown is scary. I completely get that, but my respectful suggestion Mr. Speaker, is that Council stay together through this process and we, at the relevant time we could have discussions about the strategic plan and about the management agreement when that time comes. We've enlisted our partners. They've come forward in good faith and said they're willing to work at this. And I think its incumbent upon us to trust this process. I think if you don't trust this process, if you have concerns, I'm hoping you'll take some comfort in the fact that this report, the recommendations therein have built into them two trenches, six months and twelve months that will allow anybody to pull out of the process at that time.

There was some talk about consultation and I, it was hard to get a true sense of what type of consultation has taken place on this matter. But I would refer people to the report in this item wherein it was stated in February of, I'm sorry, it was June of 2006, where we specifically authorized and I guess commanded, if I can use that term, our administration to consult with our CUPE partners. Now, Mr. Swanson candidly stated as his final statement that these and I quote and I wrote it down, we've been consulted all

the way through. That was his statement, but I think there was concerns maybe about the type of consulting and where this matter is going to wind up and I think at the end of the day, we have to acknowledge that CUPE has some concerns about this issue. They're concerned about the conservancy model and what it's going to mean for their members. Unfortunately, I don't think we're in a position right now to say categorically what this group is going to come back with. So I don't think that ultimate reassurance, as much as I or you would like to give it, I don't think we're in a position today Mr. Speaker, to offer that ultimate and final reassurance. We just can't do it.

When it comes back and the strategic plan and the management plan say something specifically that people can react to then I guess we can see how things go. I should say there is complete willingness on the part of everyone moving forward to work with CUPE and consult openly. That is absolutely not a question.

And I will finish with this Mr. Speaker in saying that, some mention of discarding the entire Assiniboine Park Issue Conservancy Model and moving to a larger parks board that includes all of the parks within the City of Winnipeg. I'm going to advise against that. I would suggest, I think it's supported by Council that this park stands alone as our Central Park in New York City, this is our Central Park and it should stand alone as our crown jewel and the one park you want to single out and whose interest you want to advance. Thank you.

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

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I rise to speak against this motion because I believe it is premature. I think it's important that we as a Council make decisions on direction, mandate and priorities. Deciding on a governance model is merely a how, and we as a Council have not yet agreed on a what.

We have competing interests in this park. We have people who have their own different priorities and we as a city have finite dollars that we have to spread amongst all sorts of competing interests. That's why we as a Council need to discuss this. I have made it clear on several occasions that I believe that we should have a full day working session on this so that we can make it quite clear where we are going as a Council. We need to discuss where we're coming from and we also need to have public hearings so we can hear what the general public has to say about what they feel is at the stake of their premier park in the city.

We cannot lay this at the feet of a conservancy group or an S.O.A. or as an online department, whichever way we decide to go on this as a how, we have a basic problem. The product that we want to put forward and how we're going to manage that product does not yet exist. We as Councillors need to drive this process. This is why we were elected to make the decisions. There's some very basic decision making which has not occurred. We need to make decisions about directions and priorities, then and only then should the direction of how it's being governed be discussed.

We have to establish a clear mandate and from there, we can give that clear mandate to the group, whether it's a conservancy group, whether it's to an online administrator as a direct department, whether it's an S.O.A., but first we have to decide what we're doing.

We know that the zoo has some very specific priorities. We know that the Conservatory has specific priorities and we know that Partners in the Park have specific priorities and we don't have the money to do all those things adequately at this time. We need to decide on what priorities need to be done first and why those are the priorities, only then can we give it over to a group to manage. We have to step up to the table first and tell people what we want to hear.

We've had many recommendations with regard to how the zoo should be funded, how the Conservatory and the Butterfly House should be proceeded with and we know that we don't have the money for all

those things, but we've got to make the decision.

CUPE's concerns are valid. They do not know what's happening, so how can we shuffle this off and out of our purview and say oh, someone else bring us back the report and tell us what your priorities are. What if, when they come back in six months there's an uproar. That's why we have to step up to the plate and say, this is how you're going to manage it, these are the priorities.

Fellow Councillors, this is grossly premature. I do not know how many times I've said this behind closed doors. I do not know how many times I've asked for more information. I can't go along with this. Thank you.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to read the first recommendation in the report. Recommendation number one, that Council approve a new governance structure for Assiniboine Park and Forest. I understand the forests has been deleted, beginning with the creation of a non-for profit corporation that would operate independently from the City of Winnipeg, with a mandate to lead, to manage, to fundraise, to restore and to redevelop the overall park and its amenities.

The key words for me in that first recommendation are a new governance structure and operate independently. Call me an old fashioned guy sometimes, but I believe sincerely that if you want to have a hand in governing public amenities, City of Winnipeg public amenities, you get elected. And that's our job. We are the governance of all assets of public property of the City of Winnipeg.

So then I went back and I did a little bit of research. I pulled up a report that was actually written in '03. It says in April of 2000, Council, 2000, seven years ago, Council approved the creation of the Assiniboine Park Enterprise and I was there and the idea behind that, seven years ago, was to bundle up everything that we do in Assiniboine park so that we can achieve economies of scale, we can improve on what we're doing and make the park the jewel that it is.

The enterprise has responsibility for planning, for managing and for operating Assiniboine Park as a business unit, including fundraising and fiscal and financial planning in 2000. In 2002, July, Council seminar was presented regarding a future vision for Assiniboine Park. This was the results of community surveying, a zoo master plan, a conservatory building analysis and preliminary analysis of all of our infrastructure in the park.

Two months later, April 18th, September 18th, E.P.C. approved 100,000 dollars to prepare a physical plan for Assiniboine Park and to present that plan for public consultations. 2003, sessions, consultation sessions were held with Sport Manitoba, youth groups, environmental groups, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, Charleswood Rotary, Manitoba Society of Seniors, Destination Winnipeg, civic staff. February '03, local architect firm were engaged to develop their long range physical plan for Assiniboine Park.

Later that year a plan advisory group was established when formed to plan and act as a sounding board for consultants on the development plan. Other planners were hired and the long and short of it is that the Assiniboine Park framework plan was supported by the three boards of directors and everything was there for us to move forward.

Mayor Katz was absolutely right this morning when he said that there's been a lot of inaction in the last ten years concerning Assiniboine Park and I agree with that. And I was there for some of those ten years, probably six out of the last ten, and I'll accept my share of responsibility. The key issue here is that the City of Winnipeg is simply not invested the amount of money necessary to maintain Assiniboine Park. We could do that now. We could make this a emrife priority project. We could approach the provincial government, the federal government, we could approach non-

profit foundations, we could approach other foundations and actually start moving on fixing that monkey cage that's been an issue for the last ten years that we continually talk about but nothing seems to get done.

We have a reserve account with I don't know how many millions in it, but I had a quick look at the City of Winnipeg financial plan this morning because it was in my inbox as I got here and we have a substantial amount of money in our reserves that we could invest in the public amenity if the will was there. And that is where this Council has been lacking, is that we have never put forward the resources necessary to maintain the park the way it should be.

Point to be made here is that there is nothing that this group that we are going to hand over governance of the park, there is nothing that they can do that we cannot do now. The plan is there. The consultations have been done. We need to just move ahead and start spending some of, investing some of our dollars to make those necessary improvements.

Some people are going to say fundraising. They're going to have greater access to fundraising to make the park a better place. But I dare say that all you have to do is look at the Winnipeg Millennium Library model and see what the private sector of our city, the private sector in our city have come up with to make our library a signature library, upwards of twenty million dollars to do that. The task is greater, but no one says this has to be done in three years. There is nothing that this group will be able to do that we cannot do now.

So why are we here? A couple of esteemed colleagues got up this morning and made a point that why is CUPE worried because we haven't seen a strategic plan and we haven't seen a management agreement. Well I think the answer to that question is in the question. We haven't seen a strategic plan. We haven't seen a management agreement. When I sell my house, I don't sell the house before I know the terms and the conditions of the purchase. What is, we're giving the governance structure of a public entity of which we were all elected to lead on to a non-profit independent organization. We're saying you guys govern this, now were going to hand out the management, we're going to negotiate the management agreement and we're going to negotiate the strategic plan and that's going to come back in eighteen months.

That, to me, is putting the cart before the horse. Why not let Assiniboine Park Enterprise which has been here since 2006, we've bundled it up. We've provided the necessary staff. We've hired a C.O.O. to work on these issues full time. Why not let that person, whoever it may be in the future, negotiate the management agreement with the stakeholders, negotiate the strategic plan and then come back to us, who are the governors and say this is what we have, these are the realities, this is my recommendation. Then as governors we would take the recommendation and we would discuss it politically. We're not doing that. We're doing it backwards.

Mr. Speaker, the real problem here as several people have pointed out is a lack of funding on behalf of the City of Winnipeg that we can provide as proof evidence that the city is serious in reinvesting in its public amenities. There's all sorts of negotiations that can be ongoing with the federal, the provincial governments, the non-profit organizations. If you don't believe me, look at the library model.

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

Councillor Vandal: And in my mind this is an abdication of public responsibility for public amenities by democratically elected politicians. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker, you know I think Councillor Vandal put it quite well. The Zoological Society of Manitoba, the Friends of Assiniboine Park Conservatory, Partners in the Park, are all

fed up with the lack of action of the City of Winnipeg and they've put this proposal forward because they want to see the park developed. You know, I can understand that. We have neglected this park.

You know, you go to the zoo, like it's embarrassing. I have a friend from Hong Kong who comes here every year and he visits the zoo and he sees the deterioration. It's not; you know that zoo used to be fantastic. We should maintain it to where it should be. We have allowed the park to deteriorate. Why should we be handing over our tarnished jewel to non-elected people? They're not elected. You know, it's our responsibility. We should take that responsibility.

And when I was on the Protection Committee, I suggested that we follow the Winnipeg Library Foundation model for raising funds. And you know, I read the report in the agenda and here's what they said about that, just a bunch of gobbley gook, however, Assiniboine Park requires a governance and management model that will provide overall strategic direction for the park that will integrate operations and fundraising. What does that mean? You know, it's not clear. They haven't really looked at raising enough funds through the library foundation model. It's a model that will work and as Councillor Vandal says, we don't have to do this all in a couple of years. You know we should start planning; we should start making our priorities, what we want done in that park. So I suggest to you that we should not be supporting this clause. We should take our responsibilities on it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I guess we're going to hear the left-hand side of Council first, well I guess we heard the mushy middle already. But, I would like to put some comments on the record regarding the creation of the new governance model and I'd first like to say that I appreciate Councillor Vandal's comments quite a bit because it really did clarify. And I think Councillor Vandal's comments actually answer Harvey's question about what that statement means because it's saying, it's sort of saying that this board has to do everything and I think what Councillor Vandal is saying is that the governance may be the responsibility of Council and the fundraising could be done by some form of private group as we did with the Millennium Library. But, so I think that might answer Councillor Smith's question.

I would start off by saying and I want to put this on the record that I think we all agree that Assiniboine Park is the crown jewel of our park system and is extremely important. There's and we all agree that there's been a long history of under investment in maintenance and infrastructure in this park and in many other parks and I agree with Councillor Vandal that we all have to take some responsibility for that as members of this Council.

Assiniboine Park houses, except for Councillor Nordman, Assiniboine Park houses such amenities as the Zoo, the Conservatory, the English Gardens and many other wonders and amenities. It is a huge asset to our citizens and visitors of our city and we all agree that we need money for the park and that the players involved in the park need to work together. And they need to be valued, volunteers as well as our city workers.

There is a difference of opinion, however, as to what model will be best for serving the public interest and I'm not convinced, I wanted to say something about the labour issues. I'm not convinced that they will be as straightforward as its being presented. There can't be guarantees on issues such as pensions and we can't expect employees to happily accept moving over to a smaller bargaining unit. And many of us have seen in the past with the Social Services transfer for example, when we had our employees bailing out of the package, costing the city a lot of dollars and having other employees displaced and bumping and all that horrible scenario. We've been there before and if it isn't done properly, or I don't even know if it's properly, the will just may not be there to go to a smaller, less powerful bargaining unit and risk your pension with all these unknown factors. So I think

realistically we could have a lot more difficulty than people recognize with that.

Another issue that I believe is looming large in the mind of the public is the issue of private control of a public asset and how that will be managed. And I'm, and I think that there has to be real clarity in these agreements if Council passes this today as to how far commercialization of the park can go. I'm concerned that there will be as some Councillors have stated, there will not be new operating dollars. This is a concern that has come from the volunteer groups as well, that there has to be more money for operating. It's going to cost more to operate this properly if this is what this is.

So there's going to be a huge amount of pressure to find revenue for this board, and some of that is good if they're going to do some great fundraising and lobbying the other levels of government. But I don't think a lot of citizens want to see private housing in the park and they don't want to see a Burger King in that park. And while Council may retain some sort of veto power over this, the new governance structure might make it easier for commercialization of the park to occur.

City Council is, I mean look at the Forks North Portage. You know City Council is buffered when it's an arms-length organization making decisions. And we can simply point to them and say this is what they're all telling us to do. It distances Council from those kinds of decisions.

I know there's been a lot of talk about whether the Millennium Library, the report from the consultant says that the Millennium Library approach to fundraising is inadequate. That's what the report says. But you know, after the PUFFS report, which probably cost, I don't know if that one cost as much as this one but probably about the same, these reports that we spend so much money on sometimes seem to really miss the local Winnipeg situation.

For example, the PUFFS report and I'm not criticizing our current recreational policy, I'm talking, that we actually adopted, we never adopted the PUFFS report but the PUFFS report itself completely misunderstood the value of small neighbourhood community centres in favour of mega centres. The PUFFS report missed the unique and complex way these small neighbourhood clubs meet the needs and create community capacity and I would rather put my faith in a model that is proven and has worked well in Winnipeg, if we have that option and I really don't think the Millennium Library approach has really been properly analyzed. We know it worked on that project, the problem is that we're bundling the fundraising and the operation and the maintenance all into one new governance thing and that's making it very complicated.

I would also like to point out that we are about to hear on Friday that it's possible, I'm assuming they're going to say it's possible to eliminate 53 million dollars or to replace 53 million dollars of revenue with efficiencies. Well if those kinds of efficiencies are sitting around and we've got 53 million extra dollars, maybe and this park is as important as every Councillor who's going to stand up here today and say this is the jewel of our city and we have to invest in our parks and we all care about Assiniboine Park so much, well if that's true, why are you choosing to cut the business tax over this when business pay a much lower rate of business tax than other cities when you compare the burden of business tax compared to residential in other cities.

It's what five to one in Vancouver, its two to one here in terms of the ratio. We've lowered business tax twenty percent, why and I think that some of the Councillors that think we should be spending more on Assiniboine Park maybe need to revisit some of the priorities that have been promised in the last election.

Maybe some of this funding should be going, if it is freed up which remains to be seen if it can be done, you know I just want to know, I just question, you can't have it both ways. You can't say that your number one priority is Assiniboine Park and then not, and then spend all your

money on something else which is what it looks like we're doing.

I also worry about this park board being forced to jack up user fees in various ways as things develop. Again we can hide behind that arms length board; we don't have to make the direct political decisions as much. I'm not sure this is going to serve the public interest in that way. It seems to me and I agree, Dan covered this issue very well, but when we set up Assiniboine Park Enterprises, it was supposed to bring all the groups together. It was supposed to do the planning and all those things, and what's happened is we've focused on governance and nothing else and we've spent years on governance and nothing's happened and that's frustrating to people. It's frustrating to citizens and its frustrating to all of us and I'm not trying to blame any one person but you can get lost in looking at governance. I'm not sure how much it really matters in the end, that much, what we need to do is get the job done.

And, anyway, another point I just wanted to make too, is this new community advisory committee. It seems to me this is kind of the answer to every time we're frustrated or people are concerned is we create another advisory committee, so people can feel listened to. Well I for one don't want to be listened to if I don't have any power, you know, just venting. So I mean it is, I appreciate.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: I appreciate the intention to create another committee, but it also is just adding to the confusion, because I'm not sure what their mandate will be and it seems to be sort of a last minute add-on that we're going to create this committee and then everybody's going to be, we're going to have the public interest you know dealt with on that.

So I don't mean to criticize. I, you know, I clearly support the citizen advisory committees that we have on issues like accessibility and safety, those are commitments, those have a clear mandate, it's clear what they focus on and they're the committee that recommends policy to Council but this committee I'm not sure how it fits in. You know I'm obviously open to the idea. It's probably better than not having one but I'm just, I think it's just more confusion and they won't necessarily have the kind of power to actually implement.

In closing, I think the problem with this initiative is that the devil is in the details and we keep being told that the details can't be given to us until later and it's like being on a moving train and you can't get off. We agreed to it. I've seen this before on many major Council initiatives that you know the details are just too sketchy. I don't understand why the details have to be this sketchy. I think if there was a political commitment made, if somebody would stand up and say we are not going to allow commercialization of the park ever, no matter what happens. We are not going to allow our workforce to be, we want our workers only to be doing this. I haven't heard those things. Maybe it's in the fine print if somebody can identify that.

But you know we're being told to have faith. We were told by the Chair of the Standing Committee to have faith and I'm not sure that faith is there I suppose for some members of Council. You know having said that, I respect that this is a very difficult issue. We've been working on it for years, all of us, and you know, I mean this is, I expect this is going to go forward today and I think it's important from the concerns whether they, whether it passes or not and Councillor Steeves I'd like you to hear my comments, Harvey. I'd like Councillor Steeves to hear my comment that it's important to raise these concerns today, whether, because this probably will move forward and it's important for the decision makers and those on E.P.C. to understand the concerns that citizens have and I think we're raising concerns that are real on behalf of our constituents. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I got to say I love the smell of a good donnybrook in the morning. I'm not sure whether to refer to this as poppycock or much ado about nothing, those of us who have read the report will know that many of these concerns have been addressed. You know Councillor Vandal made a couple of comments and I'm going to touch on a couple of them.

One was the reference of this being an abdication of responsibility. Well I would argue that some would see this as a modernization of governance. Throughout North America and around the world other municipalities and provincial and federal governments are adopting structures like the conservancy model and other partnerships in their communities and actually it's been written about in a book called Governing by Network. More and more, rather than being the straight down silent deliverers of the service, we've become managers of these partnerships and it's modern governments are, become stewards or managers of these networks, this horizontal plain of networks rather than the silent straight down delivery mechanisms. It's something that's being championed throughout North America for sure and I'm sure around the rest of the world.

Now Councillor Vandal started by reading item number one of the report. I'd like to ask Councillor Vandal when he has a moment to read item number three which says that the initial board of directors of the corporation be established by the Mayor selecting the board chair together with whom a slate of board members should be developed and that it lists a number of organizations that would be welcome to put members forward for the board and the clause finishes, or that recommendation finishes with the statement, initial and subsequent appointments to the corporation's board of directors shall be subject to ratification by Council.

So through this process we actually do have a method where we have some accountability. We can maintain some accountability and certainly through a management agreement and through the strategic plan we will see this strengthen as well. We also have the ability to deal with risk and manage risk and provide other protections for the citizens and this modernization of the governance of Assiniboine Park.

And further protections and accountability and risk management will be provided through items four and six I believe it is which is the development of the strategic plan and on to the management agreement. You know and this is where a bit of the poppycock comes in, in that you know that we're referring to this as, you know Councillor Vandal alluded that why would we make the statement about you know the management agreement and the strategic development plan. Well I would respond to that with how can you have a strategic plan and a management agreement unless you establish the entity to begin with.

You know here we are, we're about to embark down this road so we get more information, we do it in an orderly fashion, we bring it forward, we consult with our partners and the potential stewards of this jewel in the city, we'll all agree it's that. You know we can sit here and throw stones around about who neglected the park, well look, it doesn't do us any good, we can go back and write more reports, but at the end of the day we have an urgency here. This is a crown jewel for the city of Winnipeg and we need to be seen to be addressing this concern.

Mr. Speaker, this modernization of the governance structure of Assiniboine Park will work well for the city. It will assist us in the capital financing side. I was embarrassed to hear Councillor Vandal, the amount of money that he had to spend to get into the Calgary Zoo. We certainly don't want to go down that road of jacking up; we want to put a two or three dollar fee into, to get into the zoo in place. You know we were yelled at for that and certainly we don't want that. We want this place to be as accessible to every citizen in this city and every visitor to this city as we possibly be. This modernization of the governance structure of Assiniboine Park will give us that opportunity. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Leipsic.

Councillor Leipsic: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all I'd like to clarify that I don't want to be labelled right, centre, left. I'm simply going to say I represent River Heights - Fort Garry but I'm also here for the betterment of the city of Winnipeg. So I'll begin on that note.

I want to say, negative comments we're always told are the easiest and most convenient to formulate. Positive comments and solutions take a lot more thought, energy, cooperation and ultimately, will achieve positive results. In speaking to each and every Councillor here, different stakeholders and including CUPE members, President Gary Swanson and George Jacques, First Vice President, a common denominator came through.

There's a passion within everybody here to see this park improve and eventually become a world class park. I think that's what we all want. I wasn't here for the history and you know, I'm really not interested in regurgitating the past history and all that. Today is today. I want to get something done with the park Mr. Speaker. I think we all should be working together. We have to assist and remedy the park and we have to look at the financing. I believe the conservancy model is the most workable and has the potential for ultimately being the park we seek.

I must, I'm sorry contradict Councillor Vandal in his comparison of the park and the library. I think they differ in many ways. One, with the money that was raised at the library, six million was raised privately. The balance is seventeen million, was government. That's hardly the situation with what's needed at the park. Plus, the park is viewed and that shows clearly in the research, it's viewed totally differently than the library. The library is Sacre Sang, parks wonderful but there's a different view of books and knowledge and libraries ladies and gentleman. The research showed that we have to come up with another model.

Another difference, another major difference between the library and the park is that right now we have different groups within the park there, the Conservatory, the Zoo, Partners and Friends in the Park helping, wanting to help. We have more people offering. I'm not sure of the composition of the board at all. I know we need a diversity of people. That's what everybody is asking for. I'm getting phone calls and it's so wonderful to hear citizens say, would you consider me. I also like the thought of having consultative groups assisting the board, too as we do in other models.

There's so many people out there that want to offer not just money which certainly is important, they want to offer their help, volunteerism, their support. We all come with different talents. I'd like to say also that at this time I just simply ask my fellow Councillors to please have some faith and let's get going on this plan because if we don't, you know, it's terrible.

We all agree the park's not in great shape, financially, et cetera, and we need to get going on this. So I say to everybody, Council, we need the public partners, we need our volunteers and we need CUPE. So let's just get it done and move positively, please. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors we have the Mayor to speak yet and then closing will be Councillor Steeves if there are no other speakers. Do you want to continue until we finish this item? Councillor Clement? Just a moment, hold it. Councillor Clement, you wanted to speak to it?

Mr. Speaker: Okay, yeah there'll be four more. Okay, Councillor Gerbasi moves we call it twelve o'clock and re-adjourn at 1:30. All in favour, contrary? Carried.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of June 20, 2007 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors the first speaker will be Councillor Clement, followed by, maybe someone else. But I think we can proceed, Mr. Clerk we do have a quorum? Okay. Let's get on with the game. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: What can I do for you Harry? Did you have a nice lunch?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, absolutely. Did you?

Councillor Clement: Not bad.

Mr. Speaker: Well you look great.

Councillor Clement: Thanks, I appreciate it very much. Do you like my tan? Harry thanks very much for giving me the opportunity to speak to this. I don't think there's anybody in the room that doesn't take this issue pretty seriously. We all, I think, take great pride in Assiniboine Park and I think we all want to see something positive happening there.

And I think we pretty much all acknowledge that the amount of capital that we've put into the park in the last number of years hasn't been enough. The problem of course, one of them anyway, has been that there have been a number of groups working within the park, all trying to do great things and all of them pursuing their individual dreams of what they'd like to see there and the issue is which one do you do first, I guess.

And the other part of this, Harry, that I think is important for people to understand as well, is that ten or twelve years ago, our finances weren't that great. We had some rough issues associated with assessment and the two hundred million dollar bill that had to be paid as a result of the way that Assessment Act was created even though we weren't the ones that were the authors of that, the province was, we wound up getting to pay for it. And at the time, we were basically using plastic and you can't keep doing that because we were going to wind up in a really, really terrible spot.

So we've solved the financial aspect of this, of all of those issues and we then embarked on expending more money on, or in capital on a number of things but I think when you look at the polling that was done, the majority of people were of the view that the streets was the first place that we should spend be spending the money and that's where we've been spending the money.

While we were going through that and I know all too well because I argued for a couple hundred thousand dollars a few years back to try and spend some money to upgrade some of the cages, some of the painting, et cetera, in the zoo and by the time they got done with that 200,000 dollars, they had basically hired a consultant to tell us how to build Disneyland north and I don't know why they went down that path. I don't know where that went off the rails. All I know is that the money was used for that as opposed to trying to beautify the zoo somewhat.

The long and the short of it is that some people may not think this is a perfect solution, but it's better than what we've got. I don't think that what's gone on there for the last couple of years has been very helpful or positive, personally. I get frustrated. I grew up in that park. I was there just about every day because it wasn't very far away from where I grew up. I go in there and I see the duck pond and you want to go for a skate in the duck pond.

I don't know how they do it. I know that in Public Works, in terms of snow removal, looking after ice on the streets that type of thing from the middle of October until the middle of March, we've got people working twenty four hours a day. Well, I know the zoo doesn't need people working twenty four hours a day but it might be interesting if they had them working seven days and maybe they have a skeleton staff on the weekend, I don't know. All I know is that any time I've gone and tried to skate on a Sunday afternoon whether it was with a grandchild or otherwise, I couldn't, because it's never freshly flooded on the weekend ever. It's never cleaned on the weekend ever. It's done from Monday to Friday. That's not the staff's fault; somebody's directing that traffic, not done.

You know like, you go to Nathan Philip Square in Toronto, cripes they've got not one zamboni, they got two, all night long. There's somebody every three or four hours, they clean the ice and you can go, you've got fresh ice to skate on. What do we get, you get there Friday, its okay. Get

there Saturday, not a chance if there's been a little bit of snow, you're not skating. Like, it doesn't make any sense. You can't use the facilities when we're not maintaining them like that and I don't know why that kind of stuff hasn't happened. Why isn't there a garage by the duck pond with a zamboni sitting in it? I don't know the answer to that. I've asked the question quite a number of times and all I get is well you know we're putting this package together. We're trying to come up with a solution.

Well, I listened to what Dan Vandal said, when you look at item number one, it leaves you to the conclusion that we're maybe abdicating our role. Although if you go to numbers four and six, it clearly tells you they have to come back, we have to approve their plans and we have complete control over that Mr. Speaker. And what I know is that when you get private citizens involved in these initiatives, they generally deliver.

I know that in the last twenty years we've been told we don't need any more hockey rinks, but they're all full. They're all rented every hour, every day. So how can that be? And who built those twelve rinks, the community clubs. We helped them. We, you know we guaranteed their loans and that type of thing. They've never reneged on a payment, not one of them. So they've done that type of thing. We have a group that went out and fought hard to create a huge change to the downtown library for the millennium. They did a great job. Did they have government money? Sure they did. But they went out and they got a huge amount of private funds to do it and they pushed it in every direction until they got the thing done. The Humane Society went out and basically did the same thing and they're building a beautiful structure in the south end of the city.

It happens when you get them involved. The community, I've been involved in any number of projects. I've got a skateboard park that's going to open in the south of our area soon that would just plain wouldn't have happened without the residential group that got together and pushed for it and fundraised over 200,000 dollars themselves. We've built community clubs in Lindenwoods and WhyteRidge the same way by people participating and it wouldn't have happened if we would have waited for the city capital to come out of the parks department. It just wasn't going to happen that way.

So, the way this is structured is melding those various groups together and I can't, I'm not going to guess whether the Conservatory should be rebuilt first or whether the Zoo should be upgraded first. I'm not going to worry about that. I'm going to let this group come back with a plan to tell us what they think the priority should be and how they should do it. I'm not under any illusions Mr. Speaker that we're not going to have to continue to pay to maintain this park and to continue to increase the funds that are required to do that. And I'm under no illusions that they're not going to come back and request some capital from government. I think that they probably will.

But they will partner that with other sums from whatever they choose their fundraising to be, whether it just be personal philanthropy, have I got the right word, philanthropy, sorry or whether it be fundraising. I guess you do. But anyway, the long and the short of this is that I appreciate that everybody's got different views. I mean I've heard from CUPE.

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

Councillor Clement: Thank you, I believe that Gord Steeves hit that nail on the head. When this comes back and we have a plan we'll know some of the answers to some of those things, but we don't know the answers to those, to some of the issues that have been raised by CUPE in the short-term and you know we'll get there.

But we have to move forward with something in this regard. It's, it is the major park in our city. We have neglected it in my view and I think that we have to do something to turn that around. This would appear to be an awfully good start and I would urge everybody to support it Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers? Mayor Katz you have the floor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all, I must say it's gratifying to hear everyone on the floor of Council share their views. You can see that there is definitely passion and everybody cares, and I believe that we care about Assiniboine Park and we care about every park in our city and I think one thing we'll agree on is that they all need a great deal of work. It's no secret that Assiniboine Park is in a very unique scenario because of the Zoological Society, because of the Conservatory and because of Partners in the Park. It is different and we are focusing on that today.

I'd like to address a few issues that have come up. Number one, I very much appreciate Gary Swanson and George Jacques coming here today and I understand their concerns. I truly understand them and I wish that they could have been addressed and that they come here today and had joined the other stakeholders, those being the Conservatory, the Zoological Society along with Partners in the Park who at one point in time were all separate and they were not united and they all had their own interests.

But you know what, they have come together and they have unified to do what's in the best interests of the park. And I wish that CUPE was part of that, because Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that if CUPE had some of their issues resolved today they would have come forward, they would have endorsed this and there would have been very little conversation, I believe it would have been supported unanimously.

Unfortunately that is not the case, but that does not mean they do not have legitimate concerns. But the realities are, when it's pointed out, I think was a new governance model and operating independently. Well, the Conservatory, the Zoological Society, Partners in the Park, they all have their own governance. They're all not-for-profit. They all operate independently and they've all done an unbelievable job under the circumstances. You can look at all our community centres. They're not-for-profit. They operate independently. CentreVenture, I could go on and on. This isn't something new Mr. Speaker. We've been doing this for a long time, some with more success than others. But there's no question, it works.

And here is the dilemma we face. When you talk, when you talk about abdicating your responsibility, what I would say to you is for a decade now and there seems to be consensus, okay, we've done what I call procrastination, suicide on the instalment plan. And Mr. Speaker, doing nothing is abdicating your responsibility because we are charged with making decisions. Maybe difficult, maybe easy but that's our responsibility and that's why we're elected, to make those difficult decisions.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that the reason this could be successful is because it doesn't make a difference whether you come out with a governance model that might be similar to Stanley Park or Central Park, there have been problems such as ours before. We're not the first ones to have a beautiful park in decay. Central Park is a perfect example and it can be turned around. And it gets turned around when leaders in the community come forward and work with government.

And I can tell you this much, the difference about people who come from the private sector, some community leaders, they don't like to fail Mr. Speaker. If they can make this a success, by raising a quarter of a billion dollars, they would only come forward if they believed they had a chance for success and they believed they would have the support of the city government, the provincial government and the federal government, because there is very little doubt we're all going to work on this together.

But you know what, Mr. Speaker, unlike Councillor Clement I didn't go there on a regular basis in my youth, I was at West Kildonan Park every day. But in the last six years, I go to that park, I guarantee you as much as anybody on the floor of

Council or in the gallery, because when you have young children, we know that's what you do and I'm there on a regular basis and we have something special there Mr. Speaker.

But you know what? It's falling apart. It needs help. We need to do something now and we have an opportunity. We have an opportunity to do something great for the city, because that park can be great. I'd love to see a butterfly pavilion. We've heard of the Winnie the Pooh potential there, to renovate and restore. I think Councillor Vandal, was it the monkey cages, etc. I mean we know we need to do things there and here's what you have to remember.

With Partners in the Park, independent, not-for-profit, there's no charge to go to the Lyric Theatre. There's no charge to go to the art gallery. Once a year Mr. Speaker for the Zoological Society, the Mayors' Office sponsors free zoo day. It's on Canada Day. It's a celebration. Happy to do that so that everybody can enjoy some of the wonderful assets we have. But let's make sure they're assets that are going to be there for a long time and let's make sure they live up to their potential.

And Mr. Speaker, the best thing that I heard was when the stakeholders were appearing at Executive Policy Committee last week and basically said they want to work with CUPE. I think it's important to understand that CUPE, which is our public service, cares about this park. You know, when we heard George speak earlier, you could see the passion. But let me tell you something, okay, the Assiniboine Park Enterprises, they're also part of our public service. They care too and this isn't Councillor Clement's decision or Sam Katz's decision or anybody else on the floor of Council, our public service came up with this recommendation Mr. Speaker. And I assumed they came up with it because as Councillor Vandal told us, they've been around for seven years and they finally came to the conclusion, what will work best. And I encourage everybody here to support this Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers. Councillor Steeves, closing.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to read from page 4,006 of the report this appears in front of the Council this morning, this afternoon, pardon me, quote, July 26th, 2006, Council adopted in principal a new partnership model for governance of Assiniboine Park and Forests. Characterized by the creation of a new not-for-profit organization led by an overarching board and operating independently from the city under long-term agreement with the City of Winnipeg in order to lead and manage the overall park and its amenities, with the city retaining ownership of all properties and provide an annual operating grant.

The new government's model is expected to provide overall strategic direction to the entire park and forest complex, including responsibility for raising and leveraging new funds, to compliment the City of Winnipeg annual operating grant for the management and redevelopment of the city's premier green space. The corporation would be established as a not-for-profit organization pursuant to the Manitoba Corporations Act. It would be accountable to the City Council through the Executive Policy Committee, assurances that protect overall public interest regarding free park access, park development, control, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. The Mayor would select the corporation's board chair, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, endorsed unanimously by this Council almost one year ago.

Today, before this Council again, that a new governance structure be approved for Assiniboine Park and Forest, beginning with the creation of a not-for-profit corporation, a corporation that would operate independently from the City of Winnipeg with a mandate to lead, manage, fundraise, restore and redevelop the overall park and its amenity, that the corporation assume responsibility for management of Assiniboine Park and Forest in a phased in approach as contemplated by the report of the acting director. That the initial board of directors of the corporation be established by the

Mayor in selecting the board, chair, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Does this sound familiar Mr. Speaker?

How can one year ago this Council endorse something and give our administration for need and direction, and then one year later with the same issue on the table, my colleague who voted for this one year ago now says quote, this is an abdication of responsibility, quote, we should take our responsibility seriously, quote, we should not hand over our tarnished jewel.

Councillor Gerbasi voted for this a year ago but today we cannot expect our employees to go along with this. Today, quote, new governance structure will help with the commercialization of the park, quote, I am not sure this will serve the public interest. And what did we hear from Councillor Thomas today who one year ago voted in favour of this?

One year ago we gave our administration this direction, one, almost a full year ago. Today, when it comes back, the adjectives used to describe it coming back, quote, grossly premature. This is what's frustrating, Mr. Speaker. This has been on the table in black and white and we all supported it one year ago, because we all agreed we needed a direction for this park. That was exactly what we said and it's in the report.

If you took the time in this occasion to read it Mr. Speaker, it's right there. Like there's no getting around what this Council said in July of 2006. I am not in a position regrettably to excuse anybody, same for Councillors Vandal, Nordman, Leipsic, Browaty and Fielding. If they were to stand up and one of them did and say they don't agree with our direction, I ought to respect that. I mean I have to acknowledge that they weren't around at that time for that vote and things change and that's sometimes the way it is. But, to stand up now and take a position that is so diametrically opposed to the position you took eleven months ago.

When this vote comes and goes Mr. Speaker and I'm sure there's going to be people who'll going to stand up and vote against this report, in my heart, I'm going to be looking at these people and wondering what in the heck happened here. What happened to you? What changed?

Why did you give the administration this exact direction in July of 2006 and why are you now pulling the rug out ostensibly or trying to, pull the rug out from under their feet right now? Sometimes, ladies and gentlemen of this honourable Council, when we make decisions, the expectation, the expectation from our administration is that we are going to stick with a decision. It's not unfair of our administration to expect that. They have every right to expect that. Can you imagine just for a second, the frustration of some of our administrators who have been kicking away at this file over the course of the last year, trying to get this to where it is today, only to hear some of the things that we've heard in the chamber today?

This is not something that we are surprising people with today. We cannot be accused of not having all of our carrots on the table for a full eleven month, eleven month period. Whether you like this or don't like this, please, Members of Council, accept the history on this matter. Take responsibility for the decisions you have made and take responsibility for the direction you have given our administration.

It's been said many times already in this debate, we cannot presuppose where this new government structure is going to go in terms of a strategic plan and a new management structure. We recognize and completely acknowledge the fairness of the concerns. I do not believe Mr. Speaker, that we are in a position to say whether or not these concerns will be founded or not. They may well be one hundred percent spot on. They may well be one hundred percent off the mark. There is simply no way Mr. Speaker that any human being could know where this is going to land, six months from now with the strategic plan or twelve months from now with the management plan.

I respect people's right to debate, but please understand and please accept that this Council has been straightforward in its decision and its intention on this matter and I want us to go forward unanimously in good faith, on the path that we asked our administration to pursue almost one year ago. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillors ready for the vote. Recorded vote has been called for. Councillor Gerbasi has called for recorded vote. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: It's carried. Motions, none. Consideration of By-laws, none. Question period. Oh pardon me, there's a report of date May 28th. I'm sorry Councillor Steeves, you're on, May 28.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MAY 28, 2007

Councillor Steeves: Categorically, it could only be described as anticlimactic, I'll move that report Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. No questions. Any questions of the Chair, none. Councillor Clement, my leader, you're on.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED MAY 29, 2007

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the report of the Committee on Infrastructure and Renewal and I'll move Clause 1 as a consent Item.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. You have a report dated June 20, 2007.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED JUNE 20, 2007

Councillor Clement: Yes Mr. Speaker. There's a report with two items on it and it was circulated earlier this morning and we had a special meeting this morning to deal with the two items and I'll move items 1 and 2 as consent.

Mr. Speaker: You want to move both together.

Councillor Clement: I'll move them both.

Mr. Speaker: Or should we do it separately? Let's move number 1. St. Anne's, all in favour, contrary? Carried. Item No. 2, Plessis Road, all in favour, contrary? Carried. Motions if any, you have a motion?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS MOTIONS

Councillor Clement: Yes. Motion No. 2 Mr. Speaker and I'll move Motion No. 2. Do you want me to explain it?

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Clement
Seconded by Councillor Browaty

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg enacted a new Boulevard Maintenance By-law on May 16, 2007;

AND WHEREAS the new Boulevard Maintenance By-law allows property owners to install non-standard boulevard treatments on boulevards adjacent to their properties on residential streets without the need for a permit;

AND WHEREAS there are numerous underground structures, such as utility cables, wires and pipes, located below the surface of boulevards on residential streets;

AND WHEREAS the installation of non-standard boulevard treatments may involve excavating below the surface of boulevards;

AND WHEREAS such excavations could damage underground structures and could result in harm to people and the structures;

AND WHEREAS June and July are the months during which the installation of many non-standard boulevard treatments, such as the planting of flowers and other plants, can be expected to take place;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in the interests of public safety and the protection of underground structures, the Boulevard Maintenance By-law No. 125/2007 be amended by adding the following immediately after subsection 5(1):

5(1.1) Prior to making any excavation in a boulevard, the owner or occupant of property must contact utilities and other owners of underground structures to ensure that no underground structures will be disturbed or damaged by the proposed excavation.

Mr. Speaker: Well I don't think it needs to be explained. I'm sure everybody's in favour, all in favour, contrary? Carried. Now it is a By-law, introduce the By-law.

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

Councillor Clement: There's no By-laws.

Mr. Speaker: Yes there is right now. Councillor Clement there is a By-law that's just been handed over to us. The Boulevard Maintenance By-law, this is what you, we voted on. Yes, read the By-law. Yeah, I knew that. Bill I knew that a long time ago.

Councillor Clement: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-law 136/2007 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 136/2007.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law 136/2007 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 136/2007.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 136/2007 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Thank you Councillor Clement, you see how fast we can get By-laws. Just a snap of the finger, the By-law was here. Okay, any questions? Questions, yes, Councillor Swandel followed by Councillor Smith.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Councillor Clement, we've see recent reports in the newspaper regarding problems with our gravel backlanes, I for one as many Councillors have some of these gravel backlanes, we've, those of us who have been here for a bit know the history and the problems with trying to address them through the local improvement process. I guess my question has to, seeing that we have a capital renewal program for backlanes, I'm assuming that we use that for

concrete works on paved backlanes, why do we not have a capital improvement backlanes or program for gravel backlanes as well?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I believe that the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker is that City Council's policy on backlanes that are gravel is that they are local improvements and that's why there's no money placed in the capital to do improvements in the backlanes because there inlays and the people who live there have to vote on it as a local improvement to have them upgraded.

Mr. Speaker: Your second supplementary Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I can see where the upgrade of a gravel backlane to a concrete backlane or an oil/asphalt service could be considered an improvement, but the addition of materials as the capital renewal of that backlane, like they would do in an already paved or asphalt backlane, I fail to see how that would only benefit the local property owners any different than the repaving of an asphalt or concrete backlane. Perhaps you could answer further, Mr.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement. That was a form of a question.

Councillor Clement: I think the answer is the same, under the current budget flipping over from capital to current, the money for maintenance in backlanes is basically spent for grading them and they're graded on request. Usually on the request of local Councillors and there is no provision to do anything to them other than that at the present time. If somebody thinks that that's a good idea, that it could be raised during the budget I suppose, as something that could be reviewed to be changed. But, I, at the present time, they are strictly local improvements and that's how they're dealt with.

Mr. Speaker: Your final supplementary.

Councillor Swandel: Just, you know, I guess they could very succinctly, why do we pay for pavement, new pavement on paved backlanes but we don't pay for new gravel on gravel backlanes. I fail to see how that's local improvement.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well first of all, the paved streets, most of them anyway since 1971, have been improved by developers, not by the city. The city maintains them. And all new streets are built to full development standards, to certain thicknesses and widths and those types of things through the planning reports. And that's how they're done. If somebody wants a street upgraded from a type two oiled surface to a concrete surface that is also a local improvement. So we maintain concrete streets to concrete street standards. We maintain type two oiled surfaces to type two oiled surface standards and we maintain gravel surfaces which you'll find on the periphery of the city. I have some, I know Councillor Swandel has some, I know Councillor Wyatt and O'Shaughnessy have and we maintain those to a gravel-level of construction. I'm not aware of a fourth type. Those are the only three types of roads that I believe that we have. We do have some asphalt sorry, as well and anybody that's paid for asphalt gets them maintained to that level of service. So whatever anybody has paid for, through the history of their lot being created or their street being created, that's what we maintain. But we don't upgrade beyond that other than by local improvement, whether it's a front street or whether it's the backlane. And we can always review those things but that's the way that it sits right now. So I mean you're asking me the question and I didn't make all the rules up, I just, that's the answer to them.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Councillor Clement, why do we wait for complaints before we fix the potholes? Why not have a Public Works employee drive down our streets and note the potholes? The department can then fix them. Why don't we do that procedure?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well, that's a really interesting question because I believe that we have about five or six of these types of machines that are being used within the City of Winnipeg. And they are being controlled by the, what I'm going to call central services and spend virtually ninety percent of their time in the central core of the city refilling potholes. And I know this because I actually spoke to one of my foremen yesterday and was complaining why they hadn't solved some of the potholes in my area and I was told well they got so far and then they called the machines back downtown because that's the priority and so I was a little frustrated to hear that frankly because I have a few potholes out my way too. But in terms of being proactive, the, I don't know how you handle your constituency, Harvey, but if I have, when I drive around and I spot things I point them out. Many times when I'm pointing things out I find out that they already are dealing with that and that's the answer. So, they are proactive. They are doing it all day long. They, there's just a lot of them and if they're not getting to them as fast as they should in your neck of the woods if you can imagine what we're putting up with in the suburbs because most of the machine time is downtown.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. Our goal in today's Winnipeg Free Press suggest that, my information been all gravel backlanes are graded once a year or as warranted, if this are soft spots or low spots they are filled in. My experience with my calls to Public Works is that gravel backlanes can only be improved through local improvements. I've had very limited success in getting small amounts of gravel added to backlanes and in a lot of cases they haven't been able to do that. If in fact gravel backlanes are maintained at gravel backlane levels, why are not small amounts of gravel being provided to do these low spots and fill-ins?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well that's probably the way that that question was put, up to the discretion of the supervisor in that particular section of the city, because my understanding is that these lanes have to be graded to a drivable state and if they have to fill some holes to make that happen, I'm assuming under regular maintenance that they're doing that. And I know personally, I don't have very many of those types of lanes, I used to have a lot at one time when I represented Fort Garry. And I know that from time to time, that they put some gravel into those potholes and when they're graded, you know, they were able to get a little bit flatter. But I suspect that that's more to do with the general attitude of the supervisor than it is with the actual By-law itself.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just, you the last answer I got from the Chair of Infrastructure and Public, Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works seem to get into the area of maintenance and the operating budget as opposed to the capital budget. In this year's capital budget we have five projects being funded for the reconstruction of concrete backlanes or six perhaps. I want to know why it is that these concrete backlanes can be reconstructed but gravel backlanes cannot unless we're using the local improvement process.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well that's a very interesting question too, Mr. Speaker. Because frankly, my understanding was that concrete backlanes because people also have a front street, we're actual (in audible) and we were getting a lot of consternation from some of our colleagues in the inner city who had a lot of these type of backlanes that were disintegrating and there was a decision made a couple of years ago to start putting money into that and there was a rethinking I think of concrete backlanes and so we started to fix some of them. But I don't know that we've actually ever changed the By-law so I don't have a better answer than that for you, but I think it was just because we thought we would try to be a little bit helpful in that area.

Mr. Speaker: Second supplementary Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Just a quick supplementary Mr. Speaker, can we get some sort of a commitment that we will ask the administration to explore the inclusion of gravel backlanes as capital projects and prioritize some of the worst ones in the city going forward in the 2008 budget.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I've got no problem with that suggestion. The, but I think its current budget not capital. If you're talking about a gravel backlane having some gravel added to it I don't think that's capital. Capital, capital items are usually 100,000 dollars or more.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well I tried to answer him. He just doesn't want to hear what I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: I know he doesn't. Look, you lasted the full ten minutes. The full ten minutes. Question period has expired. Standing Policy Committee on Finance, Councillor O'Shaughnessy, report of June 11, 2007.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE DATED JUNE 11, 2007

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured to introduce the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Finance for June 11, 2007 and I move the adoption of the consent Agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, contrary? Carried. Motions, none. By-laws, none. Question period. I'll take Councillor Steeves first and then Councillor Swandel.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Steeves: Thanks Mr. Speaker. I don't expect to have any information on this today but maybe the Chair can take it under advisement and get back to us. With the last federal budget that came down, there was much ado about the increase funding to provinces, to fix the fiscal imbalance at the time and I don't feel like I have a great sense of what Manitoba got in terms of increase funding, the same funding or decreased funding and I would like to know if there is any way of us getting us in synced, I guess detailed, how much money our provincial government was getting from the federal government before the budget, how much they're getting after with the view to maybe seeing if the City of Winnipeg might fit into some of the program reserves that are setup, or increased.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I think the question would be better asked of his buddy who shares jurisdiction over some of the same areas as his ward, Finance Minister Selinger, however I will undertake to ask the provincial government to provide that and I know in the spirit of cooperation, there has been development in ourselves and the province, that they will reply as singly and completely.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel, your first.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. At the Council meeting in April I'd asked the Chair of Finance the question regarding open capital projects that were over five years of age and also on outstanding expropriation matters that were alluded to, like the liability was. I received the response from the administration that suggested we had thirty million dollars, thirty million dollars of projects five years of age or older, still capital projects that are still open and further that we have a liability of worst case scenario, liability of 13.9 million dollars in expropriation that's funded to 16.1 million dollars. My question through you Mr. Speaker to the Chair of Finance, is the worst case scenario statement is

easy to do the math on it; it doesn't give a most likely case scenario on expropriations, could the Chair enlighten us what the over funding would be relative to the most likely case scenario on expropriations.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Last numbers I have and I think some settlements have occurred since, would be in the neighbourhood of a most likely scenario eight million dollars and a most optimistic scenario of just under five million.

Mr. Speaker: Your second supplementary Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In 2006 the capital budget included an amount of special innovative capital of 650,000 dollars. As of the end of February, that, 2007, that 2006 special innovative capital had not been touched. Is the money earmarked for something specific and if not, will it be made available for projects this year or will it be put forward into the 2008 capital, or budget at that time.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: You're doing a great job of filling potholes and killing our slush funds sir, thank you. That's my knowledge. That money is not earmarked nor could it be earmarked from within a prior year's capital or the current year's capital without it coming before this Council. I will have a very specific answer for you from the department, for all Members of Council and I must say that, I gave you fairly round numbers in answer to your first question, I'll get very specific numbers for you and all Members of the Council to that question as well.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the answer. I look forward to the information coming forward. That 650,000 dollars would probably go a long way to dealing with some more gravel back lane issues. I guess my final question to the Chair is, have you or will you consider using your committee as some form of a treasury board or like a treasury board model to help us deal with some of these matters, so that we're dealing with them in more of a current fashion as opposed to reacting when we see these monies mounting and not be allocated to specific projects.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Yes and that project is being worked on and now that the work load is lightened a little bit, it will receive a higher priority.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions. The Secretariat Committee report of May 14, 2007, this report is self-explanatory and I'll ask Councillor Browaty who sits on the committee to introduce it on my behalf.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE DATED MAY 14, 2007

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured to move the consent agenda Item No. 1 on your behalf as Chair of the Secretariat Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pull the item off the agenda.

Mr. Speaker: Pardon?

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd like to speak to the item.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor.

Councillor Browaty: This recommendation from the Secretariat Committee is a formalization of the current practice regarding the use of the City's crest by Councillors for various ward activities. Basically it allows Councillors to use the crest on items such as business cards, newsletters and advertisements. As the recommendation states, other users require approval of the Secretariat Committee and items related

to fundraising require approval of E.P.C. Any further questions?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: My question has to do with the logo that was adopted by the previous Council under Mayor Glen Murray and that logo seems to be disappearing from the promotional materials and that might be what people want.

But my point that I wanted to raise today, what some people would like to see that perhaps. But my point I'd like to raise and I'm not sure of the best way, perhaps Secretariat Committee can consider that, but according to this, Executive Policy Committee has the authority to make the decisions about fundraising and I guess it seems to me that there has not been any public discussion about this.

There hasn't been any discussion with non E.P.C. Members of Council. If there has been discussion at E.P.C., I'm not aware if it's in public. And I feel that that logo was adopted by this Council. We were using it. A lot of my constituents like it on their pins and their products and things that, and I mean I'd like to see us use both because I think the crest has lots of merit as well.

But I just, I'd like, the reason I'm standing today is I think there should be some public discussion about an issue like this. I think we should find out what citizens want or at least find out what at least the fifteen Members of Council want and there hasn't been any discussion and I just wanted to raise that point today. I think there should be discussion on this issue.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty, closing.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you for your comment. My understanding is this particular motion has nothing to do relating to the crest verses the logo but that is definitely a good item that we should bring up at a future Secretariat Committee. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, thank you. All in favour of the clause, opposed? None, it's carried and that is it Councillors. We've had a good exercise here this morning. Somebody wants to speak towards the adjournment? Councillor Swandel?

Councillor Swandel: I thought we would have a question period for Secretariat Committee. I'd love to grill.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves moves adjournment. All in favour, contrary? Carried. Roll call, madam clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council Adjourned at 2:18 P.M.