COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday September 26, 2007

The Council met at 9:36 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Thomas.

ROLL CALL

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

Mr. Speaker: Yes thank you. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker just a Point of order if I may.

Mr. Speaker: What is it? What is your Point of order?

Councillor Steeves: The reason I bring this up now is so maybe the Clerk and yourself will have a chance to consider this during delegations. I'm aware that there is a Notice of Motion coming forward that one Councillor is going to ask to be considered this morning, that may be received and people might want to hear that. That's on the EPC section, this is with respect to the Police Advisory Board generally and then it's at the end of the agenda as well under the Protection and Community Services Committee.

So as its set up right now if this Committee wishes to hear the matter under the EPC section then there could be a full kind of debate on that, and then we go through the balance of the agenda and have a full debate at the end of the agenda. I am wondering if there is a way to combine it so we could do it all in one fell swoop without having to have two full debates. People can speak once to the issue. Does that make sense?

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker. Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: If Councillor Steeves is speaking to Item 2, is that Motion 2? If so, I was advised by the Clerk that because it's a stand alone Motion that it's not amending the clause.

Mr. Speaker: It would be automatic referral.

Councillor Gerbasi: That it has to be heard separately under EPC. That's why it was done that way. I would have been fine if that was appropriate procedurally but I was advised by the Clerk.

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker I'm not challenging the ruling of the Clerk. I completely agree but I'm wondering if as gentlemen and gentlewomen around this table given that we might not want to have two full debates on this, maybe we could combine all of this Motion with the report, with the amendments, so people could have a chance to say their piece on the issue one time and we could move through it. That's my respectful suggestion. I don't know if it's possible.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves we'll proceed as is what is on the agenda. That Motion is not really on the table to happen.

Councillor Steeves: Okay, I just thought it might assist Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you for your concern.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Welcome guests and announcements. We don't have any.

A Condolence Motion for Charlie Boyce, father of Kenny Boyce. Would the Clerk please read it and we'll have a moment of silence.

Motion
Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz
Seconded by Councillor Leipsic

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Charlie Boyce, father of Kenny Boyce, Manager of Film and Special Events, which occurred on September 25, 2007.

This Council extends to Kenny Boyce and his family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Everyone please rise. (Moment of silence).

MINUTES

Councillor Nordman moves the Minutes of the meeting held on July 18, 2007 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Thomas: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes what's your Point of order?

Councillor Thomas: When we were disrupted before, I guess it threw everybody a little bit off kilter because it wasn't in order but we missed the introduction of our page, Simone Jaman who goes to Miles MacDonnell Collegiate and resides in our ward.

Mr. Speaker: I know, she wasn't here, present when we were dealing with that. I'm going to introduce her now.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Simone Jaman, Miles MacDonnell Collegiate, resides in the Elmwood - East Kildonan Ward, welcome. Simone was busy distributing material. That's why I didn't do it until…

Delegations. Nick Ternette, you have 10 minutes.

DELEGATIONS

Nick Ternette: Mayor Sam Katz, members of City Council, Mr. Speaker. Of course I do share my disappointment with environmentalists concerning the proposed Non-Essential Pesticide Use By-law which passed the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services as well as the Executive Policy Committee.

Philosophically at least though, the fact that EPC is even prepared to recognize that we need such a By-law is significant, concerning that in the past, City Councillors refused to deal with the issue of pesticides and the environment. However as I stated previously, these rules are too weak to protect people in the long run or the environment.

I would of at least hoped that as a result of those public meetings that were held on May the 29th and 30th, 2007, where over 60 delegations appeared that Winnipeg would have followed Brandon's example to enact a by-law, a pesticide by-law that would not only allow for a 30 metre pesticide free buffer zone around private properties but also respect the use of certain chemicals on public properties.

But as summarized by the Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Essential Pesticide Use, those of us in support of pesticide regulations clearly argued, and it was stated in the report on the issue of health effects. In fact, the David Suzuki Foundation says that after reviewing poison control records across the country, it was found that pesticide poisons more than 6,000 Canadians, 6,000 Canadians every year, and almost half of them are children younger than six.

Also the Canadian Cancer Society suggests that there is a direct link between pesticides and certain types of cancer. It is important to me that there is a recognition of the link between cancers such as non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma which I went through in the last two years and testicular cancer to the use of pesticides. As well as the link between pesticides used and the 3% of Canadians who suffer from multiple chemical sensitivity (MCS).

The city of Toronto has legislative control over the use of pesticides states that "the evidence is persuasive that the greater susceptibility of pregnant women and fetuses, infants, children and the elderly justifies the prudent avoidance and precautionary measures to limit unnecessary exposure to pesticides for these vulnerable sub-populations. As well as the environmental effects due to the use of pesticides.

Furthermore, the effects of pesticides on the environment are very clear. While designed to kill certain organisms, pesticides can have a negative effect on the biodiversity. Many pesticides such as DDT can linger for a long time in the environment and even, and even enter the food chain. Pesticides are also able to travel long distance even if they are applied locally."

But for someone who has been an activist at City Hall since the formation of Unicity in 1971 and has followed the politics of this City during that time, I am encouraged that for once Councillors have not become more regressive or even maintained the status quo per say.

For a City that has a Council that generally has shown no political will to make change, for example Winnipeg is the only major city who continues to use malathion to spray for mosquitoes and the only major city in North America that refuses to have a Police Commission to governance of the police force, the fact that Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services as well as EPC is even considering, as Councillor Gerbasi has stated, baby steps, in regards to restricting non-essential use of pesticides, is a positive step forward.

But the proof will be in the pudding that is the actual drafting of the by-law, the content of the by-law not just the philosophical implications which have been talked about today.

Let us now examine some of the recommendations being made and some of the pitfalls that may rise from them that ought to be looked at. No. 1 recommendation requiring the use of signage by commercial applicators to notify citizens of pesticide use. Even though the City does post signs when they use pesticides which includes information on the pesticides used, the registration number, what its intended to do or control, and a contact number to call, it is not clear whether the signs will state the nature of the toxic chemical it contains and what impact it could have on people and animals. As someone has said in the meetings that we've had before, at least on the cigarette packages you see pictures of cancer-ridden lungs and I would like, hopefully hope that the by-law contains visual imagery to be put on those signs.

And even more important what is lacking is how large the signs should be and are they accessible to visually impaired people? In fact I just had cataract surgery so I'm quite well aware that I have a visual impairment and it's difficult to see signs. And where the signs should be posted so that people can actually see them. They should be required to be sufficiently large along with pictures and a description of what the chemicals are intended to do and the harm they can do.

While no doubt, and I know that for a fact, commercial companies do post signs, I wonder if any of you have ever seen the size of them? Two, three by inches by five inches. They're so small that you could easily miss them unless you're crawling along the grass sometimes. In fact my wife and I did miss signs in the front of our boulevard a few years ago and lost a cat to the poisons being sprayed there at that time.

But most importantly this by-law and this is the difficulty, will not apply to residents who choose to use pesticides on their own property. Why is this a problem? Firstly it's discriminatory and I think there is an issue here that has to be looked at that nobody has really looked at. You really can't pass a by-law that applies to one set of people and not to another set of people. If you are going to apply it to the commercial applicators you've got to apply it to people who use it also as far as I'm concerned.

And secondly more importantly in this case I will give some credit, commercial companies at least apply pesticides professionally while many homeowners will disregard directions causing as far as I'm concerned even more harm to individuals and the environment.

2. Allowing individuals who object to pesticides used to request a buffer zone around their property. While this recommendation is positive as it pertains to the City as well as the commercial companies, I would urge the City to recommend as Brandon has, at least a 30 metre buffer zone for around those properties and that of course will be part of the pudding to see whether that will be in the content.

I would also urge the City, as I say, what was most disturbing to me however is that these buffer zones will not apply to individual property owners at this time. And that is what really bothers me. If that means that if a person who objects to pesticides lives beside someone who wants to use pesticides they really wouldn't be able to get a buffer zone wide enough to be able to protect their property. So as such this I think significantly undermines the impact that buffer zones could have on individual properties and neighbourhoods as a whole.

For example in Wolseley where we live the use of buffer zones for mosquito spraying is used to protect not only individual properties but in fact to protect the whole neighbourhood and that is the essence of why one needs to have buffer zones. Buffer zones protect not only individuals but collectively the neighbourhood in which people live in.

3. Recommends that the City develop an implementation plan for a public education campaign. And that's the most significant element of this whole, of this particular by-law at this stage. This of course I think is an extremely positive step precisely because of the lack of political will at City Hall. A major public and I'm talking about a major public education campaign needs to be organized. That goes far beyond what was stated supporting all the City does at the present time, a series of organic lawn care workshops run by Manitoba Eco Network.

It is important to hold conferences, seminars, public forums and workshops throughout all of Winnipeg. All year long. Meaning the inner city and suburbia and the reason I'm putting this little part in is because I've been noticing that every public meeting that's been held lately all are being held in the inner city. Nothing is being discussed in suburbia. All civic issues tend to wind up in the inner city and I think in order to deal with the issue of the long-term effects of pesticides on care, suburbanites are just as much interested in this issue as the inner city residents are.

And we need to try to engage hundreds of people on this issue. The last time that this happened as far as I'm concerned in my experience since 1971 was when former Mayor Glen Murray's New Deal, introduction of the New Deal around the communities, which attracted over 2,000 people. I think if we are really going to have a real by-law we need to attract a lot of people, pros and cons on all sides of the issues in order to have a real public debate about the use of the pesticides.

These conferences, seminars, public forums and workshops should include professionals from both sides of the issue. For example, Cancer Care and medical professions, David Suzuki, all of the various environmentalists, et cetera as well as the companies that sell pesticides and that use them on lawn care and whatever else.

This will require a significant monetary investment as well as working with the media. Otherwise, as far as I'm concerned, because the media will have to do a lot of work in educating the public on this issue. This issue is only becoming aware just as much as the Anti-Smoking By-law became aware. Public education is the essence as the public comes to express their will more and more, I will, I am sure that Council will move towards a total ban on pesticides just as they did for a total ban on public smoking. We need to progress beyond these baby steps

towards determining what kind of pesticides this by-law is going to have.

Lastly I'm a little concerned that this by-law will be reviewed in two years time. I think that an educational campaign can take at least a year, a full year, full out. And I think that the time line is simply too long because I think one year of full public education and then coming back to have a real debate here with a packed hall here with people concerning about the issue for both the pro and con position on pesticides is much faster and much more durable. Two years people will forget because the issue is going to be spread out too long.

So I would really urge if somebody would like to at least move an amendment on that issue that this by-law be reviewed in one year instead of two years because I think one year is more than enough time to provide the parameters for a good pesticide by-law in Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Nick Ternette: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions? No questions? Thank you Mr. Ternette.

Nick Ternette: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Next delegation on the same subject is David Hinton. Mr. Hinton you have five minutes.

David Hinton: Thank you very much. Good morning. My name is David Hinton and thank you for the opportunity to give you some feedback from the green industry on the pesticide issue.

I am Vice-President of Landscape Manitoba and have owned and operated a lawn care company in Winnipeg for the last 22 years. I am also the first Manitoban to obtain the designation of Certified Landscape Professional issued by the Canadian Nursery and Landscape Association.

Landscape Manitoba represents the green industry in Winnipeg and the rest of the Province. Our members include garden centres, nursery growers, landscape installation and maintenance companies, wholesale and supply distributors and the lawn care companies.

I want to state that we are pro plant health. We are not pro pesticide. Our businesses are successful not because we use pesticides. We are successful because we help our customers have beautiful lawns and gardens. We use both natural and synthetic pesticides only as tools to control specific problems in our customer's valuable landscapes.

Landscape Manitoba recognizes the great work done by the Ad Hoc Committee. The recommendations that have been put forward represent a common sense approach to a very complex issue. We applaud the Committee's diligence to wade through what must have been a huge mountain of information and come up with a by-law that actually makes sense.

Notifying customers and neighbours with a sign when pesticides are used on a property makes sense and has worked well in other jurisdictions like Ontario.

We are not opposed to the requirement of a buffer zone around a property if it is implemented as in Brandon. The by-law in Brandon requires that medical proof that a sensitivity to a pesticide exists before a buffer zone is put in place.

After weeks of research it is obvious that the Committee realizes that banning pesticides out right is not practical or enforceable. Some feel the proposed by-law is not restrictive enough and naively think that you should just ban all pesticides. Other communities in Canada have tried complete bans only to find that they do not work. Homeowners can still legally purchase the products at garden centres, hardware stores and other retail locations. Banning takes the products out of the hands of people properly trained to use them. Pesticide use can actually increase as homeowners who used to rely on professional lawn care companies are forced to take matters into their own hands.

The best way to actually reduce the use of pesticides is to reduce the need for them. Healthy, well maintained yards and gardens require fewer pesticides. When your lawn is healthy and strong, the weeds and insects have a hard time competing. We should focus on increasing the maintenance of City property. Properly maintaining the City green spaces will result in fewer weed seeds blowing in from our parks and boulevards and seeding themselves on residential lawns. Better green space management will result in less pesticide use.

By-laws that ban pesticide products have no chance to control pesticide use as the products can still legally, are still legally for sale at retail stores. When homeowners are faced with ants all over their patios or bugs on their roses, they will continue to legally purchase pesticides to protect their properties.

I believe the Ad Hoc Committee recognizes that the City, that the citizens of Winnipeg are not irresponsible when it comes to looking after their properties. Winnipeggers can read and follow a label and understand that pesticides should only be used when required. We recommend that any restriction on pesticide usage only come from Health Canada. Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency is the authority on pesticides and must approve the use and sale of all pesticides in Canada.

The PMRA has over 400 scientists, toxicologists and doctors who work full time to ensure that any pesticide sold in Canada does not pose any unacceptable risk to people or the environment. Years of testing and research is done and only when a product passes all criteria is it allowed to be sold and used in Canada. Health Canada has the toughest registration process in the world and re-evaluates products on a regular basis to ensure safety. The Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA in the U.S. and the World Health Organization all agree with Health Canada on the use of these products.

We feel the City should not be involved with the evaluating, with evaluating the health and safety of particular products as the testing has already been done by Health Canada. The City should spend its time and limited resources on issues within its control.

So to sum up, Landscape Manitoba agrees with the Ad Hoc Committee's common sense recommendations. We feel that restrictions on particular pesticides should only come from the experts at Health Canada. If there are any new concerns with any of the products used for pest control in Canada, the PMRA will restrict their use immediately. And as the availability of effective, natural alternatives increases, homeowners and the green industry will move to these products without the need for an unenforceable by-law. Increasing the maintenance of our City green spaces and educating the public to properly maintain their landscapes will result in the largest reduction of pesticide use and one great looking City. Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any questions? No questions. Thank you for your appearance here today.

Next delegation is Ralf Klenke on behalf of Nutri-Lawn Winnipeg in opposition to Item 7. Sir you have 10 minutes.

Ralf Klenke: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Speaker, Councillors. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I guess the most interesting thing is that I'm standing here as the owner of a lawn care company, Nutri-Lawn and I actually think that the proposed law does not go far enough or do what it's supposed to do. I believe that today, Council is simply rubber stamping the recommendation by the EPC, and nevertheless I've decided to make my point here so that it's, it is at least on the record and I get to say I told you so.

I state again that I'm in favour of drastic reduction of pesticide use but I'm against this proposed law since it does not achieve the goal but is in fact counter-productive. I do not support any

legislation that in fact increases use of pesticides behind a mask of ill conceived and poorly copied by-laws from other municipalities.

Here are some facts: More than 80% of pesticides for lawns sold in Canada are sold retail to end users. End users are not trained or licensed. End users will often use so-called weed and feed products that apply pesticides liberally and unnecessarily. End users will store products unsafely in their garages, accessible to children. And I didn't think I would ever hear me say this but I actually agree with Nick Ternette. It's kind of like last time Councillor Gerbasi and, agreeing with Gord Steeves. But yes, there is 6,000 cases of pesticide poisoning which will increase further if we take the products away from the professional and leave it in the hands of the homeowners to go out and buy products, put them in their garage and make them accessible to children. End users will not dispose of empty containers in an environmentally acceptable manner as well.

Professional companies on the other hand use less than 20% of the product, use trained and licensed applicators, use IPM, which is integrated pest management principles, use the minimum of pesticides as required, do not blanket apply and dispose of the empty containers according to the guidelines.

With regards to the proposed by-law, the first part of the by-law states that commercial companies will be required to use signage after application. In case you haven't noticed all professional companies do that already and I completely disagree with the note that we had before about the size. Our signs are actually in most cases, the size of a paper and we don't mind having it that size because obviously for us it's not only a warning but it's also an advertising feature.

Why does this by-law not require homeowners to do the same? And again I agree with Nick Ternette on this one. Why do we have a double standard that discriminates against the party that is better trained and uses less product? Aren't we trying to protect somebody? How can we protect anybody if a large majority can use the pesticides without posting? This is like checking only commercial vehicles for speeding and letting everyone else get away with it. It does not make sense.

I believe this by-law is unnecessary as proposed. In fact I'm convinced it's counter-productive to the stated goal. It's discriminatory against professionals but encourages untrained users to apply pesticides themselves without posting anything.

The second part of the by-law asks for a buffer zone around properties. It is, in fact allows homeowners to decide for their neighbours if the neighbour is allowed to have his property treated by professionals or not. So if my neighbour decides that he or she does not want pesticides, it is effectively illegal for me to hire a professional trained applicator. Who is that neighbour to have the right to decide that for me? I do not want to go to the store, buy and use a product, I want a professional to do it right. Because I happen to have such a neighbour I will not stop to care for my property value. I want to maintain the value of my landscaping. I do not want to but I will have do go to the store, get the product myself and apply it and my neighbour who caused me to do all that, I won't tell him when and what I apply because there is no law regarding the homeowner and that neighbour who caused me all this trouble, he can go to hell.

This is in effect, is the effect of the proposed by-law. Unless you're willing to extend this by-law to include all users and effectively stop them from running to the stores, buying lots of product and applying them indiscriminately without posting signs or respecting buffer zones. This proposed by-law is actually an insult to the law maker.

The recommendation can only be acceptable if a doctor's note is required by the homeowner seeking a buffer zone as Brandon's by-law does. And in the requirement it exists to officially notify all effected homeowners in the buffer zone so they know that their rights to care for

their property is affected and a possible recourse system exists for the affected homeowner who wants to care for his property but does not want to do it illegally himself.

Both (inaudible) by-laws are useless and we are finding counter-productive to the goal of pesticide reduction. It seems law makers are giving into the demands of a very vocal minority. Last week when I was standing here I outlined how to achieve substantial reduction without discriminating or risk of increased use by untrained homeowners.

And in my eyes, and there is many examples for this, the only way to change behaviour of homeowners is through their pocket book. Here is what works. A by-law that in fact increases the price of pesticides on retail shelves by a factor of three over time and the requirement of a pesticide applicator's licence to purchase pesticides. Additional revenues are allocated 20% to the stores for the administration and collection of the levy and 80% to the City.

The money will be used to educate, do the campaign that everybody is talking about, promote organic alternatives to the property. Solutions will actually reduce usage substantially to aid funds for education, create funds for alternatives on City land, allow homeowners a choice and allow professionals to do their job but at a higher cost.

To end my presentation I would like to address a major argument from Councillor Gerbasi. She claims pesticide bans work. They actually reduce usage and not increase it by taking it away from the professionals and driving people to the stores. If you look at Quebec they have a Province-wide ban on cosmetic pesticides. The user rates there are according to Councillor Gerbasi 14% while we have 50%. And that is an argument to the fact that pesticide bans work.

The only thing that Councillor Gerbasi failed to mention is that those products are all banned from retail shelves in Quebec. So with the ban and also no products on the shelves, it's actually surprising that we still have 14% usage rate in Quebec, and I wonder where that comes from. Obviously people still have a need for the product and they will get them somewhere else and still use them.

Councillors please do not rubber stamp this by-law. Send it back to the drawing board create a better by-law that will actually move us forward to the goal of an actual pesticide reduction. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any questions Councillors? If not, thank you sir.

Next delegation on the same subject matter is Robin Faye. Ms Faye you have five minutes.

Robin Faye: Good morning everybody thanks for having me here. I would like to point out that I'm speaking on behalf of the Chemical Sensitivities Manitoba. Sandra Madray is away at a meeting in Ottawa and unable to attend today. I would like to point out that we are not opposed to opening discussion on the issue that is not why we are opposing this report. It has more to do with the flavour of it which leaves us feeling ignored. I'll pass around what I have written or who shall I give it to?

Mr. Speaker: Pass it out, yes.

Robin Faye: Thank you very much. While we commend the Committee for sitting through hours of presentations we must express our disappointment and even surprise. The clear scientific evidence against pesticides very aptly presented by over 20 deputations against the non-essential use of pesticides is not reflected in our perspective in the Committee's recommendations. There were only six presenters in favour of pesticides and all those represented the lawn care industry. Where is the recognition of the suffering caused by the accumulation of pesticides in the body?

Signage and buffer zones will not protect the health of Winnipeg residents. I am submitting to you a chart, on the flip side, showing drift measured by Accu-Chem Laboratories in Quebec, and this was taken from a report written by the

Environmental, the AEHA, Allergy and Environmental Health Association in Quebec. The drift will be in our bodies before we are close enough to see the signs. Spray 30 metres from our homes will drift and be tracked onto our properties and into our homes.

The increasing numbers of people suffering from MCS environmental allergies are only too aware of the effects of drift. Symptoms include fatigue, dizziness, sore throat, flu like symptoms, memory loss and headache and there are more. These effects directly interfere with our abilities to work and to participate in our communities. And there are financial costs to this that end up being borne by the public. The use of pesticides creates an unnecessary serious public health hazard. Please visit the web sites of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment and the Ontario Association of Family Physicians for information and evidence.

We urge Council to recognize the serious dangers to the general public especially to children and animals and to the ecosystem presented by the use of pesticides. Period. We also urge Council to consider how the special needs associated with multiple chemical sensitivities are to be accommodated as regards pesticide use. None of that is directly, our needs do not seem to us to be reflected in the report.

I would now like, if I have a few minutes left, to maybe…

Mr. Speaker: Two minutes.

Robin Faye: One. Just to speak as a person here, as an individual, a parent, a business person, a person with multiple chemical sensitivities. I was walking here this morning and I went past Vimy Ridge Park and I smelled pesticide and I looked around and there was a young woman picking weeds out between the flowers at the clinic end of the park and no signage there.

I looked and I looked and further at the very end of that long flower bed was, as Mr. Ternette has pointed out, a very small yellow sign and you couldn't read what was on it. I smelled that stuff way before the sign was even within my view. The sign is lower than the level of the plants and so on and there was a young woman presumably working for the City, picking the stuff that has been sprayed with her hands. I'm very concerned about that.

I crossed over the road but now I have a peppery taste in my mouth. My tongue has gone from tingling to numb and I have a constriction in my throat. You may not recognize it but I do have a big booming voice. So, I know that that stuff is in my body and I'm wondering how we are going to recognize the fact that this is a problem.

I don't take issue with, when people saying that there is a problem of homeowners spraying is greater than that of the professional spraying. I believe that's probably the case because the professionals are more trained. However, I can see homeowners pressuring the professionals because we are used to the quick fix. I want this gone now use the biggest killer you can find. And that is going to be a problem.

I also take issue with the idea that people will legally be able to buy this stuff in stores. We can say no they can't. We need to take back our sovereignty. The people in Quebec have a court case that went to the Supreme Court of Canada that gave them the right to ban pesticides. We do not have to be afraid. We can start with the homeowners and then gradually phase in the limitation on the professional people. Thank you very much for listening.

Mr. Speaker: Ms Faye there is a question. Councillor Smith. Your first question.

Councillor Smith: To the delegation. Are you, if you were a member of Council would you support the clause or would you regard it as a baby step towards, in two years, doing something significantly to do with pesticides?

Robin Faye: I have to admit I am quite ignorant about the municipal process and

how things are going to fall out. As a resident of Winnipeg what I would like to see happen is that this move forward into further discussion involving more people, into the development of public meetings and a task force, including good representation from the public, something like the 20 to 6 that we saw at the hearings that existed. I'm not trying to, I'm not saying we should just forget about this but what I'm saying is that as it's written in the report, perhaps in a format that many people will accept, is not acceptable to the members of Chemical Sensitivities Manitoba. It doesn't fit us in it.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor Smith? Councillor Steeves your first question.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you very much for your presentation ma'am. We were here and we went through the debate on the banning of smoking in public places. That was one of the issues this Council dealt with. I was one of the Councillors. It was hard to deal with. One of the things that really helped was that the Federal government in no uncertain terms had made a determination that smoking was bad for your health and of course all the regulations that go along with that. It would appear they have not done the same thing with respect to pesticides. It seems to run contrary to your research and evidence. What is the reason for that chasm and that gap?

Robin Faye: Do you want my personal opinion? I'll be entirely honest with you. What I tell my friends is I think something is up. You know I think industry has got big bucks involved in this and that they are doing major lobbying and major pressure. Winnipeg has U of M. U of M is heavily dependant on funding from Monsanto. Where does that leave those of us who aren't in that loop? So I think that there is something more to it that is kind of behind the scenes quite frankly.

In terms of the Federal government coming down, I know that Winnipeg Centre MP Pat Martin did put forward a Private Members Bill to regulate pesticides in 2006. So I, there is effort being made at the Federal level and as concerns with the World Health Organization too. Yeah, I am just a small little person from Winnipeg, but I would really appreciate the opportunity to address them as well if we can gather the funding for that. I question what's behind the World Health Organization doing that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Thank you Faye, a pleasure. Next delegation Tom Simms on behalf of the Inner City Safety Coalition in opposition for Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Mr. Simms you have 10 minutes.

Tom Simms: Thank you for this opportunity to speak before Council on this issue. I wanted to first start off by providing a brief historical context regarding the Police Commission issue.

We really appreciate Councillors Lazarenko and Wyatt making a Motion back in 2003 to set up a Police Commission and we saw that that Motion really gathered dust for a number of years

In June of '06 the Inner City Safety Coalition went down to the Protection Committee to pick up on the work that Councillors Wyatt and Lazarenko were doing on this issue and reactivated the issue, and that really, we're here today, I think because of that work that was done in the past.

One of the things I think we need to think about from the past is the Police Commission that we had in Winnipeg was disbanded in 1986 because it had become more symbolic than substantive because it lacked decision-making authority. The proposed Police Advisory Board is not learning from past experience and in order to be effective we think issues around police governance, that decision making is a key issue.

The second kind of theme I wanted to talk about is one of the major reasons why the Inner City Safety Coalition brought forward this issue around police governance is we felt for 10 years we were getting nowhere on influencing police policy. It's very frustrating. We saw everything moving backwards and so we

thought that you know if there was some kind of civilian oversight of the Police Service, our main motivation was how do you influence policy to improve the quality of safety and policing in our community?

And so we talked about this need and people have heard it especially Protection Committee. I'm not going to go on and on about balancing law enforcement and peace keeping functions. We've talked about the importance of community policing. And I think it's been really interesting over the past month or so, it hasn't been just community groups but the BIZ groups have come out very strongly talking about the importance of community policing as one of many tools we need to look at in terms of policing in our community.

I think one of the important things, especially I know the Osborne BIZ people and the Exchange District BIZ people were talking about is that current initiatives like Crime Stat don't pick up community disorder issues on the radar screen at all. And that's been one of the big issues that the BIZ community is really interested in. Those issues aren't even on the radar screen and that we need a range of strategies around policing to deal with that kind of thing.

I think the other concern that we have around the Police issue is the deployment of resources. We have the highest per capita number of police officers in any city in all of Canada. We're Police rich. And yet we have these challenges that the Police say that they don't have the kind of resources they need to do what they need to do.

You know I think a lot of these things are about accountability and leadership. The fact that we have under staffing of Police that are operating below authorized staffing levels is unacceptable. That's a leadership and accountability issue. If you're given a budget for having personnel that is an administrative responsibility; ensure you are fulfilling that mandate. And so I think we need to look at accountability, things around that.

I think with the baby boomers retiring and we have all these retirements on the Police Service there is also the question of where are some of the resources going there? We have senior officers retiring at the high end of the salary level and junior officers coming in at the low end of the salary level which is almost half of what the senior exit officers are. We once again have resources that are going to be long-term in the future because we know there is going to be a lot of retirements over the next number of while. So there is a whole issue around accountability and leadership around how resources are deployed with the Police.

And I think that the most extreme example of questionable deployment practices is using 60 police officers to bust a card game on Corydon Avenue. It's unbelievable that kind of a use for resources. So I think we need accountability on those kinds of issues.

The third theme that I wanted to talk about was what I call looking at inclusion verses exclusion. Looking at doing with verses doing for. And we have this dynamic in our community where we have and in my handout that I gave you, we talk about the racialization of crime. That 80% of the kids in the youth centre are aboriginal. That 65% of the adults in provincial custody in Manitoba are aboriginal. These are systemic issues that we need to grapple with as a community.

And we have this dynamic in our community where we have an over-representation of interaction with Police by aboriginal people, racialized people and inner city residents. And on the other hand we have an under representation of aboriginal people, racialized groups and inner city residents in the decision-making roles regarding services provided around Police Services. So to put it in a simple way, we have the biggest customers having no say regarding Police Services.

And we look at in terms of the senior administration of the Police Services we don't have that kind of representation there. And we also see at Executive Policy Committee there are no inner city representatives sitting around the

Executive Policy table, the highest level of decision-making at City Hall. We need it look at who is included around those decision-making tables and who is excluded and that has an issue around best possible decision-making in terms of having resources.

I think around this inclusion and exclusion discussion, in doing with and doing for debate, is we need to look at over the past month or since July City Council was asked to hear from the community on this issue. And the community is really wondering if Council is listening. In July there was I don't know, about 30 delegations that unanimously said we don't think that the Police Advisory Board is the right thing.

We had at Executive Policy Committee and I was out in Toronto listening to big Dave McLean, did a great job, presenting Winnipeg. The Toronto fans were just "wow, this guy is pretty good", so I couldn't be there but I hear, there was no people speaking in favour of the Police Advisory Committee at Executive Policy Committee. And I know here today that there are two groups speaking in opposition and we still haven't heard anyone from the public speak in support of this Motion so I hope people think about that.

The last piece I want to raise is the issue of leadership. The leadership of the Mayor, the leadership of City Council and I think good leadership makes decisions based on best practices. And I'm just going to quickly go through them. I think best practices in this area of governance of the Police Service has looked at a decision making function not an advisory function. That there is a principal of the police need to be independent and accountable and that you need arms lengths mechanisms to do that. That there is a need to depoliticize policing.

And that I would like to point out in the package that I've given you that your report from Chief Jack Ewatski to the Standing Committee on Protection and Community Services talks about this, these issues. "Regardless of the governance model in place, the challenge inherent in all forms of police government is the need for balance and independence with public accountability". And he goes further into that whole issue of independence, balancing independence and accountability. So, we're not making it up. It's in your administrative reports.

The other piece that's in your administrative report is this idea that if you really want to develop a Police Commission with decision-making authority there needs to be some kind of relationship with the Province on this issue and it's clearly set out on that last page "that a change in the governance structure in Winnipeg would require a combination of amendments, The City of Winnipeg Charter and the Law Enforcement Review Act" and it goes on to reinforce that issue. Now that's the opinion of your administration on this issue and that's why we talked about the need to have a provincial/municipal approach on this.

Another piece around leadership that I would appeal to the Mayor and City Council to look at is that there is a need to bring diverse views together for common good. That's good leadership. Consensus building verses polarization. Win-win solutions verses win-lose solutions. And as I said before inclusion verses exclusion. We think that's good leadership and we've seen that leadership over the past couple of months on this issue of policing.

We really appreciate Councillor Grant Nordman regarding the School Resource Officer issue. We would not have a School Resource Officer initiative, which I understand there is going to be a media conference next week to announce it, without Councillor Grant Nordman's support on that issue. And I watched Councillor Nordman. He listened to the inner city voices, he listened to the educators. He lives way out in St. Charles and he looked at making a decision that was for the common good of the City. That's good leadership.

We appreciate the work of Councillor Russ Wyatt in recent days to try to find some common ground on this issue; to

look at finding a win-win solution on this issue. Who understands that this issue isn't about the personality of the Mayor, who is taking an interest in policing right now, or the potential personality of the Police Chief to change things around, it's also about good public policies, about structure. What are we going to do in the long term so that we're just not dependent on the personality issues, which we appreciate people taking leadership on these issues.

I would also like to express, acknowledge leadership shown by Councillor Jeff Browaty in North Kildonan. Councillor Wyatt introduced motions at the East Kildonan - Transcona Community Committee that was trying to find some common ground, a win-win solution and that amendment was unanimously passed by Councillor Browaty, Councillor Thomas and Councillor Wyatt. I think that that's looking at the bigger picture as a suburban Councillor as one of the things that needs to be looked at.

Finally I would like to acknowledge Mayor Sam Katz. I think that the last budget that he passed demonstrated that he looked at building consensus in that the budget was passed unanimously. That's good leadership. How we can find win-win solutions and a common good.

My fear around this issue is that we've seen a movement to more unilateral leadership on this issue. That my understanding the way this thing could possibility go today, that we'll have a split vote and it will be split on inner city, suburban lines. I don't think that that's healthy for our community. I don't think a 9-7 vote on this issue, I don't think a 10-6 vote on this issue is healthy for our community.

I understand though with some of the amendments that are being proposed...

Mr. Speaker: Tom your time has expired.

Tom Simms: Okay just one last sentence though I want to say here. Yet the amendments that are being proposed is that we could have a consensus building decision where the vote could be 15-1 or 16-0. I urge the Mayor and City Councillors to look for this common ground so we can move ahead on this important issue in our community. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Tom, if you can stay on the side here because Mr. Keeper will be speaking right after you and he gets five minutes and we'll ask questions for the both of you and you'll have 10 minutes.

Mr. Keeper. I'm taking the names down for questions. Mr. Keeper you have five minutes.

Cyril Keeper: Thank you. There was so much praise there for the Mayor and other Councillors from the delegation that I wondered if anybody dare criticize policy at City Hall. You know this place is beginning to look familiar. I came here to the Community Committee, I came to the Executive Policy Committee and here I am today.

Of course I used to come here quite regularly with the father of one of the sitting Councillors. But at that time I got paid for it. Getting paid for it is a compensation for many things and I hope you guys get paid for it for a long time to come.

I read the Free Press before I came to the Executive Policy Committee and they said that the Mayor would listen. Well I wasn't sure but I went on that anyway. And then I read the, I think it was the Free Press again and it said that the Mayor had made up his mind. Well I'm not so sure about that either. Maybe he is still listening. I don't get any indication from the facial expression.

I want to take you to the public hearings that Annitta Stenning held. The two public hearings. I want to take you there because I think it's kind of a, perhaps a model of what a police board might be, a governing police board. At least one Councillor attended both. And you know community members were there expressing their opinions and their desires and they had the time to listen to people. And people really said that's what

they wanted is they wanted to the heard both at Kelvin and at R.B. Russell.

So I think that there was a panel up there of four people, Annitta Stenning another senior bureaucrat and two consultants I understand, and I really got the impression that they were listening to what people were saying and because I got that impression, when I stood up I spoke what I really thought. And I was hopeful that what we said would impact the decision and the outcomes.

Now it doesn't mean that they do exactly what I recommended because you know, there were many opinions expressed. But there was kind of an overall consensus, you know like Kelvin, it was a different crowd than R.B. Russell but, they all wanted some input into the policing in this City. And they don't feel that they have it at this point. And at R.B. Russell they felt, I would say they expressed it much more intensely about the feeling of the need for input and for perhaps changes.

So now there was also at R.B. Russell a greater presence of aboriginal people. And there was a greater sense of urgency and people were calling for the Police to have a sense of urgency when aboriginal people call for attention to specific issues and also, there was the question of were individuals treated with respect. So these are kinds of serious questions that were raised. And given the increasing population of aboriginal people in this City, then this is something that needs to be addressed.

I just mention those two hearings because I think it kind of serves a hint about what could be done. I mean imagine if that panel that heard us at those two schools were made up of prominent citizens across this City in whom everybody could had confidence that when they made a decision their voices had been heard and some thought and some real consideration had been given to what the outcome would be. Now does that mean that a City Council could not do that? No. Does that mean that a Committee of City Council could not do that? No. But people up till now, as they spoke at those meetings do not have the experience of that happening.

So whatever decision you make today you must give people the experience of being heard and they must come to the conclusion that their concerns and their advocacy on policing in the City are being taken seriously and having an impact on decision making.

Now this really comes down to, I think, to a question of democratic process. You know today governments seem to, it's only my impression, seem to want everything in a package before they announce it and that leaves very little room for public input.

Now public input is much more messy. I mean there's debates and people are all over the place and you know, the leader or the Mayor cannot say this is precisely where we're at, at least until the process is over. And I think of some previous governments you know in previous times who had messy situations but then had good results.

You know, I think in the Schreyer administration he had to put up with characters in his cabinet, Sidney Green, some others, you know but yet they allowed for discussion and they came to decisions. I think of Jean Lesage. He had to deal with René Levesque and Eric Kierans for God's sakes, excuse me. We don't want any divine intervention here. And I think of Pearson, Lester Pearson. His government looked like it was falling apart and he had time to look like a bumbling idiot and he never had the pizzazz of Pierre Trudeau, but I'll tell you that measures that Pearson brought through for the benefit of the Canadian public far out passed any other Prime Minister that I can think of.

So I ask you to consider the essential point and I think the essential point is how does the public get heard and get a sense of confidence that their input is having an impact on decisions. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Keeper. Just stay there. Questions? We have

Councillor Swandel, Wyatt, Pagtakhan and Councillor Smith. Councillor Swandel you have the first question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Tom when you spoke, you spoke at the beginning about the history and you started the history in 2003 and the Motion by Councillor Lazarenko and Councillor Wyatt I believe it was. What was going on at that time? What was the history prior to that and what was the conversation around Police Commissions or Police Advisory Boards prior to that? There was a lot going on at that time in our history and I want to get a sense from you what you see was going on at that time.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Simms.

Tom Simms: Well to be real honest with you we showed up June 2006 with this idea around a Police Commission and we didn't really know that this was already a Motion on the books. We found out that way. So that I can't really tell you what you was going on prior to that.

In June 2006 we came forward because we felt as I said, 10 years of frustration of not being able to influence policing policy, not micro-managing Police but how do we look at problem-solving and working together. We just felt shut out and we had someone actually, a resource person that's been involved in community policing for many years, Chris Brayden, had mentioned it to us. He said I can't believe Winnipeg doesn't have a Police Commission. And that's when we started thinking about it and started doing some research on it.

So to be honest with you, I don't know what the dynamics were because it wasn't really on our radar screen until Chris Brayden had raised this issue with us and then we started to work on this issue in '06 out of frustration that we weren't being heard by the Police.

And I think we hear this frustration from the BIZes when we've had these public meetings on what do you want to see in a new Police Chief and what do you want to see for community policing. It's not just residents it's the business community as well that are very frustrated about not being heard.

And I know in River Heights there was a whole network of parents from the River Heights area who unilaterally lost their community officer, felt their voices weren't heard and had to spend countless hours working to get a school resource officer.

So I think that the kind of intent of where all this came from is saying what's, what we have isn't working and I couldn't really comment on what the political dynamics were.

Mr. Speaker: Your second supplementary Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: My first supplementary, second question. Tom you mention going back 10 years there has been a lot of conversation, and it seems that this Mayor, this EPC and this Council are trying to get something going here. But we're constantly in this conversation and not action. We have the opportunity to get action here today and I hope that as a member of the Inner City Safety Coalition that you're not advocating just for the issues of the inner city that there are much bigger issues when you're looking at police advisory or police commissions or governance of police.

Tom Simms: Definitely and I think we're all talking about the public good and the common good. One of the things I will say around policing is that we made the point in the presentation, is that there is an over representation and interaction of aboriginal people, racialized groups and inner city residents with the Police and an under representation of aboriginal people, racialized groups and inner city residents on the decision making on how those services are provided. So I agree it's a whole City issue but that there is a disproportionate connection around crime and safety in inner city communities.

So that we agree totally. We want to look at the big total picture. We also know that there needs to be as well, and my theme today for everyone would be that we can

walk and chew gum at the same time. You know on a whole range of things we can have, look at a Police Advisory Board now and we can look at doing some further education through a conference with the Police, around police governance and look at how we can begin to work with the Provincial government on it.

It's not about “either/or” and I think that's unfortunately how this has been framed. It's about “and”. And Councillor Swandel, you know, I think as Cyril Keeper pointed out it is about democracy. It's messy, it's not as efficient but it is about are we looking at consensus building or polarization. And I think, you know we’ve talked about there is a lot of experience around this table of how to do consensus building. Let's work towards that.

So we're supporting trying to work through and make those things work. We appreciate the leadership that EPC and the Mayor has taken on this issue. All is we're asking is will you listen to the voices of the community that's come forward? You asked in your EPC Motion of July ‘06, you said "in light of all the interest around community policing or the police governance, let's have a public meeting”. So you had a public meeting in July. You invited all the citizens of Winnipeg to come out and they came out and unanimously said we don't think this Police Advisory Board is what we need. We need to move some other direction.

So I guess I would just throw it back to you. People aren't trying to be negative we're trying to work in a democratic way to forge a consensus that is a win-win situation.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a final question?

Councillor Swandel: My final question Tom is you mentioned democratic approach and I would like to get a sense from you when you say all the people that came out, what did those rooms look like at Kelvin and R.B. Russell? Were they truly a huge representation of the people of the City of Winnipeg or were they mostly inner city groups with their voice of inner city issues? Was there representation there from the suburbs and other people who want to see us move forward with something instead of just conversation?

Tom Simms: Well you know I guess, Councillor Swandel I'll just be really blunt. I mean you've asked for people to put their voices forward on this issue and no one has come out at the July meeting around the police governance issue. No one spoke in support of the Police Advisory Committee and no one spoke in support at the Executive Policy Committee.

So when you keep saying that people support this thing when they've been asked to come down to City Hall which is a democratic forum to express that voice, no one has come forward. So when you keep saying well everyone sort of likes this kind of thing, you know, show me the money! You know like I haven't seen it. And I think generally in the public the Free Press is taken an editorial position on this issue.

So I guess all I'm saying is all’s I’m saying is we’re not trying to polarize the issue. We’re trying to look at how do we problem solve the issue. And we ask people to listen to the voices and I want to reinforce that message. We can chew gum and walk at the same time. We can do the Police Advisory Committee and we can do some further education work around what best governance looks like and we can start exploring options around where things can go with the Province.

And I go back to your analogy which I thought was a good one. We've talked on the phone about this. You know your criticism of the Inner City Safety Coalition is that we are trying to hit a home run and that the Police Advisory Committee Board is getting to first base. And our analogy is, is we’re concerned that we’re going to, that the inning is going to end and we're going to be stranded on first base. And that’s all the inquiry goes. What we are encouraging is let’s go to second base as well too. Let's put that out there over the next little while and you know maybe we never get to home plate.

Mr. Speaker: We have only one question. One Councillor asked a question and we've got five more and the time is only another one minute and fifty six seconds. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Thanks for your presentation Tom. What is, the challenges that are being faced in the inner city, you're very familiar with them. The challenges being faced in the suburbs I can tell you with policing are issues such as, and the Police I think are extremely taxed with the amount of calls and pressure put on the resources that they have, so I know that they're doing everything they can with the amount of service that they have.

But the challenges we're facing in the suburbs are things like you know not being able to get through to the district offices, no Police presence on the streets, and these concerns. Do you see a direct connection between what's happening in the inner city and what's happening in the suburbs with regards to the challenges we're facing?

Tom Simms: Well I think you know bottom line we're a whole City right and you know, what happens in one of the areas of the city impacts areas of the other. If we have a healthier stronger inner city we have less resources that have to be directed there and reactive ways in that there is more resources to go around. So I think that's important.

And I think an issue like a Police Commission brings the whole City to look at those kinds of governance issues to make the best possible decisions that we can. And we have no illusions. There is no one silver bullet. I think there is a range of factors, a Mayor that shows leadership, a good Police Chief, good governance structures, good relationships with the community. There needs to be those kinds of things.

So we appreciate the work that you have done and we appreciate the work by people like Harry Lazarenko that have been working on this. We need a full blown Police Commission to work towards and that some of these things we are working on right now are not going to hit the mark.

Councillor Wyatt: Next question. Your document here refers to the Provincial involvement. How best do you think in your mind could we get the Province involved on this issue with regards to just governance in general? Because clearly the Police Act is involved. The Charter is involved, the Law Enforcement Review Act may be involved.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Simms I'll allow you to answer this because the time has expired for question period. Answer his question, please. Thank you.

Tom Simms: Well we as an organization met with the Minister of Justice, Dave Chomiak, and he's acknowledged that the Police Act hasn't been reviewed since 1933 so it's a little bit out of date. It speaks nothing of governance issues and they're very interested in working with the City on those kinds of issues.

So that I think that there is a keen interest. It's on the radar screen. The Police Act is currently being under review, these kind of things are going to be looked at, and so I think there is an openness on that.

And you know one of the things that I thought that was important that he said in that meeting and that stuck with me and I think it's appropriate to talk about here, is he said you know he's the Minister of Justice he says, "you know the role of government and the community is to help those who feel excluded to feel included". And I think that we can look at policing and that's one form of things, of the stick thing, but we have also got to look at other issues around building community to address prevention kind of issues and I think that exclusion and inclusion issue is I think a relevant issue to once again reinforce here. Are we going to make a consensus decision and try and work with the democratic processes that you've laid out? Or are we going to look at unilateral decision making? And we appeal to people to look at an approach that is building on inclusion and not exclusion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Simms. Time has expired in question period. Next delegation is Larry Pelzer, President Winnipeg Labour Council. Mr. Pelzer if you're present you have 10 minutes.

Larry Pelzer: Good morning. The Winnipeg Labour Council supports the Notice of Motion to refer the E.O.C. report to all Community Committees. Everyone needs to examine that E.O.C report and question its assumptions and conclusions. Winnipeggers must challenge their Councillors and show them ignoring the E.O.C report and its recommendation is good for everyone in this great City.

The 2008/2009 City budget being prepared now will tell us if Council is prepared and committed to maintain a strong and vibrant community or merely cutting budget at any cost. Winnipeg can continue to be a great place to live but it will take a visionary leadership and City workers whose are committed to the public and public service. Thank you for your time. Mayor Katz and Council do the right thing and send this to the Committee, to the Community Committee.

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

Councillor Fielding: Thank you very much for your presentation here. Just a quick question. The E.O.C. of course had an extensive consultation over a six month time period. There was ample opportunity, in fact I wrote an off ed piece in the Winnipeg Free Press that encouraged citizens, groups and organizations to come forward with ideas and suggestions and that was an opportunity for people to talk about their agreement and disagreement with the process and an opportunity to meet with my Council colleagues and a variety of the different unions.

I'm just wondering if you had an opportunity to make a written submission to that effect while the time period was in place for the Economic Opportunity Commission.

Larry Pelzer: Yes we did make, have an opportunity to make a submission. But that's for Winnipeg Labour Council. I'm talking about the rest of the citizens who were left out of the process that should be included in the process and that's why it's very important, very important that it goes back to Community Committee so that the citizens who didn't have an opportunity to make any comments on it should have this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Larry first thank you for your brevity. It was well spoken. Are you aware that there is no need for a Council Motion to have these matters heard by Community Committees? The Community Committee can choose to hear it and hold public delegations and that there really isn't a need for a Council Motion to do that?

Larry Pelzer: No I'm not aware of that.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was, I guess this is a are you aware question that although we, there were public, actually it's not an are you aware question. The question is the venue of Community Committees and why would we be wanting that to happen and why we would want Council to endorse that and I guess I'm wondering are you feeling that although there was public consultation it was a different kind of consultation in that it was consultation with the members of the commission. And now that the commission is done it's Council that will have to decide what to do with the recommendations.

So are you suggesting that this is why we would want to have it heard on a more broad public basis by Councillors?

Larry Pelzer: Yes Councillor Jenny, I (inaudible) and if that's a leading question maybe. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? I guess no need to. Thank you, sir.

Larry Pelzer: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Next delegation Bruce Robinson on behalf of Robinson Lighting in support of Item 5 of the Executive Policy Committee, dated September the 5th of 2007, in respect of a street name change. Mr. Robinson you have 10 minutes.

Bruce Robinson: I hope it won't take more than two.

Mr. Speaker: Good.

Bruce Robinson: Brevity is important too I think. It's my pleasure today to speak in favour of the renaming of Arena Road, which is going to be hopefully renamed Milt Stegall Drive. As a business person located on Arena Road, we have this horrible situation of being called Arena Road which has no arena within sight and people always wonder where Arena Road is and we have to use other descriptions.

So, Milt has been, I think, all of you would agree an exemplary citizen of the City of Winnipeg. He's been a credit to the City of Winnipeg and to the Winnipeg Football Club for the last 12 years.

Honestly for the last two years I have really commiserated over the name Arena Road and I thought what can we rename it and I was amazed at the brilliance of the City to come up with a name like that. I credit you for I think a great move because Arena Road really was a dead end street for two blocks that really needed a new name. I must admit I've been a long time Director of the Winnipeg Football Club and I'd love to see credit going to a Blue Bomber with a street named after him.

Arena Road I think also has another part of the history in the fact that Arena Road, the original street adjacent to the old arena was renamed Cactus Jack Way. I think, I believe in 2000, in the year 2000. So we do have the precedence already of renaming Arena Road in one block anyways. I hope that you will give due consideration to the renaming of Milt Stegall and I speak in support of it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any questions? Thank you sir.

Okay let's get on to business now. We've, the report of Executive Policy Committee dated September 5, 2007, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 5, 2007**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 5.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: No. 1.

Okay now 2, 3, 4 and 5 is Consent Agenda.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1.

Item 1 - General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres – 2007 District Planning Report File PR-2

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker Item 1 is in reference to four specific areas, Notre Dame, Winakwa, Tyndall Park and Bronx Chalmers. I would very much like to hear from Councillor Vandal and then I will certainly try and respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I too will be brief. I just want to put on the record my concern about what I consider to be a somewhat wonky recommendation. Number 1 and 2 that the Notre Dame Community Centre front entrance project which is St. Boniface be approved with no commitment of funding from the Community Centre Investment Fund which I understand all our community centre money went in to.

Recommendation 2 that the Winakwa Community Centre project be approved with no recommendation of funding. This puts a lot of pressure on the minimal funds that we have at Community Committee and that I have a hard time understanding that if a project is good enough to receive approval, a recommended approval, how a project can be not good enough to receive a recommended approval for funding. And if it's not good enough to be funded I don't think it should be funded at all. In fact both of these projects are part of a larger whole.

Having said all of that I think the bigger question is that unless we move to amend what I call the stalemate policy of no new community centres, we won't add additional space unless we actually shut down additional space per community centre area. I think we have to look at the question of demographics, the question of need.

And I'll talk about St. Boniface only because I know perhaps there is a perception that Winakwa and Southdale are not growing. But within the next five years, five to seven years, we are going to have 4,000, 4,000 new units going up in the Sage Creek. About 20% of those will be multi-family. That is new, a new net growth and those kids are going to have to go to a community centre somewhere, unless we build a new one in Sage Creek, they're going to have to go to Southdale, they're going to go to Winakwa.

In the last three years alone there has been 1,000 new homes in Royal Wood and those children are going to have to go to a community centre and we know we are not going to build one in Royal Wood. We're going to have to, those kids will be going to Southdale. And Island Lakes is almost built up to the City boundary with hundreds of extra kids that are going to have to go somewhere for a community centre.

So in certain situations it may not be feasible to shut down community centre space before you build new space. And I hope that within the next short little while we can address this. We can look at the demographic changes in our City and that we can service our growing areas because I know St. Boniface is growing by leaps and bounds and we are going to need new community centre space with attached funding. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I do appreciate Councillor Vandal's comments. And as Councillor Vandal knows because he was present when the G.C.W.C.C. made their presentation, the reason that they approved certain projects but there are no funds committed, because when you are making alterations/renovations to a front entrance, they don't meet the criteria for financial support. And that's the way it is and so they make the decision.

And I think we can all agree that the G.C.W.C.C. has a monumental task of trying to work with limited funds that are available to them as well as trying to keep our recreational infrastructure available to our youth and to keep improving on it. But I do believe they are doing the best job they can with the resources that they have. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor.

On Item 1.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of September the 19th, 2007, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 19, 2007

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 10.

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

Report of September the 26th of 2007.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 26, 2007**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and the report of Executive Policy Committee dated September 26/07 be considered.

Mr. Speaker: Item No. 1.

Mayor Katz: I would move that Item No. 1 be adopted Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour?

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I would like to be recorded in opposition please.

Mr. Speaker: Okay fine. Councillor Thomas recorded in opposition. Councillor Smith recorded in opposition. So three are recorded in opposition.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Congratulations Mr. Robinson.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Okay now EPC Motions. There are two Motions. Motion No. 1. Would the Clerk please read it? Motion No. 1.

Councillor Gerbasi: Is this the Notice of Motion Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: This is Councillor Swandel…

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh Motion No. 1, I'm sorry. There are so many things going on today. Excuse me. I would like to move a request that two-thirds of Council move that the rules be suspended and that we hear Motion No. 1 today. I would like to ask for a recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: No, no, no hold it. Look, let's deal with No. 1. Motion No. 1 is Councillor Swandel, Mr. Mayor with just a simple Motion, Councillor Swandel.

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

WHEREAS on June 20, 2007, Council approved the development of an Indoor Soccer Complex by the University of Manitoba; which approval referenced the termination of Expression of Interest and Qualifications No. 119-2006 instead of Expression of Interest and Qualifications No. 93-2007;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 7 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated June 13, 2007, be amended as follows:

1. That No. 119-2006 in Recommendation 1 be deleted and that No. 93-2007 substituted therefore.

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

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 1 is a housekeeping matter. There was an error in the writing of the tender or the qualification for tenders on this matter and it's just an amendment to the text to correct that error.

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

Now we deal with Motion No. 2. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Apologies.

Mr. Speaker: It's an automatic referral but I understand you want to move the Motion.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that we suspend the rules to hear this Motion and have it debated in here today.

Mr. Speaker: Council you heard the Motion.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Jenny Gerbasi
Seconded by Councillor Mike Pagtakhan

WHEREAS there is significant community interest in further exploration Police Commission Models

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

As a condition of proceeding with the Police Advisory Board as a first step, the following actions be carried out:

A. The City of Winnipeg shall participate in a community conference on the best practices of police governance in partnership with the Province of Manitoba and community groups.

B. Winnipeg City Council shall call on the Province of Manitoba to establish an intergovernmental committee on police governance to review the findings of the said community conference as well as other research and pertinent information, and to make recommendations regarding police governance to the City and Province by December 31, 2008.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you for your co-operation everybody. I just have to find what thing I'm talking about this morning. There are so many.

Councillor Steeves: Point of order Mr. Speaker. I'm picking up a vibe that maybe people might be more amenable to my earlier suggestion on this. If there is still a possibility…

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll get to it Councillor Steeves. I have the Motion. I was unable to find my notes but I usually (inaudible)

The Motion before you today is moved by myself and Councillor Pagtakhan, and what, it's so distracting around here. What this Motion is similar along the lines of what the community expressed their desire when they came to Community Committee. This Motion is exactly the same Motion moved by Councillor Wyatt and Browaty at their Community Committee and it's the same request that the community and some Councillors that are, continue to have concerns about the model of police governance we're going to be having in our City and are asking.

And we recognize that a Police Advisory model has been put forward. We recognize that the Mayor and others are, would like to intend on this thing proceeding and so what the community and those of us are saying is that we would like to ask for some common ground. We would like to ask for some willingness to allow a community conference to occur on best practices in police governance and we would like to ask the Province of Manitoba to establish an intergovernmental committee on police governance to review the findings at the said community conference as well as research pertinent information and make recommendations to Council in December of 2008.

And there has been a lot of discussion about this police advisory model and I think everybody knows it has been all said very publicly that there is some concern that that model is not going to adequately address the needs of and concerns of the citizens. I think it was said very well by some of the delegations earlier today that there is a need for common goals to be sought for a sense of trust, for a perception of people being heard and a number of other issues, I could go on and on, but I'll save those debates with all due respect to Councillor Steeves for the major clause on the police advisory model.

But really to simplify what this Motion is asking is that what we're saying is that those of us that were not really willing to just accept this model of the Police Advisory Committee as the end all and the end of this discussion, if you are willing as a Council to accept this offering, this peace offering, we would be willing to support the model on a temporary basis. And it's my understanding from, as it can leave the door open to look at other models and keep the discussion going, keep, that the community groups such as

the Inner City Safety Coalition and others have told me that they would be comfortable with that too.

And then we could end this day on a much more positive note. I think it's, it is really concerning to have a police advisory model without buy-in from a huge number of stakeholders in the inner city, from human rights groups, from members of Council. I mean I think we want to all come together on a form of governance we can trust. And I'm not saying that myself and Councillor Pagtakhan, and I can't imagine that others are thrilled with this model but what we're saying is okay we can bend a little bit here. We'll accept this model for now. We'll see how it works. But please bend and give an inch here and then if we accept that can you please accept something that the community wants which is to continue to discuss, a community conference on best practice practices, to continue. And to ask the Province to get involved because they are, they should be involved. We all know that.

So that's really a simple, it's an olive branch. I don't think any of us like fighting. We are trying to get something done. I mean you know, and so we're prepared to support your model, the movers of this Motion, if you're prepared to give us something. In the sense of if you're prepared to listen to what the community has asked. This is all they're asking.

All we're asking for is a discussion. All we're asking is to be listened to. Nobody is demanding a specific model of police governance. We're saying let's keep talking about police governance, let's keep, and maybe we can land somewhere, to find some common ground. Because the model that's been proposed you know it's true that there was a public meeting to hear people, there was not one person in support and there has not been one person in support of that model other than Councillors and the Mayor, there has not been one citizen there. I think there was one letter to the editor but there hasn't been one person who has publicly appeared. They think this is the be all and end all. And if we just support this, if we don't support this today, this is the end of it because we're just accepting this model and that's it.

So I hope I've made myself clear about what the intentions are here. It's intended to be a peace offering. It's intended to bring people together and to keep discussing issues that are going to not go away, even if people aren't listened to. So I think that's the spirit of this Motion. That's the intention and I hope you'll support it. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thanks very much Mr. Speaker. I think the source of my friend's confusion is probably because it is somewhat confusing the way in which this has been brought forward.

My Point of order was unfortunately not acceptable to Mr. Speaker but it had I think a lot to do with practicality in that we're going to be discussing the report at the end of the meeting under the Protection and Community Services part of the agenda which I think is where this probably belongs. Now there has been a Notice of Motion that's been brought forward at the eleventh hour to sort of bring this into a different realm I suppose.

My respectful suggestion here is that because Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Pagtakhan have essentially brought forward virtually the identical amendment, under the PCS portion of this meeting, that we can deal with all of these things in one fell swoop and I'm not making any commitment as to who's going to go which way, but this is, this is a bit, this is a bit of a dual track way of approaching this within one meeting which I think lacks some integrity.

The amendment as appearing, I guess in the number of the amendments, as I see it, oh here it is. I guess its amendment, Motion No. 5, under PCS Item No. 1, is essentially the exact same amendment so I'm going to encourage people to not support this so we can have a wholesome discussion at the end of the meeting when we are dealing with the report. I think that makes more sense because other folks have put other amendments

on the table as well. And this is I think regrettably an attempt to kind of take this out of that process. And I don't think that's appropriate Mr. Speaker.

Let's get the report onto the table, let's have a wholesome discussion with the amendment. Heck we don't have to wait more than a couple of hours to do it and I think that would be a reasonable thing to do. That would be my political suggestion instead of further polarizing people on this issue.

On the merits of actually doing this I guess part of the problem here is that folks are coming forward and saying well, I mean they've switched their tact. And fair enough people do that, I mean at one point, the delegations were all coming forward and saying this is worse than doing nothing. Now that's changed I suppose and people are saying well yeah it's good now but we are going to tolerate it until we can do something else.

I am concerned Mr. Speaker about that point of view. I think this report is better than that. And while I appreciate that people might be trying to reach a compromise and I think this is a political compromise at the eleventh hour which would do no justice to this report ultimately and I want to encourage against that.

A compromise in the truest sense of the term is represented around this table because Mr. Speaker we know darn well that in their heart of hearts there are people sitting in some of these 16 chairs that prefer things as they are today. We all know that. We know there are also people sitting in these chairs who want to go to a full-blown Police Commission, correct? No one disagrees with the two comments I just made. The Police Advisory Board as it exists does represent something of a compromise I think, in terms of those two polarizations.

So now, at the eleventh hour we're putting motions into Executive Policy Committee that are away from the report where we're trying to reach compromises on the compromises and we're sort of saying well this is an olive branch. This is something we're doing because we want to reach out to you. We're already at a stage of compromise because people on this Council feel differently. People in this community feel differently. And that's fair. There is nothing the matter with that.

But we have to be very, very careful about setting this new Police Advisory Board up to fail. On the one hand we're saying to this new Police Advisory Board, go ahead, Godspeed, do your work. We'll be in the next room plotting how to replace you in a couple of months. That's my concern Mr. Speaker.

What are we going to say to the potential chair and the potential members of the new Police Advisory Board if we are off on another direction searching out with another level of government a different way of doing things? The potential hire of the new executive director, the potential hire of the support staff person for that executive director, what are we going to say to them? Well, Council has supported going in a different direction. The job we want to hire you for represents kind of a loose amalgamation compromise of something that we may not be that into frankly but for the time being would you mind taking this job and we'll see kind of where it goes. That's not good enough. In my respectful suggestion that's not good enough.

When it comes time to discuss the report, I am going to again, because I think it gets lost in the discussion. I going to lay out exactly what the powers are of the new Police Advisory Board, if indeed Council does address this and say this is what we want to do. At that time there are some other amendments that may or may not appeal to people around this table. And we will have to discuss that at the prudent time. I can't make any commitment either way of which way this Council is going to go because there are a body of amendments that will be considered in turn. Again I repeat Mr. Speaker essentially this amendment appears as part of the proposed changes to the Police Advisory Board so we will be debating it again.

The question for this honourable Council today is do we set in motion, sort of this

other track that's going on, that has sort of, that isn't even considered in the discussion of the report? I don't think that makes sense. I mean if you compare it to the pesticide issue we'll be dealing with as well and my learned friend Councillor Gerbasi, when she spoke about accepting her pesticide report she was quite candid in that she wanted to go further. And I respect that. She wanted to go further with a complete ban.

But when I presented the report I was very careful to say that is not what we are doing. I recognize and completely respect individual Councillors wanting to do something beyond that report and if they want to put that on the record that is fine. There is nothing wrong with that Mr. Speaker. That is completely appropriate. Councillor Gerbasi's comments about wanting to proceed to a ban are completely appropriate. There is nothing the matter with that.

But as I caution Council and as I told Council the specific wording of that report had nothing to do with the ban and that's what we voted on and that's what we accepted. And that's why I think it enjoyed the level of support that it did because Mr. Speaker I am comfortably certain as are you and as are every other single person in this room, that there is not unanimity when it comes to banning pesticides in the City of Winnipeg. So it's the same idea. It's the same analogy with this report that exists today.

And the irony Mr. Speaker, the irony Mr. Speaker is that while we're having this debate and while seemingly the report is getting a rough treatment from some members of the community, I am receiving, although they don't come to the Committee, and Mr. Simms said "well where are these people, show me the money". They're phoning. They're phoning me and they're saying "how do I apply? How do I get involved?" Prominent members of the community are calling the City of Winnipeg saying "we want to be involved. I with like to be a member of this committee. How do I apply?" But of course as we all know, the way it works is only people who are opposed to something generally show up. Sometimes there's exceptions but it's rare. So those comments are a touch unfair. I'm sure there are many people out there that appreciate the direction of Council.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan moves extension of two minutes.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Steeves: They just haven't made the appearance and I don't think we can automatically assume just because people don't come forward and say yes I agree with what you are doing, that there is no support out there in the community. That wasn't I think a very, very fair comment to make, that I would ask Council to respect that.

At the end of the day Mr. Speaker and I'll conclude with this. We have a report that has been thought out, that has been presented to this Council. It is a report on a Police Advisory Board. We are going to be dealing with some amendments that may or may not pass. But at the end of the day let us not set up a dual track that in my respectful submission Mr. Speaker is the worst, the worst of both worlds for both sides of this debate.

People who are in favour of the report will now have to deal with this outside body who is chipping away at the integrity of this group and sort of presenting an alternate option that's better. How is that going to fuel this group? And people who want the Police Commission are going to have the divided attention of those of us who are wanting to push forward with a genuine model.

It's the worst of both worlds Mr. Speaker. I would ask Council not to support it, keep your powder dry, we'll be discussing the report in a couple of hours at worst and we can discuss it then.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Last July 19th, 2006, EPC moved a Motion that called for the best practices regarding police board or commission composition and operation in

the above-noted areas of interest as it related to a police governance model. It also stated that in light of the high level public interest in this matter, the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, they requested to hold a special meeting in the evening to allow for extra opportunity for public comment upon the administrative report in this matter.

Well Mr. Speaker when we attended, Councillor Gerbasi and myself and Councillor Steeves and Councillor Nordman, when we attended that special meeting of Protection and Community Services, we had well over 50 delegations come in opposition of the proposed Police Advisory Board as it was tabled.

Now this Motion that is moved by Councillor Gerbasi and seconded by myself, received some political traction at E.K. - Transcona and I applaud my colleagues from that Community Committee for that and for their courage in that because this is talking about what the community wants to see happen. The community wants to have a partnership with the City of Winnipeg, with the Mayor's office and with Council in developing a positive governance model.

Point A) of this Motion talks about how the City of Winnipeg will participate in a conference on the best practices. What is wrong with getting information Mr. Speaker on best practices? In a report that was tabled by the former Chief in June 29th of 2006, he talked about how the CABP recently produced a report entitled "Best Practices, a Framework for Professionals and Success in Police Board Governance". But he also highlights that it does not appear to be a discussion on the merits or disadvantages of that model of governance.

Mr. Speaker there is still time. The work is still before us in order to provide the best type of governance for a governance model here in at the City of Winnipeg that's being proposed. And I think these are friendly, these are friendly terms Mr. Speaker that we're considering here today. And I urge all Councillors to really embrace this because I mean the delegation this morning talked about the over representation of the aboriginal, racialized people and the inner city and residents of the north end within the criminal justice system.

That is a fact Mr. Speaker. I represent an inner city ward, some suburbanites and a downtown area and I'm very happy to represent that ward. And my people have spoken and they want to see more representation, they want to be involved within a Police Advisory Board, within a Police Commission, within some sort of a governance model where they have a stake within what is going on. They spoke to us Mr. Speaker at the special meeting of Protection and Community Services. They've come up with two recommendations. Throughout this whole period none of that has ever been entertained.

So I applaud Councillor Gerbasi. I applaud and my colleagues on E.K. - Transcona for having some political courage and for having some traction to move to this level. And I think it's important that we realize that we really need as Councillors, as public servants and as elected officials, to move ahead in concert, in partnership with our community. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just want to clarify one point Mr. Speaker. I heard the delegation, Tom Simms make reference to it earlier and Councillor Gerbasi in her opening comments. And since a week ago today I sat in the chair from approximately 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 o'clock chairing the EPC Committee and hearing delegations on this issue and many. For the record, there were delegations registered in support of the Public Advisory Board. And number two, there were delegations who actually registered against and when they spoke at that stand with the microphone that's not there right now, they actually said they changed their mind and they are supporting it as a good first step. I just want that on the record Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I'm surprised at some of the hesitancy of, particularly the chair of the Standing Committee and in the Motion here which was basically to set up a community conference and look at best practices of police government, governance. And I believe that legislation should move, grow and change, adapting to the concerns of the public into emerging issues. Feedback is important. This is why we are here. If everything was going to stay the same forever we could all go home.

Our role here, every time we meet, is to alter legislation, to change the rules and hopefully in consultation, collaboration and the consent of the public that we have chosen to serve. Particularly, with something new, mechanisms for feedback are important.

This is what this Motion basically calls a community conference that if we don't formalize an asset for people to have this way to review it, believe me, we will get feedback, our phones, our emails, every time we attend a public event, people will tell us what they think and how they feel about it. This is a way of focusing that concern, giving people a chance to live with the new system, see how they feel about it, and come the time of the community conference they can express their good feelings, their bad feelings, their requests for changes. So why not accommodate it?

The community has shown that they are at best hesitant with the proposal that has been brought forward. And it's important to give that community a right to express their concerns, to show their studies, to bring forward our study and to have a forum for all this to be accommodated. I cannot understand the hesitancy with this Motion by some people. And I'm hoping this hesitancy doesn't spread very far, because I think it's the least we can do, is have a community conference and particularly, since the Province is now a partner in funding, the least we can do is set up an intergovernmental committee. I'm sure that they have their reasons for funding police governance. And wouldn't it be nice to sit down and talk to them about it? Instead of doing one offs when it comes to budgeting? Budgeting is a blunt tool for policy. Some specific discussions based on police government would be most helpful. I do not understand how this is in any way why people are hesitating. I really am puzzled by that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Your Worship. I'm going to reserve the majority of my comments for the discussion this afternoon on the actual clause. But, and the motions around that. I agree with some of the speakers that it would be best to have this discussion at the same time but anyways we are here with it. I'm going to keep my comments brief though.

First of all I want to thank, I think the very fact we're having this discussion here today, Mr. Speaker is to give thanks. Thank the Mayor for his leadership on the policing files. We're talking about policing today. We're discussing policing today because of the leadership that he has shown on these issues and the very fact we're having a discussion about advisory board is because he is concerned about the governance and we're and how we've been doing business in the past and he knows that there is ways we can do things better. And it's a discussion that's long been coming and it's something that wasn't around here before he was here but its here now. So I want to thank him for that.

I also want to thank Councillor Gerbasi and Pagtakhan for their Motion. I'm going to be voting for the Advisory Board. I support the Advisory Board and I also support this Motion because I think it's a way to address some of the concerns that we've been hearing from the community. Of course it's very similar to what was said and it's been pointed out, moved at the East Kildonan – Transcona as a compromise the community came forward with a different motion and this is the compromise that came out of there.

And you know, and I think frankly, a reporter not long ago called me on a different subject, through a question to me and my response to him was you know conspiracy theories do not belong here. Conspiracy theories belong in Hollywood. Let's, this is September the 26th, this is not October the 31st. The demons and the ghosts belong on Halloween.

I think Mr. Speaker this is a discussion which it's not the end of history. The fall of the Berlin wall happened, we heard you know, people were proclaiming well it's the end of history now. Communism is dead and that's it there is no more history to write for the future of the world.

You know, I'm hopeful that Advisory Board is it and that if this works and this is the direction but the discussion I think is useful to have and the fact that the community is active in the discussion for the first time in a long time I think is a good thing for our City. And I think we should welcome that discussion. So those are my comments Mr. Speaker.

The other comment I just wanted to quickly make is, you know the Province really has to show some leadership here. You know, we've been on the front lines dealing with these policing issues on a daily basis but we know a lot of the issues with regard to policing, especially quite often with the use of resources, it's tied up with the Province. The fact that police officers go to court and sit there for hours and hours and hours, getting paid to do that, okay, instead of adopting a modern system of being able to handle these proceedings and not tying up officers for hours on end. You see I get excited when I talk about the Province I start to throw my water out. You know that's just one example. Officers getting tied up at the Remand Centre dropping off prisoners. You know Mr. Speaker these are just two examples I've given you of where the Province needs to show leadership when it comes to how we operate our Police Service and co-operation on these issues and we really need to have their support.

They are part of the solution right, instead of being part of the problem and the resources that they've given us is greatly appreciated. If it wasn't for them right now, Operation, well it was Operation Clean Sweep and now Operation, the Street Crime unit, is fully funded, the 47 officers that we have there are fully funded thanks to the funding coming from the Province nowadays.

So I mean it makes a huge difference. So I think they have to be part of this discussion. This is the idea behind this. Whether it's an intergovernmental committee I guess we're somewhat presumptuous to be telling the Province what to do, but you know they're going to do what they want to do anyway I suppose but I think we have to engage them somehow and this is the way to do it. So, those are my comments. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. We have two more speakers. Councillor Vandal followed by Councillor Swandel and Councillor Smith. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll keep the majority of my comments for the main event this afternoon as well but I just want to quickly offer these remarks.

I think the best way to poison a well, relative to a proposed solution is that you come up with what the solution is, you go out to the public, you do some consultations, which occurred July 11th or July 19th, you hear from the Ndinawe Youth Centre, the Central Park Community, People Helping People, North Point Douglas Women's Centre, Winnipeg Labour Council, Ka Ni Kanichihk, CUPE Local 500, Spence Neighbourhood Association, Elmwood Neighbourhood Association, Ma Mawi Centre, St. John's Residents, Inner City Safety Coalition, West Central and another dozen residents and organizations who are all calling for a Police Commission. You do the consultations, they're all calling for a Police Commission and you come back and you basically dismiss what the community has been asking for. That is the best way to poison the well on a proposed solution going forward.

So Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor Gerbasi have come forward with an olive branch of sorts which says a Police Advisory Board is a good first step. But that we should do the following to continue working towards a solution to policing and justice and believe me, this is going to be a long process, is that the City of Winnipeg participate in a community conference on best practices in policing in urban centres in partnership with community groups. Sounds reasonable to me.

Part B) is that Winnipeg City Council call on the Province of Manitoba to sit on an intergovernmental committee to review the findings of the conference as well as do other research on justice issues and make recommendations for police governance in the City of Winnipeg. We know that the City of Winnipeg by itself cannot form a Police Commission on its own. Even if we wanted to today, we couldn't do it. We have to involve the Province.

So the Gerbasi, Pagtakhan Motion says let's do these two things. Community conference, involve the Province to do some research on best practices. What can be more innocuous than that? What can be more innocuous than that Mr. Speaker?

So we have the Motion, there is many more things to say on policing issues in the City. I'm going to save them until this afternoon but I think this is one that is a no-brainer. It should pass unanimously and I'm not sure what the hesitation is. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Actually this isn't a no-brainer Mr. Speaker it's a bit of a pathetic attempt at political grandstanding on a very serious issue that we need to address.

In front of us later on today is another Motion that reads that the item be amended to read that "the board shall hold monthly meetings. The board may hold additional meetings at the call of the chair. The board shall hold an annual town hall meeting to solicit community input on public safety and issues and priorities." That's what we want. The City of Winnipeg as a whole, sitting down together, listening to the public and understanding what we need to do to improve the relationships between our Police department and the communities, not just the inner city all the communities.

And the final Item on there which is one that should have been done, or an amendment done right away and I don't know why this was even in the report to begin with but "the board will establish its own rules of procedures including the decision to hold meetings in-camera." So the issue was raised that we don't want this advisory board meeting in-camera makes perfect sense. We don't want them meeting in-camera. We want this to be a public, open and transparent advisory board but we know that there are issues that are going to come up that are going to require, you know the advisory board to deal with some matters in-camera especially those that affect human resources or may affect the City being put in a position of liability or dealing with claims and settlements with the City.

So it's an Advisory Board. It's a good step, it's a way of getting out. I'm not going to support this Motion. I'm certainly going to support the Motion to amend what we have when it comes to Protection and Community Services because I think that's where we at and that's where we need to be. But I'll be speaking more to that this afternoon and perhaps convincing some of our colleagues who believe that we need to be at the table with the Province in order to do this. But that's not the case.

We are the City of Winnipeg. We have strong leadership. We've got this matter to this point and we need to continue forward on the path we're going so that we can finally start improving the relationship between the Police and the community as opposed to sitting up and allowing these, this conversation to constantly go on and never get anything done. Let's get something done here.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Swandel. The final speaker is Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. You know, this is a, I would appeal to the Mayor to not be so rigid. I grew up in British Columbia and we had a, I can remember a Premier, W.A.C. Bennett and he'd say I took a second look after he heard the public.

We've had meetings with the public. They have not endorsed the idea of a Police Advisory Committee. So you know, it's not a sign of weakness to take a second look and come out with the position that represents the community interests.

You know the BIZes have come out in favour of a Police Commission. You know the BIZes the small business community in my area is strongly in favour of a Police Commission. This Motion by Councillor Gerbasi and Pagtakhan is a reasonable getting together with the Province to discuss the whole issue of how we Police the City of Winnipeg.

Now let me tell you this, one thing I haven't heard at all is LERA, you know. I'll talk about LERA later on this afternoon. But you know, it's part of the whole picture. This would give us an opportunity to discuss the whole picture and not have a body that has not many powers whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker: Final speaker now is Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I hadn't intended to get in at this juncture but why not. My office, we're talking about listening to the people and the groups who came. My office has received the same number of phone calls, emails and letters on this issue as they did on the pesticide issue. None. The people who spoke represent roughly 20% of our population. Policing is a problem in the areas most of these people live and that the others are mostly concerned with and that's fair enough.

Doesn't mean we're ignoring anyone because as I say, the deafening calls from my area have totalled zero. We had a Police Commission once in this City. I sat on Council as you did Councillor Lazarenko, it was, in my opinion, completely and utterly useless. The members took their lead from the Police Chief. Everybody wanted to go to the annual banquet and the parties with the Police Association. This wasn't governance. This was another old boys' club and they were all boys.

The Mayor is coming forward with a step because what we have now, oversight by a Standing Policy Committee has proven, I feel inadequate and he wants something more and we're going ahead a step at a time. We don't want to recreate the problems of the past and we don't want to recreate the problems some other cities are having. We're moving in a new direction. We are moving a step at a time. We don't have to hamstring ourselves by saying we've got to meet with all these same groups again all the time, which represent 20% of the City. We don't need to hamstring ourselves by turning, by using the Province as an excuse and turning it over to them. We're moving ahead on our own in a very prudent manner and I think we should support the clause when it comes and these amendments, if they're proven to be needed, Council through the Mayor, will bring them themselves in the year or two years or even months to come if they prove necessary. But let's move steadily forward as far as we need, and not go out to, not go into overkill before we even start.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor O'Shaughnessy. Councillor Gerbasi will close.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you everybody for your comments today.

There has been a lot of people talking about a first step and I guess, I think people might be able to accept something as a first step if they were really given any indication that there was going to be a second step. And I think that's what this Motion is asking for. It's saying let's

accept this as a first step and let's continue a discussion.

And the Motion is talking about a bringing in of an expert on best practices and talking and getting that information out to people. It's talking about talking to the Province and Councillor Smith is very right that there is a bigger picture here. There is a bigger picture here that we need the Province to help us look at as well and those issues have not been addressed as of yet.

I don't believe, I just wanted to correct a few comments that were made. I don't think I heard anyone in all of the hearings say that it was worse than doing nothing. If they did say that I missed it. I don't, I think the point was Mr. Speaker that they didn't feel that what was being offered was adequate. It wasn't saying… So I think that was just something I wanted to clarify and in fact, in my discussions with the communities since then and with other Councillors, we're saying that we will accept this as a model, we will accept this as a first step. It is an olive branch but, we're asking, we're just not going to accept it with nothing in return. That's not exactly a negotiation. It's not exactly a give and take if you just sort of accept something with nothing in return.

And I guess what the community and some of the Councillors that are concerned about issues of police governance that have not been addressed in this proposed model yet, what we're saying is that we would like to have an opportunity to continue discussing this, hear about best practices and also, to have the Province get involved.

And you know Councillor Steeves has been very clear he doesn't want to do that and that's fine but I think every member of Council should think about what they're saying no to. I not sure what's so frightening about it. You know, Councillor Thomas talked about a democracy and other people talked about democracy today. I don't think discussing things hurts anyone. And the big issue that was raised very well by Mr. Keeper, was that people and by Mr. Simms and by many people today, is that people feel excluded. You know to say, and Councillor Vandal put it well. You know you say you're proposing something. The word proposal. That implies openness and then you have a meeting and you hear from people. Yes there may have been a few people who came later and maybe a 100% of people are not going to agree and I don't think anyone can say that. 100% of the people at the consultation meeting did agree which was very unusual but I'm not saying and I'm sure there's people on both sides of the issue but we're ignoring the people on the other side of the issue completely if we simply move this advisory board forward and close the door on any further discussions. And I don't think that's openness and I don't think that's listening. And I think that's what people are really thirsty for is the feeling or even a perception that they're being heard and they don't have that perception right now.

And so part of it has to do with power dynamics and simply saying that the Mayor's office on high will listen to people in a year or two, you know is not going to make people who are feeling, who are vulnerable, who are in the tight spot in their communities and want to have a say, it's not going to make them feel included. It's not going to reassure them. And what we're asking is just some reassurance.

To say, I'm also a little concerned about the comment that only 20% of the people are in the inner city and the suburban people aren't hearing from their constituents. Okay, or whatever the implication was that it was a small number of people in the inner city who were concerned, okay, whatever was said, there was definitely a problem with this suburban/urban split and it is a bigger issue for some people than others but I'm concerned about a tyranny of the majority. I'm concerned that there are concerns that some people in Winnipeg have maybe a little more than others. We as Councillors should be listening to all those concerns. And I'm not saying we should be dictated to by a small group but we have an overall responsibility to be inclusive and to include, find a way to include everyone at least in the

discussion and that's really all we're asking.

This model also does not, this doesn't bind us to any particular police commission model. This doesn't say yes, we're going to have a new police commission with stronger powers. It says let's talk about it with the community, with experts and with the Province. That's all its asking and I don't understand what people are so afraid of and I don't understand, it might address the discomfort that people have with feeling that they haven't been heard. And I don't think people on this Council don't, they all want to listen to people but you have to believe there is a problem if you're going to fix it and I'm not sure if people have really heard what the problems are yet so we need to have more discussion and that's all that's being asked and I guess with that we'll be discussing this more later today.

I urge you to support it. It doesn't, it meets the needs of the community. People are prepared to support the model and then we can have a unanimous model rather than a divided Council and a divided community. We can work together which is I think what we all want to do. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Ready for the vote?

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote has been called for.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The Motion is lost.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: We have EPC Motions, Notice of Motion by Councillor Gerbasi and Vandal, that Council request the Economic Opportunity Commission report be referred to all Community Committees to provide opportunity for public discussion, in the fall of 2007. Councillor Gerbasi.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi
Seconded by Councillor Vandal

WHEREAS Executive Policy Committee at its meeting of June 27th, 2007 received the Economic Opportunity Commission's report as information and referred it directly to the 2008 Operating Budget Process;

AND WHEREAS there has been no opportunity for all members of Council and the public to respond in a public forum to the recommendations of the commission;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council request that the Economic Opportunity Commission's report be referred to all Community Committees to

provide an opportunity for public discussion in the fall of 2007.

Councillor Gerbasi: Just give me a moment. I don't know I'm usually so much better organized. Notice of Motion from last Council meeting.

Mr. Speaker: From last Council.

Councillor Gerbasi: Here we go. Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Motion before you today was moved in July by Councillor, seconded by Councillor Vandal, and it asks that the Economic Opportunity Commission's report be referred to all Community Committees to provide an opportunity for public discussion in the fall of this year.

And the reason why this Motion is necessary and I know there has been some questions raised about that, is that there really hasn't been an opportunity for public debate even on the floor of Council, regarding this, the Economic Opportunity Commission which is one of the reasons it was moved today because, and let me just clarify the process that happened last summer.

Normally when task forces are ready to table their recommendations, the recommendations go to EPC and Council for information and than there is an opportunity for discussion. And from there, the recommendations are usually referred to the administration for an implementation report.

And I believe, I think that's been Council's practice over the years is that we need the expertise of the public service to give us advice on the specifics of getting the job done in practical and realistic terms and that is exactly the procedure that was followed with the Mayor's Red Tape Commission and the Rapid Transit Task Force Commission as far as I recall.

So it's a current practice but yet this report, perhaps there is reasons I don't understand why, but I don't. This report was directly referred to the budget process and so there was no opportunity to have this kind of discussion here at Council today and there was no separate report going through the recommendations from the public service.

And the recommendations come from an appointed task force. They aren't elected people and their recommendations have been referred directly to our budget into a bit of a black hole in some cases and it's not as transparent as it could be if there could be a report written by the administration and be tabled publicly.

This summer the Mayor did announce at the Chamber of Commerce breakfast, it was a little too early in the morning for me, eight o'clock and I had another engagement but I did heard that there were certain parts of the report that he won't be supporting. And I was relieved to hear that some of those issues that were in the report, he did state in that speech that he had concerns about the ambulance service, the library issues and the recreation services and those were issues that a lot of the public was quite worried about and the city staff was quite worried about too, I'm sure.

But the remaining recommendations are still a massive change and a shift in how our City operates. There is privatization and contracting out of public services, selling off civic assets, directing large portions of growth revenue to attract customer business and also implementing a range of undefined deficiencies which may result in the degradation of our public service capacity to do important functions such as planning and risk management.

So, it's not really enough to say that the budget process alone will suffice for dialogue on this. I want to hear the administration's feedback on everything. I don't want it to just come out and then, it's pretty easy to miss something that is somewhere in the very large budget document.

And the budget process is also very hard for those on the outside of Executive Policy Committee and for the public to participate in and be fully aware of what's being discussed. I mean we all know that anyone who isn't on EPC knows that. I've been on EPC and I've been off EPC so I know that when you're on EPC, the

administration sits down with you and goes through everything line by line and tells you what's really important in there but the public doesn't get that and it's easy to miss really important things.

I also think that there is a cynicism that has developed in the City about our budget processes in spite of the efforts recently, and I applauded the Mayor's efforts in the last budget process, to include us more and to do better and there was an improvement but it's still a process that the general public just kind of throws up their hands and says "I don't know". They don't participate the way they used to years ago. And I don't blame that all on this administration. It's the last you know, it's the way it's gone over the years and there is a lack of public participation.

So something as important as this that is a huge change in the direction of our City in terms of how we provide public service. This is not a, this is a much more significant report than the Red Tape Commission in terms of the impact it's going to have on people and services and the Rapid Transit. Those are important reports. But this is a big shift in where we're going to invest in the future and what kind of a, what kind of City are we going to have? And I don't think it's been properly vetted here and that's what we're asking for.

The membership of the group and I mentioned this at the time that was appointed to that commission was weighted heavily on behalf of those in favour of reduced taxes for the business sector. And the business sector is a very important sector of our society. I sit on the board of five Business Improvement Zones. They all know me as a strong advocate for small business. But the business sector is one sector and I'm trying to look at the big picture here. Running a city is similar to a business in some ways but its a bigger picture than that, it's much more than that and we need to listen to a broader view.

And I know it was said earlier by Councillor Fielding that there was consultation in the process and there was but again it was people going and speaking to members that were appointed that already had a view that the whole goal of everything was to reduce taxes. They were outside of City administration so they didn't necessarily have the big picture of running a city beyond running a business and I guess my concern is that these kinds of changes need to be vetted through people who know that which are Councillors. And at the Community Committee it's one tool that we can use to have some more public discussion on that. And there is more comments that I could make about the actual report itself but I'll leave that aside for today.

I guess one question I think hasn't really been asked in the process of this whole EOC thing is that Winnipeggers have never really, haven't been really been asked what they would do if they had new revenue and how they want that spent. I mean certainly they elected a Mayor who promised a business tax cut but I mean he didn't run on that one issue. There's other issues. And I guess I wonder how you, if the question was asked differently to people what they would say. And they might choose something other than further business tax reductions. They might choose investing money in quality of life issues like even filling potholes or building bike lanes or building rapid transit or providing recreation services or addressing inner city housing and crime prevention and spending more on that. Because investing in those things are also very good for the economy. Thank you Councillor Swandel. Investing in these things are also very good for the economy and they make people happy too, which is also been recognized as an asset to the economy.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Thomas do you have a point of order.

Councillor Thomas: Yes, I'm sorry to interrupt Councillor Gerbasi, if you could please stop her time I'd appreciate it. I'm rising on a Point of Personal Privilege under 41, The Privilege and Rights of a Council Member. I could rise under 917 (c) Disrespect. I could rise under 95, Decorum but as you are all aware in recent years I've developed a hearing

problem. I'm wearing an assist now but when other people, Councillor Steeves and Councillor Swandel specifically, shout out right near me when I'm trying to follow who is speaking, it makes, and banging your fist also isn't helpful. It makes it difficult for me as a member of this Council to follow the debate. So I would respectfully ask that they not shout out and that they not bang their fists against the table when someone else is speaking because I just can't hear. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel and Steeves you heard that. Please, please. Councillor Gerbasi continue.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay thank you. I just tune them out right now. I'm pretty good at tuning them out but I don't have a hearing difficulty.

Anyway where was I, what I'm trying to say is that there needs to be a broader discussion on this whole report and what Winnipeggers really want. I was just talking about how investing, there is other theories about economics that people might like to share with their elected officials, that investing in inner city neighbourhoods, investing in things that improve quality of life also improve economy just as much or maybe perhaps more than simply across the board cuts to businesses of all sizes and things like that.

So I guess I'm just saying we need more methods and more openness is really all I'm asking for. And to have a chance to have a full discussion on this because some of our processes and I think we all admit every year at budget somebody says our budget process is flawed. You know we all wish we had a better process.

So all I'm saying and I recognize sure we could just have a Community Committee meeting at City Centre Community Committee. We've done it before. We've have used this, we at City Centre Community Committee, Councillor Smith will recall, we had a meeting to hear people on the issue of building the MTS Centre and we had also on the, what was the other issue? The rapid transit discussion. We held meetings and it gave people a chance. We had a lot of people out and it gave them a chance to at least express their views. And I guess I felt if it was brought to the Council level then it would be endorsed by Council and if Council endorsed it then all of you would be saying we want to hear, we would agree that we want to hear from people on this too and we want to have that discussion too.

That's why I brought it to this level. Sure I could procedurally at City Centre we could just have one but it's a little less meaningful than if it's city-wide and if all Councillors agree to it. So today you have an opportunity to agree to hearing this report which I think has a lot of impact on our City discussed at all Community Committees. Thank you very much for listening, I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors it's just about one minute to 12:00. We have three more speakers on this subject, on this Notice of Motion.

Councillor Clement moves that we adjourn and reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of September 26, 2007 at 1:30 p.m.

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

Clerk: Yes Mr. Speaker we have quorum.

Mr. Speaker: We'll reconvene from 12:00 noon today. The dealing with the Notice of Motion. The next to speak on that Motion is Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wanted to let you know there is no need to panic on this matter. That the EOC was formed to put forward some recommendations that were to be received as information and taken in for consideration in the 2008 budget process.

As you know under this current Council and Mayor we have increased our consultations with Councillors and the

matters will be done in consultation with our administration and as always in the budget process there is a great deal of opportunity for public input at the numerous Standing Policy Committees, as well as EPC and Council as the budget comes forward.

So I'm not sure where the concern comes here. I understand that some people may not agree with some or all or any of the recommendations put forward but the intent of the EOC was to put forward some recommendations. We don't have to accept any of them or all of them or we may have other things that come to life as we go through the process of analysing and looking for the efficiencies and opportunities in the 2008 budget process.

So I see this as an unnecessary step and you know as I stated before you know any Community Committee who wants to can certainly hold a public consultation on any item whether it's this or the budget in its entirety. So the fact that it's here is a bit puzzling and I would hope that we just sort of move along with our regular business as usual in the budget process and have these recommendations considered in that process.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Leipsic.

Councillor Leipsic: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just would like it address this issue too but with respect to my colleague Councillor Gerbasi, I think we're all aware that the Mayor and EPC have taken a position mainly on a portion of the menu of the Economic Opportunity Commission, Fielding Report, sometimes referred to, Fielding Report. Okay. Thank you.

And I would like to point out that I was up at 7:30 a.m. to hear our Mayor speak. I was up at 7:30 a.m. I was at the Chamber of Commerce breakfast.

Councillor Smith: Did you make muffins? (laughter)

Councillor Leipsic: Harvey, I'm sorry Councillor Smith I don't do muffins okay.

Councillor Swandel: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Swandel: Councillor Steeves and I are a little fed up with being blamed for causing (inaudible) and we would like you to take appropriate action at this time. (laughter).

Mr. Speaker: We'll deal with it later. Councillor Leipsic proceed.

Councillor Leipsic: At that breakfast at 7:30 in the morning I clearly heard our Mayor say that he accepted portions of the report, and portions that he wasn't approving so to speak, library forums, rec centre partnerships.

This commission, I know met with at least 50 stakeholders. They are on line. They've had 4,000 hits already. Councillor Fielding and this outstanding group of citizens gave a lot of time and effort which began post election right through to last May.

And I was pleased to see that these citizens could come on board to help us eliminate this business tax. The issue is, the reason we're here is to look at revenue and look at expenditures. And lots of public consultation was had. Councillors generally have about eight times where they can have input. I know the commission sent invitations to all City departments, all City Councillors, all City of Winnipeg unions, all of the BIZ groups around the City and many other associations.

And you know, I believe in the voice of the people. "VOX POPULAI" I believe is the expression. But there is also something else I wish Councillor Gerbasi would consider. We were elected to be the voice of the people. We hear from them and we have a responsibility and we should have the courage to make decisions like this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Good morning. As chair of that Economic Opportunity Commission I'm pleased here to rise and speak to the extensive consultation that we took throughout this whole process. Last December we were asked to provide a menu of options of how to offset the revenue that is associated with the loss of the business tax or implementation of the elimination of the business tax, if you will. We of course were asked to provide Council with a report back in June which I'm pleased to say we reported on time and on budget.

This was a large and challenging task for a young rookie Councillor as they start to call us in the media here and I'm pleased that my commission colleagues and I were able to deliver this report. A major part of the terms of reference for this commission was exactly that, to have extensive public consultations and no one could question the open process in which we conducted.

In just six months we met with close to 50 different organizations, agencies and groups in and of itself. As chair of the commission I extended an opportunity to discuss the process with each one of my Council colleagues and I met with pretty much everyone here on here, to hear what your ideas are. I do appreciate that the nature of the business tax is something that not everyone agrees with in terms of principle but I was very pleased to take that consultation back to and incorporate that into a good portion in terms of the report.

So I extended an invitation as well to meet with all the City departments and I can say it was a fantastic process. As a new Councillor you get elected and you bet a book about this thick for a billion dollar corporation, so allowing us to go out and meet with each of the City departments to find out how they're spending and meet with the top decision makers was a very important process.

We also had extensive consultations with different organizations and groups. We extended an invitation to meet with all the City or rather the City unions, the Business Improvement Zones, as well as any business and groups as well.

And in terms of getting the word out to our commission we of course had a press conference in early December which we announced that, we announced what we were doing with the Economic Opportunity Commission. We got extensive coverage in the media for it. There was a number of editorials that were written up, colleagues wrote in favour as opposed to it. The articles encouraged all Winnipeggers, and this was done in the Winnipeg Free Press, I wrote a off-ed piece and encouraged all Winnipeggers to come with their ideas and share with us any ideas they can have to either save money, build some revenues into the system as well. The web site of course wasn't hidden as well. We had a direct link that's attached to the City of Winnipeg web site that moved you right to the process for the Economic Opportunity Commission.

And of course, the process we used was following the award winning Red Tape Commission in terms of their approach where there is a web-based approach to it where you can make submissions. And I'm pleased to report that we didn't turn down the City, we didn't turn down a single individual, organization or agency that wanted to meet with us. We took the time whether we heard you throughout the whole commission or myself and the project director, Colin Craig who did a fantastic job in the process for us, met in and of itself.

So my point is, it was a very open and public process and everything was out in the open. There was a lot of attention to the whole process. Something that we saw a lot in research to the report, the City of Winnipeg really loves reports and I think when you first get elected you get bombarded with a lot of reports. We love to produce reports, we love to study them, we love to redo them. And commission members were surprised when we found that the City owns a health clinic, we own a helicopter hangar and we own a train line but we weren't surprised to find out that we own a City, a print shop because how after all, how are we going to

produce all these reports that we generate.

The problem with all these reports is really that they bog things down. And I represent change that people across this City voted for change in the last election campaign and I think some of the Items that were there bring us some new ideas and fresh approaches and things. It makes sense. You might love some of the items that are in there and you might hate some of them but these are ideas that are put on the table. It's a framework. It's a plan that we're moving on right now.

We also want to see a place, I would also like to draw your attention to an example, actually the Speaker Lazarenko moved this back in June 24th of 1998. My colleague Lazarenko, Councillor Lazarenko moved a Motion for the City of Winnipeg to study some reforms with the City of Indianapolis that were undertaken. The City referred the Motion to EPC; EPC on June 8th granted or moved the CAO to take a look at; September 9th there was, Council granted a 60 day extension; November 25th another 90 day extension was given; December 9th, a 90 day extension; The 16th of December that same year a 120 day extension; April 14th another 90 day extension; April 28th another 90 day extension; June 25th of 1999 a 120 days was given to that same Motion and in June 1999 another 120 days was approved.

So, my point isn't to criticize Council but what I'm saying is you know the story goes on. Three years later, 7 million extensions later, the report was finally delivered and I'm sure Councillor Lazarenko and the people that were here around the table could say that that Motion that was brought forward, the study looked nothing like the original request in terms of the proposal.

So I'm not sure, my point is that we don't need a commission to study the commission's findings. What we need to start doing here at the City of Winnipeg is to start doing and that's exactly what's proposed here. There was extensive consultations. I understand there is people that don't agree with a lot of the items that are there but this is a plan, this is a document that we can live off of. Let's look at the items that make sense. The Mayor has already committed to a variety of the things at that point and for the critics of this plan who, you know, I would suggest that burying your head in the sand and not moving on this at all is not a solution. We need to start moving on this and that's why I proposed this extensive consultation.

So I encourage Councillors to not support the Motion that is before us today as the consultation has been extensive and long serving. So thank you very much.

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. During opening comments Councillor Gerbasi made reference to process and drew an analogy to the Red Tape Commission which I happen to agree with her is a perfect analogy. So for clarification if I may Mr. Speaker, the Red Tape Commission, Red Tape recommendations were broken up into specific sections. They were not brought forward as a whole.

The same thing will apply with the Economic Opportunity Commission. When a recommendation comes forward it will come forward and everybody here will have plenty of opportunity to deal with it and speak on it. It will be a totally transparent process.

So I just want to reiterate we are following a similar process and I agree with Councillor Fielding we should just move on and get this done. Thank you.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I actually forgot I seconded this Motion until a few days ago. (laughter) When Councillor Gerbasi came into my office and said that this was coming forward. I've been around here for a few years except for an unplanned vacation for a couple of years and when something is received as information that's generally

not very good news in a report. And this document, the EOC was received as information. To my way of thinking I believe that the status of the report is then somewhere in the, somewhere but its not being acted on, and that the proposals that do, that do have some political will to come forward will come forward in the operating budget. The 2008 operating budget.

So I think, I think that's a new process. I think that is, that is something perhaps where could involve Community Committee. When I got here in '95/'96 we used to send all of the budget documents over to Community Committee and in those days we actually used to go to St. Norbert and go to St. Vital and go to St. Boniface and there used to be some, often times 10 or 12 delegations on what affected neighbourhoods in the budget.

And I think that is the, the route that is preferred by myself even though I did support the Motion. I feel that the Commission's report is received as information. Whatever the Mayor and Councillor O'Shaughnessy want to resurrect and bring to the budget is a new process and I think that process should go to Community Committee because there is going to be some impacts on our neighbourhoods there and I think that is the process that should be debated at the community level.

So I felt I needed to clarify my position on this one and thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers? Councillor Gerbasi closing.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh is there another speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas do you have a Point of order?

Councillor Thomas: No I just wish to speak?

Mr. Speaker: You want to speak? Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. With regard to the Economic Opportunities Commission. I heard a number of comments made around here about reports and having too many reports. I believe to act without analysis is folly so I think it's a good thing that we have a fair number of reports. And I also believe to implement without community input compounds that folly.

And once we have a report, there have been a number of reports that have come down that we have not acted upon because the people have made it very clear that the good souls of the persons who made the reports, did not agree with the direction the community had, circa the PUFS report. I don't think that anybody wants to close our 70 odd community centres and shrink them down to 25. That precludes driving in your vehicles or getting on a bus to get to a long distance centre and the whole purpose of community centres is a place to go to exercise. It's illogical that one would be taking a bus and even more illogical that, most of the people who frequent that are under the age of 12, and to make them go long distance into neighbourhoods they are not familiar with it, is foolish. So that's an example of a report that I didn't support and why.

But to have, we should not be afraid of having community input on the report if we want to implement the report. It's important to make sure that people are on the same page as the report because the report is basically a few people getting together thinking they know what needs to be done, maybe with certain consultation, but we need to have the feedback on the consultation. So I feel it's a great idea to refer them to all the Community Committees. That's where the citizens are. Those are easy to access. They are in communities and people can come there and state what they like and what they don't like.

And we can have an honest disagreement about direction, but we really shouldn't have a disagreement

about consulting the electorate with regard to decisions that we're about to make on Council. I think a good group of leaders wants to know if the decision that they're about to make makes people comfortable and I think that's the whole purpose behind having delegations on City Council, having Community Committee meetings where people can come and make themselves heard on the issues. So what's the problem with having it referred to Community Committee?

You might find that you get a number of people coming up and saying what they like about the report. Don't assume that it's going to be negative. We have had people that come here and say "way to go, about time". Let's see what people have to say and let's see what they agree with and what they disagree with. So that we know when we're acting on something what people may have some trepidation on and what people are comfortable with. That's the whole purpose behind consultation. It doesn't mean that we've abrogated our rights as leaders. As a matter of fact I think that sort of consultation makes us good leaders. So I'm supporting the clause. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers? Councillor Gerbasi closing.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes thank you, thank you Mr. Speaker.

I found it kind of interesting that Councillor Swandel opened his comments on this clause with "no need to panic" considering his response when the report was, was that the report, "things in there scared the beJesus" out of him, anyway.

Councillor Swandel: But no need to panic.

Councillor Gerbasi: But no need to panic, okay, I'll try to balance those two. But anyway Mr. Speaker, in jest.

In any case Mr. Speaker, I'm a little perturbed to hear this notion that we don't need reports, that we don't need input from our administration on matters as important as this. I mean a Motion, I appreciate that that Motion from many years ago took a long time and probably my guess would be that there wasn't the political will to deal with that Motion at that time and we see that now. If there is political will for something a report happens very quickly.

So I think we've seen reports come back on the Red Tape Commission and on the Rapid Transit Report in a timely fashion because those were high profile things that were led by the Mayor or and were high priority. So I would imagine that if there was an administrative report asked for on this particular report we would have also had very quickly, some analysis from the administration. Which I for one would like to have because I value the input of our administration. I actually think that they provide a check and balance to the political side that we need. So those comments I just wanted to put my side of that on the record.

Anyways this Motion is really quite simple. It's really saying let's have some more discussion about this at the Community Committee level where citizens can participate. The truth is it may be a new process and maybe that new process is okay but it was a process that resulted in there not being an opportunity to debate the issue at Council and they are not being the same opportunity there was for other similar types of reports. Now maybe you know there is a reason for that I don't understand, but…

So the other thing is that these are recommendations from a private outside group which may be valid recommendations or whatever but those people weren't elected and I think that those recommendations should go through the administration like they normally do and then those people can report back to those of us who are elected. And that was, I realize it's going to be done somewhat differently and everyone doesn't always care that much about process but I notice these things. I've been around here awhile and sometimes the process is important. It may not be as exciting, in the media or whatever, but it's actually very important for the democratic process that the political, that things move through in a

process that's open and transparent. And that's really all I'm asking is for another step to add some more transparency then if we're not going to have those public discussions here then maybe we can have them at Community Committee and have some further input. So I hope you'll support the Motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillors. You ready for the…

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote has been called for on the Notice of Motion dated September 26th of 2007.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Smith, Thomas, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker Yeas 5, Nays 11.

Mr. Speaker: The Motion is lost.

Consideration of By-laws Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would move the following By-laws be read a first time. By-laws No. 166/2007 and By-law No. 167/2007.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 166/2007 and 167/2007.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'd move that By-laws No. 166/2007 and 167/2007 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 166/2007 and 167/2007.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'd move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 166/2007 and 167/2007 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question Period. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you Mr. Speaker to the Mayor, for the last 10, 14 days or so I've received a number of phone calls concerning the cost of new Wi-Fi services in City libraries. I wonder if we can get some more information how we arrived at the fee structure and if there will be any future consideration for addressing concerns as to the cost of the Wi-Fi service.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you, thank you to Councillor Swandel. I know this was an issue raised in the media and as everyone here hopefully is aware of the fact that all of our public libraries along with the Pan Am Pool do now have Wi-Fi accessibility. There is what I would refer to as a minimal charge, being charged for that.

There are some people who believe it should be free and I think Mr. Speaker we all know there's nothing for free, somebody is paying for it. There are other cities that are charging much more than we charge, other Canadian cities and there are other cities that started to try and have free Wi-Fi and it blew up

whether that would be Chicago or San Francisco, it hasn't happened.

So if someone were to actually do a comparison you will see the approach that we've come up to date has been very fair and reasonable. It's also getting utilized by our citizens. I did have a report come forward over an eight day period; approximately 150 people have been using it. I've got phone calls from parents who take their children to the Pan Am Pool saying this is wonderful, while they're getting a lesson, they can do some work. So, so far the utilization has been good. Everybody using it seems to think the fee is reasonable and there's no doubt it will take time to grow for more and more people to become aware of it.

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

Councillor Swandel: Will we be reviewing the fees and the cost of administering those fees relative to the cost of delivering the service, whether or not there actually is an economic benefit to actually having fees and if we are going to review, when will that be?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will want to take that under advisement. Number two, I can tell you that I have no problem whatsoever with doing a review on the fees and I think what we would have to do is determine what a reasonable amount of time is to make sure we're doing a fair and proper evaluation and I will get back to Councillor Swandel with those answers.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That's it? Councillor Browaty your first question.

Councillor Browaty: It was reported in the Free Press this weekend that a bush party in southwest Winnipeg required 20 cars to address it, meaning about 40 police officers and apparently it brought our entire police force down to a standstill, required a response from six Police districts. That represents again only 40 police officers. There are 1,350 police officers in the Winnipeg Police force. Why does a small response like that bring our police force to its knees on a time like Friday or Saturday night when there should be a heavy contingent of police officers on?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Browaty, I thank him for the question. I was actually, discussed this on the radio with Ace Burpee who I believe was upset Councillor Clement that he wasn't invited to the party. But on a serious note, is I think we all have to realize we hear about the number, you know the complement and you know whether you think it's 1,354 or 1,400 or 1,292, you hear that number and then I guess you ask the question, why deploying 50 officers would have that type of impact on the City and the reality is, is that although that's the number that's used Mr. Speaker, the real number of active police officers out there policing is probably closer to between 450 and 500 and that is probably one of the problems we have with doing our policing and hopefully that does address your question.

Mr. Speaker: Second question Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Doing some back of the envelope numbers, we'll use the number 1,350. The average Police officer will say is on 45 weeks a year, five days a week, eight shifts per week representing service of approximately 1,800 hours per year. If you multiply that by 1,350 officers you're looking at 2.43 million hours of Police coverage, divide that by, obviously Police are on 24/7/365, you're looking at about 277 officers on at any given time. In addition to that there are over 350 civilian workers in our police force.

My question is I mean even if you take off 30 of them in each of the Police stations or six districts, if you have five of them at any given time in the station that should leave in the neighbourhood of 245 police officers ready for front line work. I mean, I understand there is reports that have to be done and there's court proceedings at work where an officer may be pulled away, I still don't think there is enough

response there. What is going to be done to address this and will that be a consideration when hiring a new Police Chief?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Browaty, I very much thank him for his concerns. I think he's pointing out that we do have problems which I think we've acknowledged and we are trying to improve. First of all, I believe that the process that has begun for the hiring of the new Police Chief should take those types of scenarios into account as well as many others.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you over the last several years I've been asked by the former Police Chief for more resources. We provided approximately 175 additional new officers to our force with the help of the Province of Manitoba. We've implemented a full street crime unit, formerly the Operation Clean Sweep, we now have a Crime-Stat in effect as well and the whole idea was when asked for more resources, my response would be, I'm prepared to go and fight for more resources but I need to know about what are the results going to be. I need to know there's accountability. I need to know that if Council agrees to provide more resources, there will be fewer break-ins, there will be fewer drug dealers on the street, there will be fewer prostitutes, there will be fewer gangs on the street. We need to have accountability and I can assure you that all those will come into play in the process of hiring a Chief.

I don't know how to give Councillor Browaty a specific answer why 50 officers being deployed have that impact other than the fact there are only 'x' amount of officers doing front line duty and I think we've all heard the stories how in some of those shifts as was described earlier, they may be dealing with one or two or three matters because their time is tied up for all sorts of reasons which I think we probably will get into later on.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Okay Councillor Smith your first question.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Mr. Mayor for someone that's highly regarded and distinguished as Mrs. Stenning to suspiciously resign with no notice or conventional farewell after well documented strained relationship with top officials in your office, my question to you Mr. Mayor is this, did Annitta Stenning legitimately resign design due to personal reasons or…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith, I'm sorry. Councillor Smith you can't, sorry. That cannot be admitted. That's a personnel matter. We have a policy in place we do not discuss personnel matters in these chambers. A decision was made and if the Mayor wants to answer but I would suggest no. Do you have a supplement question?

Councillor Smith: I have another question, another matter. The whole thing with the traffic synchronization, when is it going to happen to where the travelers in the City don't have to be stopping, stopping, stopping all over the place needlessly?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Smith I thank him for that question. As he knows this was an initiative that I decided to put forward and with the help of Council it will become reality. It's something that should have been done a long time ago, not only for the sake of our environment but for many other specific reasons that I think we're all aware of on a day by day basis and the facts are I think you will be seeing something come forward, probably within the next six weeks to start this process and there will be further announcements made in the very near future. This is something that the public service is working on as we speak.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That's it Councillor Smith?

Councillor Smith: That's it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, the hiring of the Winnipeg Police, the new Winnipeg Police Chief is a matter of great interest to many of my constituents and there is certainly a process in place and what I wanted to ask is, during the public consultation that took place at Kelvin and R.B. Russell, the former CAO had a chance to hear the delegations and there were notes being taken, she also had a chance to speak you know informally with some of the delegations that were speaking, where they imparted some information to our CAO, former CAO and I'm just wanting to know what the Mayor is going to be doing to ensure that the integrity of some of those conversations and those sentiments that were shared with the former CAO are now captured within this current process.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you, I thank Councillor Pagtakhan and I do agree with him that the hiring of the Police Chief is probably one of the most important hiring's that we will be doing in the near future and in the distant future and I'd like to think that everybody on the floor of Council takes that very serious.

The process as pointed out by Councillor Pagtakhan has begun. There was public consultation and he is one hundred percent accurate with the fact that there were members of the public service there. They did take notes, they were privy to all that and Mr., Councillor Pagtakhan can be assured that all of this information will be shared with the Acting CAO and I'm sure if he hasn't already been brought up to date, I'm sure it'll happen shortly and that process will continue the exact same way so we can make sure that we do the right thing and hire the right individual for this position. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to be clear if I heard it correctly, but I wanted to ask, in terms of the process happening as it may in the future on a go forward basis, does that mean there will be more public consultations within neighbourhoods and as well as meeting with various stakeholders such as Ndinawe, the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, Winnipeg Boys and Girls Club, Rossbrook House and various other interested stakeholders, relative, other than just providing the notes that were taken at previous consultations, is there going to be another consultation so that the interim CAO or the new CAO will be able to hear first hand some of the things that weren't written down during those consultations?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker as I alluded to earlier, the process will be followed exactly the way it started. I don't believe there was a thought to repeat part of that process which I think is what Councillor Pagtakhan is alluding to. I am happy to have a discussion on that topic but at this particular point in time we are following the process. If the public consultations have taken place, then we'll continue on with the rest of it. If there are public consultations left to take place then obviously they will follow. It's my understanding that the public consultation process has taken place and we continue to move on.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That's it, Councillor Pagtakhan? Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Last February I sponsored a Motion which you seconded Mr. Mayor on developing an aboriginal youth strategy which would be all encompassing across the City of Winnipeg and I'm wondering if you can give members of this Council an update as to when we would be receiving that report for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Vandal, I thank him for the question. I can update, first of all I'm sure that Councillor Vandal is aware, I believe it's the end of October that there is a conference here for aboriginal youth and I've had meetings with them and so far everything appears to be very positive. I've also had meetings with Grand Chief

Ron Evans and I believe that you will see something coming forward before this year is over.

The key thing is, in order for something to come forward we want something real to come forward. We're not looking for words Mr. Speaker and it is not my goal to say that in the past we've seen a lot of talk but very little action. We want to see talk and then we want to see action on that talk. So that is due in the near future and I thank Councillor Vandal for the question.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal do you have a second question?

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. I'm encouraged by those words Mr. Mayor. Does that mean that there is going to be a budget attached to this strategy?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I believe that in order to make something become a reality when good ideas come forward, there would have to be some type of budget. I am not at this particular point in time ready to give any type of information but I will say this and I think all of us should acknowledge it, that this is an issue that we have to deal with when it comes to our aboriginal youth. I think we should all take it serious. I think we have an opportunity to take our aboriginal youth and turn them into a phenomenal asset for the City and if we don't we're asking for trouble. So I can assure Councillor Vandal, this will be one of my priorities.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal, third question, final.

Councillor Vandal: I understand that over the summer there was, you made some presentations to the Chamber of Commerce about the Economic Opportunity Commission Report or the Fielding Report as I call it, outlining initiatives that were going to be moving forward and initiatives that were off the table in your purview. Could you repeat for the members of this Council the main messages of that communication?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, thank you. You should have been there. The Deputy Mayor got up early in the morning, no just kidding. I may want to refer to Councillor Gerbasi for some assistance on this. Some of the things, it seems like a long, long time ago but I know that we had talked about potential library services and volunteers and I felt at this particular point in time that that was not the route we should be taking. I made a lot of comments that day and I'm just trying to refresh, oh yeah as a matter of fact I think Councillor Gerbasi said them about 20 minutes ago so I guess you were not paying attention to Councillor Gerbasi. But I would be happy to write down the whole list and get it over to you Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Your first question.

Councillor Thomas: Yes, I was Mr. Speaker, I was disconcerted when I heard in the media that there had been a proposal that we were charging for Wi-Fi services as this service in many libraries across Canada is for free. I was even more disappointed when in response to Councillor Swandel's questions, the Mayor responded by saying that nothing was for free and I was wondering if the Mayor was aware of the signage that was on, that's on several of our libraries in the City that says, free for all. The Mayor could comment on that.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would hope that Councillor Thomas is aware of the fact, when a service is provided for free, the taxpayers are paying for it. It doesn't come for free, someone pays for it and just to give some specific examples Mr. Speaker, in the city of Toronto Wi-Fi they pay $4.99 an hour, $9.99 a day, $29.00 a month, more than the City of Winnipeg; Ottawa, $4.95 an hour, $9.95 a day, $29.95 per month; Montreal, $30.00 a

month. I could go on but I'm not going to bore you Mr. Speaker.

We are providing a valuable service. You can access it. It is extremely reasonable and the facts are someone pays. Every service that this City provides, taxpayers are paying for. It may, you as the user may get it for free, someone's paying for it Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Your second question Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Mr. Speaker, as a person who was on the library board for I don't know, 17 years, I'm very disappointed with that answer because, is the Mayor aware that most of the users of the library service are users because they can't afford to have their own personal libraries and that by saying that the individual user who is now paying for service in the library, that is supposed to be free for all, is now making it difficult for our citizens who are in most need of educating themselves, to get out of that morass of poverty by not allowing access for free within our library services? I was quite shocked by the Mayor's response and I'd like him to comment further on that.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'm very sorry to see that Councillor Thomas is shocked. I don't know why. This was an initiative brought forward by the public service, negotiated by the public service. There was no political interference. I don't know where Councillor Thomas was at the time because I'm sure she could have made her comments or thoughts expressed to the public service, but the facts of life are there was no Wi-Fi service today, prior to just recently. We now have the service that is available to people and yes, there is a charge for it. It's just that simple.

This isn't really complicated and if this is an initiative that Councillor Thomas feels is very important to her and others, than she should come forward with other ideas and discuss it because my understanding, this was all done by the public service and I don't believe they had any input whatsoever from Councillor Thomas to raise her concerns.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That's it with your questions Councillor Thomas?

Councillor Thomas: No, I think the Mayor's opinion is pretty clear.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Gerbasi your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question has to do, to go back to the issue of the hiring process around the Police Chief and I'm a little concerned because I met with the former CAO as part of the consultation, Councillors were also consulted and I spent an hour with the CAO answering her series of questions and she was the only person in the room. So nobody else has that information and I guess I'm wondering if there's going to be rescheduling of meetings and the Councillors who had opinions about, had input put into this consultation process, are we going to be having another opportunity?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Gerbasi, I thank her for that. I think that's a very reasonable suggestion. The Acting CAO is directly behind me and I'm sure that that is something that should be discussed and having dialogue and communication and getting feedback from Councillors, I do believe is a very important matter. So I certainly will take that under advisement and follow up on that Councillor Gerbasi.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I appreciate that and I accept that. But I guess my concern that flows from that which is kind of indicated by Councillor Pagtakhan's concerns, too, I'm wondering if there are other groups other than Councillors who our former CAO may have met with on her own without anyone present and I would hope that would be looked into because people who believe

they've been consulted and had in fact and now that information is going to be lost unless that sort of analyzed as to who else met with our former CAO to give their input because that input is all going to be lost if something isn't done. I wonder if that could be done. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, rather than speculate and I do believe that that's what it is, speculation, it's not very difficult for the Acting CAO to talk to staff and find out if there were any other meetings. So I think that's a very simple thing. I'm willing to wager that's probably something that's going on right now in the process and rather than speculate I think we can just deal with the facts and if it is the case, I'm sure that's a subject that should be broached and will be broached.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Vandal your second round. Round two, the bell.

Councillor Vandal: It was reported in the media several weeks ago that you were working on a plan to resurrect the project at Upper Fort Garry, the Upper Fort Garry, 100 Main Street. I'm wondering was that correct?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: No. But I will elaborate. I would never do that to you. Mr. Speaker, what had happened was that a, a former citizen of our City came up with an idea, a very gratuitous gesture I thought. As it turned out it was so gratuitous because the land they were willing to give to the City they didn't own and having dialogued with some of the members on that committee who landed where they landed, we realized that there was no merit in it whatsoever, so the definitive answer is no.

Mr. Speaker: That's it for questions? Okay. Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works report of September 11, 2007, Councillor Clement please.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED SEPTEMBER 11, 2007

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker I'm pleased to bring forward the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure and Public Works for September 11, 2007 and move clauses 1 to 5.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Oh just a minute Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: No. 1. Okay and 2, 3 4 and 5.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1.

Item 1 - Revision of the 2007 Capital Budget - Cindy Klassen Recreation Centre Enhancement File FC 2007

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I'm not sure what the question is exactly. I don't know if this was, because there are two reports on this. One was from this morning and I haven't moved that one yet because the first one that we just brought forward here was just housekeeping within the department. As I understand it it's bookkeeping.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: A very simple question. It's a very simple question. Reading the recommendations it says our capital budget will be increased by $1.2 million dollars and I'm wondering why that is because they are Provincial and Federal funds and is this something that is a regular order of business whenever we get Provincial and Federal grants do we have to increase our capital budget? It seems out of the ordinary.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: You're on the first clause not the second one right?

Councillor Vandal: First one.

Councillor Clement: Okay. Sometimes it works like that. It depends where the money came from. If it was an MRIF fund as an example, where the Province and the Feds put money forward we don't participate in that although we have to approve it.

Sometimes when, usually it's tripartite funding where we would participate. We don't just ante up because they say they want it to be so. But what we do do is we offer projects, I know we certainly do it in Public works all over where we offer up projects and the Province, not usually the Federal government, but sometimes the Federal government want to participate in what those projects are and so we sometimes offer up a minutiae of opportunities and then they choose the ones they want to fund. But no, we don't typically ante up just because they're doing that. That's what I don't think, I don't think that's what this really was. Not the way it was explained to us anyways.

Mr. Speaker: Okay ready for the question. Clause 1.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of September 26th of 2007.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED SEPTEMBER 26, 2007

Councillor Clement: Yes thanks Mr. Speaker. I'll move that clauses 1 and 2 from this morning's meeting as Consent.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motions. I believe there is a Condolence Motion Councillor Clement. We didn't have a chance to deal with it earlier. Clerk will you please read it. Please read it Madam Clerk. Yes Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I was going to just suggest that because this came from this morning that the rules had to be suspended before it could be introduced. Is that accurate?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Clement: So I'll move that the rules be suspended so that we can deal with what we just voted on.

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

Councillor Clement: Is everybody happy now?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Madam Clerk. Madam Clerk will you read that please.

Motion
Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz
Seconded by Councillor Clement

That Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Doug Prysiazniuk, employee of the Public Works Department. Mr. Prysiazniuk was fatally injured while working on the Maryland Bridge on Friday, August 24, 2007.

This Council extends to the family of Mr. Prysiazniuk, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Would everyone in the gallery and the chamber please rise for a moment of silence.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillors. Very unfortunate. Councillor Clement By-laws.

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

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 179/2007 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 179/2007.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 179/2007 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 179/2007.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 179/2007 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Question period. None.

Standing Policy Committee on Finance. There is no report. Councillor O'Shaughnessy as the chair, no report right?

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Pardon Me?

Mr. Speaker: No report? Good. Finance Motions. Is there any? None. Consideration of By-laws. None. Question Period. Any question period in Finance? None. Oh Councillor Vandal I missed you. I'm sorry. Councillor Vandal.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. I would like to ask the chairperson about the 2008 budget. I assume things are under way and I'm wondering if you can share with this Council what the goal is for business tax reduction.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: At this point the only involvement with the 2008 current budget which that would fall under has been administrative. I have not been made aware of forecasts or anything for the current budget at this point. Work at the political level should begin in two weeks on the capital budget.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor Vandal? Thank you Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Next Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development. No report. No Motions. Consideration of By-laws. Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Wyatt: I move that By-law No. 168/2007 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 168/2007.

Councillor Wyatt: I move that By-law No. 168/2007 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 168/2007.

Councillor Wyatt: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 168/2007 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Questions. No questions. Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development.

Councillor Vandal why didn't you do it sooner? You always wait until the end,

okay what's your question Councillor Vandal. First question. He's playing games. He's playing games with me. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: A question to Councillor Wyatt is that I understand there was a tentative deal on the Ryan Block whereby there would be a new, new construction of a parking lot, store front, retail and restoration of the historical facades of the Ryan Block. Can you tell me why the deal has fallen through?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Well basically what was reported publicly over the summer was the Forks were involved with attempting to pull together a project which would have had a parking lot built. There was a large gap with regards to the cost of actually making the project happen and the financing required and to make a long story short, there was discussions held, but at the end of the day the Forks Board of Directors chose not to make that.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker, Point of order if I might?

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: This is a property matter, we're now discussing part of what were the negotiations for that property deal which is not proper and anything the Forks, somebody may have heard that the Forks Board did in private at their meeting that would be up to them if they wanted to release it. I don't think we should be doing that. I think that goes beyond the propriety of this Council.

Mr. Speaker: I agree. Councillor Vandal any further questions? Thank you Councillor. Councillor O'Shaughnessy, thank you for that information. If not, Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Swandel, report of September 4th, 2007.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 4, 2007

Councillor Swandel: Just Mr. Speaker before I introduce the report I'd just want on a Point of order to remind the Speaker in chambers of questions forming content Rule 14 sub (5) Councillors shall not inquire where there is statements made in the media report, in a media report are correct. It's a Councillor's duty to ascertain the truth of any statement before bringing it to the attention of Council.

On two occasions today that's happened Mr. Speaker. So I just want to make sure that everybody is aware of that it's actually contrary to our Procedures By-law.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Swandel: And with that I'm pleased to introduce the report of September 4, 2007 and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 16.

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

Report of September 18th of 2007.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 18, 2007

Councillor Swandel: I'm pleased to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

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

Motions.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT MOTIONS

I believe there is one Motion isn't there? Mr. Clerk? It's this one Motion No. 3.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan
Seconded by Councillor Swandel

THAT Item 11 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated July 18, 2007 be amended by replacing the words "Doctor Jose Rizal Way " in Recommendation 1 with the words "Dr. Jose Rizal Way ".

Okay this is moved by Councillor Pagtakhan and seconded by Councillor Swandel. Motion No. 3 do you have it Councillors? This is just correcting the name of the, of the wording.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Consideration of By-laws Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: I will move that the following By-law be read a first time: By-law No. 160/2007, 161/2007, 162/2007, 163/2007, 164/2007, 165/2007, 169/2007, 170/2007, 171/2007, 172/2007, 174/2007, 175/2007, 176/2007, 177/2007 and 178/2007, be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 160/2007 to 165/2007 both inclusive, 169/2007 to 172/2007 both inclusive and 174/2007 to 178/2007 both inclusive.

Councillor Swandel: I will to move that By-laws No. 160/2007 to 165/2007 both inclusive, No. 169/2007 to 172/2007 both inclusive, and No. 174/2007 to 178/2007 both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 160/2007 to 165/2007 both inclusive, 169/2007 to 172/2007 both inclusive and 174/2007 to 178/2007 both inclusive.

Councillor Swandel: I will move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 160/2007 to 165/2007 both inclusive, 169/2007 to 172/2007 both inclusive and 174/2007 to 178/2007 both inclusive be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Addendum Property and Development Consideration of By-laws, first reading, only, Councillor Swandel. That's on your addendum. By-law No. 181/2007.

Councillor Swandel: I don't have it.

Councillor Vandal: Point of order.

Councillor Swandel: I'll move that By-law No. 181/2007 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute. What's your Point of order Councillor Vandal?

Councillor Vandal: This is By-law No. 181?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Vandal: I would like to declare a conflict of interest on this By-law.

Mr. Speaker: You're too late.

Councillor Vandal: And leave the chamber.

Mr. Speaker: You're too late.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: No he's not.

Mr. Speaker: Okay just a minute. Let it be recorded Councillor Vandal left the chambers. Councillor Swandel do you want to finish reading that?

Councillor Swandel: That rules be suspended and that By-law No. 181/2007 be read a first time.

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

Question Period. No questions.

Councillor Vandal you can come back. Okay. This is, this is going to be a very easy one. Should be out of here within 15 minutes. Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services report of September 10, 2007. Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2007

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will with respect to the report dated September 10, 2007 I will move Items 2 through 7 as Consent Items. We have to deal with Item No. 1 as there is amendments.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker I would like to be recorded against Item 7 please.

Mr. Speaker: You want to be recorded and the rest all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Swandel: I'm tempted to refer it to Community Committee for further consultation. (laughter)

Mr. Speaker: Item 1 Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm sure there will be much to say about this report. I recognize it's been a controversial matter for some time. And I have to admit it's not completely disappointing that we're coming to the end of the public debate portion of this at least. At least for the purposes of Council meetings or maybe I spoke too soon, I'm not entirely certain.

If I was speaking while Councillor Gerbasi was talking I would be in big trouble mister, I can tell you that. I would be in big trouble. (laughter)

The history of a Police Commission in the City of Winnipeg has been decently documented over the course of the last little while Mr. Speaker. You're aware up until, well I guess it was 1986, whatever the date was, I'm not even sure it matters at this stage, but the former Police Commission was abandoned as a policy vehicle in this City for a variety of reasons. But City Council pulled the plug on the Police Commission because it simply wasn't working and it wasn't serving the needs of Council of the day. I think we all kind of accept that.

The descriptions of the then Commission range from ineffective, unaccountable, unaccountable to an unmitigated disaster depending on who you talk to and frankly, it was before my time as a Councillor and I don't know that it necessarily matters who was right or who was wrong but there seemed to be a general consensus in the community the idea of a Police Commission was not working for the City of Winnipeg, be that as it may.

There has been various attempts at iterations of Police Commissions and different things over the course of time and again Mr. Speaker I would be in big trouble mister if I was talking during Councillor Gerbasi's speech. The, other places in Canada, as has been well documented have gone towards a Police Commission model over the course of time, and these Police Commissions have been romanticized and I think they have been held up as a bit of a Shangri-La in these other cities.

I think a couple of things seem certain, just to set the record straight, on that matter. There is no objective evidence or research that I can see that would indicate that a Police Commission reduces the amount of crime in a city. If it exists it certainly didn't come forward during the course of public consultations or debate.

The other thing that is certain as was alluded to by another member of this chamber earlier today, there is certainly no acceptance across the board that Police Commissions are well received by Councils across the land.

There are examples I think where Councils are very pleased with the way that their Police Commission is working. Regrettably other examples in large

Canadian cities where Police Commissions are not very well received at all by the Council of the day in those cities.

So perhaps we can start with that and people can acknowledge that there is no perfect model, either advisory board, commission or what we have now. We are essentially talking about individuals, each and every one doing the very best they can in difficult circumstances and for someone to hold it up as has been done throughout the course of the delegations as a Shangri-La or a perfect result is frankly not accurate and perhaps some people inadvertently overstated their case but I think that needs to be said.

The report for the Police Advisory Board as you are aware provides that this board would advise City Council on the following: a) annual Police Service business plans and their performance targets related to crime prevention and enhancement of neighbourhood safety; Effectiveness of the Police Service in deployment of resources and tactics and crime prevention and neighbourhood safety efforts, both as a measure of achievement of annual business plan targets and as a value for money function of budget allocations made by City Council; Effectiveness of the Police Service and their efforts to liaise with community groups; Effectiveness of the Police Services reporting regularly to the public on crime trends and occurrences in all districts of the city; Response by the Chief of Police, the findings of LERA related to accusations of Police misconduct. Things excluded from the mandate include LERA and citizen complaints during the investigative hearing process, ongoing criminal investigations and public inquiries, personnel matters and the Winnipeg Police Service budget development.

The terms, the composition will be 7 to 10 members which will include a board chair and the chairperson of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, not as the chair of the advisory board. All the initial appointments shall be made by City Council and they will be for three year terms although at the outset there is a staggering of the terms, some twos and some threes. The meetings will be held primarily in-camera. There are some amendments and I'm going to talk about in just one moment Mr. Speaker.

There has been extensive public consultation as you are aware over the course of the last several months. There was originally a limited amount of folks coming forward at the committee stage when we had our public consultation and a special meeting, there was a more robust appearance. I can tell you that it would appear there was an organized effort in the community which is fine. There is no rule against that, to bring people forward to speak against the potential advisory board. And again, there is nothing in the rules that say you can't do that but I can tell you at the public consultation it would appear that most people were most concerned about the aspect of community policing which has come up over and over and over again throughout the course of debate and frankly I'm not sure it has a lot to do with specifically the report we're voting on today. I just want to make that comment.

The concerns were primarily for, when it comes to the report, they were the LERA issue and who deals with Police discipline. Who hires and fires the Police Chief. Who should be responsible for the budget and who should appoint the committee members. There were other concerns but those were the primary and the big four.

Obviously with respect to LERA, hiring and firing of Police Chief, there is some technical aspects there that have to be adjusted with the Province, I think people have alluded to that. But by and large I think those are the concerns and for my part, I can tell you the Province which people keep coming back to, I want to essentially take them out of this debate for the time being. I'm comfortably certain that the Provincial government, if we went to them and we said we want to take over here. We want to take over this we want to take over that. It would take them exactly 12 seconds to say fine. You want that responsible, you want that expense, it is all yours.

I am going to respectfully suggest that our Police Service should be stewarded by an organization that is set up by us. There are those in this chamber who may wish to offload that responsibility on to another level of government in one form or another, in one degree or another. I don't think that's the right way to go and I'm going to caution us against doing that. Rightly or wrongly, agree or disagree this should be an issue that us 16 people can solve and do on our own.

If we want to make specific requests let's agree amongst us or by a majority vote what request we are going to make to the Provincial government and I'll tell you what I think on this issue they will be the least of the issue in terms of changing matters. Let's not muddy the waters any more with that if we don't have to.

Regrettably there has been a massive amount of political polarization on this issue which I thought was unnecessary, which I thought was counter-productive. People have come forward, tried to vilify people, tried to make it sound as though people weren't compromising. Making it sound as though people weren't coming some distance. Again, as Councillor Swandel pointed out this is light years ahead of where previous administrations have gone with this issue. Everybody here acknowledges that. There is no debate.

Tom Simms said for 10 years he was asking the people that came before us on Executive Policy Committee to change this, to change things, to do things differently. But it never happened. But of course as you know as soon as we embark on a method of trying to change things, that's when you open yourself up to criticism and that's fine we're here to be criticized. But I hope there is an acknowledgment, again I've said this time and time again.

We're having this debate because the Mayor, Executive Policy Committee and some other Councillors have elected to have this debate and have this discussion. At very least that should be acknowledged. What's most disappointing to me is that members of our community have come forward and they have not acknowledged at least that. This issue never saw the time of day before this Mayor took office. Not a single solitary little bit and I can see Mr. Speaker nodding in agreement.

There are some amendments we're going to talk to, speak to. Motion No. 4 is a Motion that obviously I'm putting forward that deals with meetings and formal gathering and reporting and it adds the aspect of monthly meetings at the call of the chair; an annual town hall meeting for community input on public safety issues and the board can establish its own rules for procedure including the decision to hold meetings in-camera.

That should help in terms of the public openness and the public accountability. I'm also going to suggest that we go ahead with Motion No. 6 which kind of amends Motion No. 5 and states at B) that we adopt after 18 months following implementation of the PAB the public service shall conduct a review of the advisory board to determine the overall effectiveness of the said board in fulfilling its mandate. That's what I suggest we do Mr. Speaker. I look forward to hearing comments.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors we have three Motions 4, 5 and 6 before us. We'll deal with them and the clause at the same time, you can speak to all three and the clause. And I understand Councillor Wyatt has suggested to me that the Motion No. 4 is substituted with the following "including not in the month of August." But I mean Councillor Wyatt will be able to speak to it because he is the first on the list of speakers.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Pardon?

Councillor Gerbasi: Maybe the Clerk can clarify it but don't movers of motions get to introduce them?

Mr. Speaker: Oh yes, yes, absolutely.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay. Thank you.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Steeves
Seconded by Councillor Lazarenko

THAT the Terms of Reference for Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated September 10, 2007 be amended by deleting the following section:

(3) MEETINGS, INFORMATION GATHERING, REPORTING

Meetings
- The Board shall hold monthly meetings, of which at least two such meetings annually shall be public and the remainder shall be in camera.

- The Board may hold additional meetings at the call of the Chair.
- The Board shall hold an annual town hall meeting to solicit community input on public safety issues and priorities.

- The Board will establish its own rules of procedure.

and substituted with the following:

(3) MEETINGS, INFORMATION GATHERING, REPORTING

Meetings
- The Board shall hold monthly meetings.

- The Board may hold additional meetings at the call of the Chair.

- The Board shall hold an annual town hall meeting to solicit community input on public safety issues and priorities

- The Board will establish its own rules of procedure including the decision to hold meetings in-camera.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Motion No. 4 Councillor Steeves you're the mover and I'm the seconder. Motion No. 4.

Councillor Steeves: You want me to do it again? I trust my comments are clear.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, good. Now Motion No. 5 Councillor Pagtakhan.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi

Motion to amend the Executive Policy Committee Recommendations for Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Service dated September 10, 2007, regarding the Police Advisory Board, by:

a) re-numbering Recommendations 2 and 3 to now be Recommendations 4 and 5 respectively, and;

b) inserting a new Recommendation 2 which shall read:

"Within 18 months following the implementation of the Police Advisory Board, the Public Service shall conduct a review of the Advisory Board to determine the overall effectiveness of the said board in fulfilling its mandate." and;

c) inserting a new Recommendation 3 which shall read:

"The City of Winnipeg shall request the involvement of the Province of Manitoba to participate in a review of police governance as it pertains to The Provincial Police Act and the City of Winnipeg Charter".

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Gerbasi for seconding this Motion. Similar to my comments this morning, this Motion really is, it's really a friendly amendment. It's friendly terms to the main clause of a Police Advisory Board and I do definitely want to thank Mayor Katz through you, Mr. Speaker, for his leadership on this. And I just want to acknowledge that clearly that the delegation this morning through Tom Simms representing the Inner City Safety Coalition did acknowledge the leadership of the Mayor and thanked him specifically for his work relative to this governance model and structure that we're debating today.

This Motion before us, that Motion No. 5, is asking to, that within 18 months following the implementation of a Police Advisory Board the public service shall

conduct a review of the advisory board to determine the overall effectiveness of the said board in fulfilling its mandate; and as well as the City of Winnipeg shall request the involvement of the Province of Manitoba to participate in a review of police governance as it pertains to the Provincial Police Act and The City of Winnipeg Charter.

Mr. Speaker, this is in keeping with the Motion that came out of EPC where last year, it was moved by the Mayor and debated and actually supported by EPC that best practices regarding the police board or commission composition and operation in the above-noted areas of interest. That's in a Motion of last year. This document, the Police Advisory Board and this particular Motion is borne out of that spirit and intent from last year's EPC Motion of July 19th, 2006, Mr. Speaker. And I just want it say that that's exactly what we want to try to find out.

One of my colleagues said that we don't want it make the mistakes of the past Police Commission. We don't want to inherit the mistakes of some of the Police Commissions across this country. Well, this clause within 18 months to do a review I think is a prudent step and the proper approach to ensure that we don't make those mistakes of the past and that we don't make the mistakes of the other municipalities across the country that do have Police Commissions because there certainly are Mr. Speaker, some good best practices that I think that we can adopt here in the City of Winnipeg under a new governance model.

The second part of this Motion the City of Winnipeg shall request the involvement of the Province of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, this police board governance report that's before us today was borne out of some comments and advice of our Police Chief. And in his report he is talking about the Charter does not allow for the delegation of powers to non-city employees or to committee which includes a combination of Councillors and members of the public which is the usual make-up of a board or commission. Therefore in order to implement a board or commission Provincial legislative authority would be required to grant power to those individuals.

Furthermore to emphasize the fact that we ought to be working with the Province of Manitoba Mr. Speaker, the Chief says in his report of May 25th, 2005, "concerning internal investigations of the Winnipeg Police Service has a formal protocol that is invoked in major investigations. However a gap exists as there is no formal ongoing service body mandated to review such major internal investigations. In addition to stipulate requirements respecting governance the Province review and subsequent revision to the Provincial Police Act may compel the City to operate a new model respecting internal investigations as well." And he goes further to say Mr. Speaker "this underscores the importance of initiating a discussion with Province in the near future."

So this intent really is in keeping with the spirit and intent of our administration, of the Motion coming out of EPC of last year and with our community, Mr. Speaker who came out in droves on a special meeting of Protection and Community Services to explain our views. I mean it was also mentioned that while 20% of the population of the City of Winnipeg came out, well yes that might be correct but on the issue Mr. Speaker, 100% of those who came out spoke against that police governance model. And that really, that really says something. It says something to me and I think that we really need to extend an arm out to these folks, to listen to them, to work with them.

As I said earlier Mr. Speaker, the inner city the north end, the downtown, our aboriginal friends, those of ethnicity of different visible minorities are over-represented in the criminal justice system. We definitely need to help them, we definitely need to work with them. I think this is, these two very friendly terms Mr. Speaker, are something that I think that we all should all be able to support. It's in keeping with what we do as Councillors. We represent our folks. We represent our people. This is not just an inner city, a downtown and a north end issue Mr. Speaker. This is a city-wide issue.

The Deputy Mayor spoke of the voice of the people. I can't remember the Latin expression.

Councillor Leipsic: "VOX POPULAE".

Councillor Pagtakhan: "VOX POPULAE", well thank you very much. So that the voice of the people spoke Mr. Speaker on the special meeting of Protection and Community Services this past July. We should listen to them. I don't think we've had a chance to speak to them. I appreciate my comments from the Councillor from St. Boniface, Councillor Vandal. We want to listen and we don't want to spoil the well. We want to listen to these folks. I think this is a very friendly amendment.

On Motion No. 6, I mean what's this Motion about? It's about replacing the words within 18 months, after 18 months. Time is of the essence Mr. Speaker. I think we ought not to delay anything. My colleague from St. Norbert says why, why are we talking, we should be having some action. Well Mr. Speaker, why delay it even further. And to take out the whole recommendation No. 3 which talks about, which talks about talking with the Province of Manitoba that goes right in the face of what our former Chief is advocating about dealing with this issue because it's important to work with our government partners of the Province of Manitoba. This deals with a Provincial Act as well as The City of Winnipeg Charter and I think that we will get positive results if we work with the Provincial government, the stakeholders within the City and with all of us here today.

So I just want to finish by saying that I hope that we can find some consensus and that there is support for Motion No. 5. You know, I think this is in keeping also with the Motion that got some traction at the EK-Transcona Community Committee. And I hope that all Councillors from that Community Committee will support Motion No. 5. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding on your Motion.

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Fielding
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz

That the amendment proposed by Councillors Pagtakhan and Gerbasi regarding Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Service dated September 10, 2007 be amended by:

a) Replacing the words "Within 18 months " with "After 18 months " in the new proposed Recommendation 2;

b) Deleting the new proposed Recommendation 3 in its entirety.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and I'm going to save the bulk of my comments in regards to the Police Commission for the actual debate that's there. I listened to Councillor Steeves and his comments and I very much agree with a lot of them. I think it comes from his wisdom and knowledge of turning 40 yesterday, the grey hair is there so I take that as wisdom and knowledge.

Which in regards to the Motion No. 6 that's there. You know really I think the last thing that we need is a committee to report upon a committee so that's why I suggested this.

The 18 month review. I very much agree with this in terms of the process for the Police Advisory Board. This is something that I was very lukewarm to begin with but I think the 18 month window is something so whether it's within, it's just a word terminology thing that's there.

Really, this puts the cart before the horse and intergovernmental work should not really not be taken in the absence of consultation in support with the new Chief that's going to be coming on line as well as the new CAO and the Police Advisory Board. So this Motion really makes sense in the context of the 18 month window. I've got no problems with that.

And I'm moving an amendment to an amendment, I can't believe that I actually said that, moving an amendment to an

amendment which includes the review but leaves out the aspect that should consider when it's necessary, when the necessary information, the Chief, the CAO and an experienced advisory board is in place. So thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Now to speak on the Motions and the clause Councillor Wyatt you're first.

Councillor Steeves: Point of order. I just want clarification Mr. Speaker. Since the 6, Motion No. 6 is amending No. 5 which hasn't yet been accepted, when it comes time to vote on No. 6…

Mr. Speaker: We will be voting in reverse order Councillor. We will be dealing with 6, 5 and 4.

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker thank you for that answer. I just want to be 100%. I think people should declare before they make their comments.

Mr. Speaker: Yeah I Councillor will allude to that. 6 will be going in reverse order, 6, 5 and 4, when we vote on the amendments, on the Motions. We'll be voting No. 6. So No. 6 is voted on.

Councillor Steeves: If for example No. 6 passes then No. 5, we're voting on the amended No. 5 not on No. 5.

Mr. Speaker: Yes the amended No. 5.

Councillor Steeves: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: That's what it is. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support the advisory board and also support the amendments coming before us today on the actual advisory board.

I am a strong, as you know, you wrote the Motion, I simply seconded it back in 2003, February, on a Police Commission and I'm a supporter of it. I know others are as well. I just want to read it because I think it's worthy or reading it into the record.

"Whereas the '74 Council established a Winnipeg Police Commission to provide quality police force and ensure it is properly equipped, highly staffed and administered;

2. Constitute a body of citizens concerned with local standing and well-being of the Police interested in the maintenance of law and order and able to give advice to and formulate policy to be carried out by the Chief of Police;

3. Guarantee prompt, thorough and objective investigation of all complaints concerning the personnel operation of the Police department;

4. Play an active role in the fostering of good relations between the police force and the community it serves;

And whereas until it was dissolved in November '86 the Winnipeg Police Commission was composed of three members of Council and two electors of the City and at time held overall responsibility for the operations of the Police department including budget preparation and administration, subject to Council approval, operating rules and regulations, disciplinary matters, public complaints against the department, or any member, grievance procedures, dismissals, appointment of senior officers, training and recruitment, community relations and crime prevention;

And whereas other cities in Canada, notably Edmonton and Calgary are now well served by a Police Commission with a mandate to balance the requirement of public accountability and Police independence and provide an interface between the police force and elected officials;

Therefore be it resolved that Council consider the re-establishment of the Police Commission."

I think it was a very comprehensive Motion Councillors and I'm a believer that change does not happen over night. That society and I think human nature is to resist change. That it takes time for change to occur and I believe the

inevitably in many ways that this that in time we will in the future have a Police Commission. And I want to give you my arguments why I think that will happen.

I think first of all the fact that we were doing an advisory board I think is an extremely productive first step. I think the very fact Mr. Speaker that today, this Motion which you moved and I seconded which was buried by the previous Mayor for quite awhile and the very fact that the chair of the Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services at that time Councillor Gerbasi, is now a supporter of the Police Commission tells me the inevitability of the fact we're going to have a Police Commission in the future. And I welcome that support and I want to thank her for that support and I'm pointing it out to thank her for that support and that's why I'm raising it.

And I do that because as you know I know the cabinet system and I don't know what kind of discussions took place, to be fair to Councillor Gerbasi, what kind of discussions took place behind the scenes at the cabinet table and what she might have advocated for but we do know that the Mayor of the day did not support a Police Commission. Councillor Gerbasi may have behind the scenes but because of the cabinet confidential system, she might of not have been able to win the day in that case at that table. So I want to thank for the fact that she is supporting this today. And I think that speaks to the inevitability of this.

I think the fact that the challenges that we faced back then Mr. Speaker are no different than the challenges we face today. The shortage of officers or the perceived shortage of officers. The issue of how we manage the time. The drug problems on the streets, the crimes of opportunity that flow out of the drugs and the gangs. The national headlines that we got then, and we are still getting now unfortunately, the lack of response to Police issues in the suburbs that we're hearing as so-called suburban Councillors. These issues have not changed then. They have not changed now.

The one thing that has changed I would tell you though and I said it earlier today, is that we have a Mayor who is more dedicated today talking about policing issues and trying to solve policing issues then we've had in many, many, many years. And I think that is a huge change and I think it bodes well for the future.

I also don't believe that Mr. Speaker, that when it comes time to look at the Police Commission or Police Advisory Board today, the inevitability of a Police Commission I believe is just simply by the very fact that ultimately the challenges being faced today on a daily basis with our City are, how can I say it? I think any individual can rise to the challenge and try to face the challenge but over a period of time for one man or one woman to constantly, day in day out be the person to say we're going to solve these problems, I think is impossible. I think it takes a team effort and that's where I come back with the idea of the Police Commission as was clearly defined in the Motion that you brought forward in 2003 Mr. Speaker.

I believe in the fact that the idea of a vision which the advisory board is getting to and is definitely part of shared responsibility of sustainability of empowering community and including members of our community who may not feel today they are included when it comes to the development of policing policies. And I talk of course in terms of those activists Mr. Speaker who sometimes yes they may rankle us but as an old friend of mine once said, that real change in society has never come from reasonable people. It's always come from unreasonable people who push those in power to make the decisions ultimately that are made.

This is the reality of these activists and yes maybe they don't come from Tuxedo and there is not a whole slough of them in Transcona, at least not yet, and they come from the inner city because these are where the issues tend to be the sharpest, the pointiest, the contrast, if you like.

I believe the inevitability of a Police Commission also Mr. Speaker and the fact that we need to build institutions not just for today and again I speak in terms of the fact that we have a very proactive Council, a very proactive Mayor. But we should be thinking in terms of 10, 15, 20 years down the road. I know that if we have a great Police Chief I think things will change for the better and I agree with that argument 100%. The questions that we leave is that are we building the institution to be sustainable for the years to come and the challenges that we are continually going to face?

I think that the underlining reason Mr. Speaker of why, if I can get to the very heart of it, all the issues facing policing in our City today and why there is an inevitability in the long run that this will occur is by the very fact that the very issues that we are facing from policing is only a cause of a core problem in our City. That we are to our policing system just simply treating the systems of what's happening in our City. The core problems that we are facing in our City, or the core problem, the greatest problem that is generating all these issues Mr. Speaker, is poverty that exists in many of our neighbourhoods today. Because poverty kills hope. It kills opportunity. It builds barriers. It isolates individuals and attacks directly at the heart of an individual's self esteem and self-worth.

In my view Mr. Speaker, if Charles Dickens were alive today he wouldn't have to go to east London and walk around the streets there to get material to write a future book. He could walk down certain streets here in Winnipeg and get enough material to write a book on the future of what's happening in our City.

The challenges we are facing Mr. Speaker today, in our inner city and parts of our city are absolutely abominable. And the very fact that we have some of the poorest neighbourhoods in Canada right here in Winnipeg is something that we should all be ashamed of. And these neighbourhoods when you have young people who have no opportunity, who graduate and you hear the stories, graduating on car thieves. First of all they are a level 1 car thief, level 2, level 3, level 4 car thief and now they've moved on into the big league and they are really...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel moves extension of two minutes.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: This route of poverty Mr. Speaker until we decide as a City to roll up our sleeves to start to address the issues of poverty, we will not be able to fully address the issues of crime and safety because they are directly connected. We will only be treating the symptoms and that unfortunately is the situation.

The only thing we can do when it comes to policing and yes it is within our mandate is to build institutions that are strong enough to be able to handle this over a lifetime. And that is really the challenge. And that's why this is an excellent first step. That's why I think it should be unanimous that we're supporting the Police Advisory Board today because for years we've been calling for more public inclusiveness. We've been calling for more consultation, for being able to have input into the operation of the Police.

I can tell you Mr. Speaker, it's not long ago where certain people of this Council were told I'm sorry, you have no input on how we are going to run our Police Service. That's an operational decisions. You have no input. I ask you Mr. Speaker that the Minister of Defense has input on where the military bases can go but yet Councillors were told sorry that's none of your business. That was wrong Mr. Speaker and this is now changing and it's a welcome change.

So I'm optimistic for the future. I'm confident of the future more than ever before. We are moving in the right direction. I'm supporting the Police Advisory Board and every amendment coming forward here today. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Good words. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I just want to set the record straight on a couple of things. When I was on EPC, I swear to you I was never told to vote a certain way. I actually didn't care that much about a Police Commission because it wasn't a big issue in the community, for my community at the time. I don't know if there is some new code that's been brought in lately but I certainly voted with my conscience then as I do now. But my opinion then was different and my position has evolved and I think all of us have the right to have our positions evolve.

This is 2007, and I want to tell you why my position evolved because I remember the Motion from Councillor Lazarenko and Councillor Wyatt and at the time I wasn't hearing it loud and clear from everyone the road we must go. And maybe I was wrong not to hear it at that time but today, today, it was in 2006 when the Inner City Safety Coalition, aboriginal groups, young political activists, immigrants, other human rights organizations came to our Committee. And Tom Simms, to correct what was said earlier by the chair of our Committee, Tom Simms said that he first got on to this issue when their committee formed to fight for this issue in 2006. So this is a recent thing that there has been a big community effort. So I just want to clarify that.

I would first like to put on the record that I'm very proud of our Winnipeg Police Service. And I believe and I greatly respect the dangerous and thankless work that our police officers do. I think that needs to be said today. They are dedicated and hardworking. Can we have some order please? Thank you. They are dedicated and hardworking and they risk their lives on behalf of the safety of our community. And I'm sure that police officers across Canada do an incredible job in their communities as well. I don't see how Winnipeg is really that different in that regard to many other places. So why is it that all these other cities have a form of civilian oversight of Police? Why do they all have Police Commissions? They don't only have an advisory body that meets in secret or has a narrow scope of issues within its mandate. Experts on best practices in police governance don't need to be advocating for this model that we are looking at today.

The meeting that was held, I also want to clarify, the 30 plus delegations that unanimously agreed at that meeting that this model was not adequate to address the concerns that they have, I would like to clarify that many of those people who spoke were representatives of organizations. Organizations with boards of directors that voted and took a position in support of changing police governance in our City. Organizations that represent thousands of people all over the City. People opposing the advisory model are being labeled as a small group of activists who don't represent a wide group of people. I think these people do represent a wide group of people.

But even supposing that they didn't, supposing that it was only a small group of activists. Let me name a few activists for you, as Councillor Wyatt is often fond of mentioning Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, Tommy Douglas, Nellie McClung. These were all people who spoke out for the rights of the vulnerable in our society, often alone, often in jail, often facing all sorts of scorns and sanctions for saying this, for speaking against the status quo of the day. And because these kinds of people who have the courage to be activists and come down to whatever political body and yell into the wind at people who didn't want to change anything. These people, because of people like that, because of Tommy Douglas we have a public health care system in Canada. And we have seen wars averted and conflicts solved through non-violent means. And because of activists we've seen the end of apartheid and we've seen women be given the vote. So I'm glad there is people like activists who will come out here and poke at us and make us wake up, all of us, to these kind, to issues that something's amiss.

And I would like to thank the inner city activists, the neighbourhood safety volunteers, the aboriginal community and

the human rights spokespeople for the time they took to come down here meeting after meeting after meeting since 2006 and try to speak to us. And some have been listened to by some members of this Council. Some members of this Council have listened to you. And I think we all should be thanking them.

The reason we need some change to our police governance model and nobody has prescripted in any of these Motions, have prescripted an outcome, have prescripted an exact model. All we're saying is to discuss it. All we're saying is to look at best practices and look at what other places are doing. These other cities have a different model that involves the community more in an empowering way, in a real way because there is a need to maintain a high level of public confidence and trust in our Police Service. They recognize that the public needs to have meaningful input into governance to keep a balance.

And no model is perfect. I'll say it again. Councillor Steeves is right on this. No model is perfect. I agree with him but we should be looking at it from a best practices point of view. Not just, no more to just do anything without thinking about it.

Instead this advisory model will have a limited form of accountability, focusing heavily on tracking crime statistics, Police response times and comparing them to spending. That's about it. This does not address the concerns that have been expressed by our aboriginal community, our immigrant community and our inner city neighbourhoods to name a few.

I'm not going to get into all of those arguments that we've been listening to for hours and hours and hours and days and days of community people time to hear those concerns but those concerns are real. And I think that's the problem is that some members of this Council don't realize those concerns are valid. That we have to look at the whole system and we have to look at the big picture which includes the Province. It includes LERA. It includes all of that.

The Mayor's amendment or I should say Councillor Fielding's amendment No. 6, closes the door on discussion with the Province. It completely takes away the whole purpose of Councillor Pagtakhan's Motion that I seconded. You've already defeated the idea of having a community consultation. You've already, or a speaker come in on best practices. You've already defeated the second part of that which was having a committee work with the Province to really look at this issue in the future. Even when the community and all members of Council, we could have had an unanimous vote, or close to it, to support this model as a first step. We've been told it's a first step by Councillor Steeves. But it's not a first step. It's a last step for 10 or 15 years. Councillor Wyatt maybe you're satisfied with that but I don't really want to wait that long to start talking about this, especially with the level of concern in the community. That's what drives me.

I don't think government should be completely top down and a Councillor gets an idea and wings a motion and then we do it. I think when we start hearing in droves from a huge portion of our community, a huge sector of our society we should be listening to that. And that's what the message. I think, I'm afraid we're going to hear today at the end of this, from the way this is going is that they're not being listened to. And I think that's really sad.

Councillors and community groups have said that if you would give an inch and open the door to just even having discussions with the Province and even having an expert on best practices come and address a community conference, that's all they've asked. They will accept this model. They will accept, you know and I'm just asking for a review.

But this Motion 6 is not give and take. It's not giving anything, it's not a compromise. It's simply putting lipstick on the pig and pushing it out the door as I said a few times. It's not an olive branch. I mean maybe they just think the public will be so confused by all these motions flying around that they'll think they're getting something. But unfortunately we're not

getting anything. We are getting the exact model as proposed before we had the meeting in July.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith moves extension of two minutes.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: I guess I could speak to the Motion, the first Motion 4 which changes a few things about the meetings. You know I'm fine with Motion 4 in terms of it simply, they might not have 8 out of 10 meetings in-camera. They could decide to have some less, less than that, that's about all it is, you know, fine. But the fact is that I haven't been given a reason in my role as representing the people whose voices are not being heard here today, which I have fallen into that role, unfortunately. I haven't been given a reason to support the Police Advisory model.

And I think it's unfortunate when we're talking about governance that we have a divided Council because we have an opportunity here. We had an opportunity and I thought we had come together. I thought there was an understanding earlier before this meeting in the last few days but I guess that fell apart. But I thought there was an understanding that we could come together and we could accept this as a first step and the we could just give people something to continue the discussion. But all the Motions that give anyone anything they're asking for have been defeated or watered down to the point where we're not giving anything. So I'm really sad about that.

I don't think its good for the City, I don't think it's good for the City to have a governance model that's a big chunk of Council, mostly the inner city representatives don't support. I think that's a really bad message for the public confidence. And this division between the inner city and the suburban Councillors that has been talked about is being, that division has been created by this because the Police Service is for the whole City but for something to be for the whole City you have to listen to all the different sectors, including the inner city. Your have to listen to the concerns of the vulnerable, the disenfranchised, the people with less power, this is all about power. And this direction of Council appears to be going is simply in the direction of the status quo.

You know it's not worse than nothing Councillor Steeves but it's worth making the point that it is not what the community has asked for one iota and they have not been given an olive branch, they've been given nothing. So I wish I could support it but I'm sorry I can't. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. There are no further speakers.

Councillor Thomas: Hello, I held up my hand for a long time.

Mr. Speaker: When? I didn't see it? You want to speak? Who else?

Councillor Thomas: Mr. Speaker I'm very concerned about what is happening here today. Citizens who have been advocating for a Police Commission have been expressing their severe disappointment with the recommendations that have come out of Executive Policy Committee.

Let me make an analogy for those who like simple analogy. We've heard many people come in and say I would like a blueberry pie. There is a blueberry pie recipe in the Joy of Cooking. My grandmother in Kamloops, my cousin in Halifax, my sister in Thunder Bay, all use this recipe and there is a good pie out there. We think that you should make a blueberry pie. And we would all like to share in that thought.

And what's happened here is someone has come back and saying oh, you know what we think it's better to have a chocolate chip cookie. We're going to put that chocolate chip cookie in the window. You can count the number of chocolates in the chocolate chip cookie. We'll let you weigh the chocolate chip cookie to see how heavy it is and we'll even let you look at the cookie but you can't smell the cookie, you can't taste the cookie, you can't interact with the cookie in any way.

And people are saying why are you making up something on the fly when there is a proven recipe out there?

There is a Police Commission recipe out there. It's across Canada. Everybody has it. Why are you making this cookie? And no one has ever tried this cookie before it's a totally unproven recipe. But if you are going to try it wouldn't it be a good idea to smell it, to taste it, to look at it in some way? No, no, take a look at the cookie but no you can't comment on the cookie. And that makes me scratch my head.

And I can understand why the residents have come here to say we didn't ask for this. What you've given us is not something that we asked for. But given that, we respect that you've given us something that you think we might like so how about if you give us an opportunity to comment? Let's send this out to committee afterwards, let's have these public hearings so we can get a chance to comment on the cookie. And the response has already been no to that.

Well then let's, let's look at have a review within 18 months so that we can see whether this cookie is maintaining its mandate. It's very different from all the other blueberry pies across the country but we'll take a look at it. And the answer is no, we'll do it later rather than sooner after 18 months. Well what does that mean, after 18 months? Five years is after 18 months. Ten years is after 18 months. Never is after 18 months. That is what the Motion in clause 6 is just silly because it doesn't say when. It just says later rather than sooner but no time line be arrived.

I think that the citizens have chosen good faith in saying that even though we never asked for this we're willing to give it a chance if you provide some opportunities for us to input on how we feel about this new thing that you've created which isn't what we asked for at all.

And that's why I'm willing to support Councillor Pagtakhan's Motion and that's why I will not be supporting Motion No. 6 because it's not what the people want. They've made it clear that they want input. They've made it clear that they are disappointed with what has happened and I feel we need to find out sooner rather than later if this new cookie is doing the job that people want it to do.

Because it's certainly not something like anything else across Canada. It's certainly not something that has been tried and well received in Toronto or Vancouver or Halifax or any of the many other places where they have Police Commissions. So why are we out in the cold without one and why are we stepping cautiously in the direction that we were not asked to step? I don't understand that.

So, my final comment is that, if you're going to give people cookies rather than blueberry pie they should at least be able to let you know what they think of it when you change significantly what they've asked for. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I must confess after those words by Councillor Thomas I'd like to take a break and go into Partners and get some pie and maybe some chocolate chip cookies have a glass of milk and life would be wonderful.

Mr. Speaker I can tell you that I will be supporting the Motion for the public advisory board. I will be supporting the amendment by Councillor Steeves and I will be supporting the amendment, amendment No. 6 by Councillor Fielding.

I very much wish today that we could all genuinely and passionately, and Harvey by the way you don't bother me one bit, talk about policing and how important it is to our community. And I wish we could all be open-minded and all be honest.

The facts of life are Mr. Speaker, is we have a problem in our City. Long before I was Mayor I remember the headline "Winnipeg Murder Capital of Canada". I don't think that's something that any of us here are very proud of, or "Auto Theft Capital of Canada." Now we all know that someone has to be first on these lovely lists and someone has to be last but it's not something that we want.

I know Mr. Speaker that you in the past have been very passionate on this issue. Tom Simms was kind enough to remind us in February of '03 the Motion that yourself and Councillor Wyatt who was then, still a rookie was championing, and I know from stories you shared with me, that the only thing that you found out about knocking your head against a brick wall is it doesn't hurt as much once you stop because that's all you did was knock your head against a brick wall.

What Tom Simms failed to mention was when that Motion was put forward and hopefully we'll hear the answers and we've heard one, Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Thomas and Councillor Vandal were all on EPC. Councillor Thomas was kind enough to say she changed her mind today. I'll accept that. I'll give anybody the benefit of the doubt. I've heard that before. I'll accept it again. But the reality back in 2003 Mr. Speaker, it was buried under "G" and put away for a long, long time not to resurface.

What I believe we're supposed to do with our citizens is be proactive. We're not supposed to wait for citizens to call about a problem. We're elected to do a job. We're paid to do a job. Nobody called City Hall and said set up Operation Clean Sweep. We need help. Okay. There is a problem, we went and did it. Alright? No one said we need accountability with or Police department so let's get a form of Com Stat into effect and help us.

Tom Simms used two words - leadership and accountability. That's what this is all about. I think it's time we all face the reality that we have problems and we all show leadership and sometimes that's not easy Mr. Speaker and sometimes that means you're not going to be popular either. But we all show leadership in starting a process to make sure we're solving a problem. And I believe that the public would very much accept and does accept the Police Advisory Board.

Now unlike some people here there is a major debate going on. Police Commission, no Police Commission? Police Commission, Police Advisory Board? Mr. Speaker I'm not going to sit here and tell you that a Police Commission is a silver bullet that is going to solve all our problems because I don't believe for a moment it is, alright?

I heard Tom Simms talk about other cities that have Police Commissions. I talk to the mayors every day and as Councillor Steeves eloquently said already, they're not working in many cities. They're looking at ways to get out and many of those cities are watching what we're doing right now. It doesn't make a difference whether it's an advisory board, a commission or just a great Police Chief.

We just need to solve this problem and I believe we are taking a good step forward today. We're acknowledging there is a problem and we're taking action. And down the road, maybe Councillor Wyatt is right, maybe we'll end up with a Police Commission. Or maybe we'll have such a great Police Chief, who believes in community policing, who believes in officers being on the frontlines and many other philosophies.

Maybe we won't need it. Maybe we'll wake up in the morning and say you know what we live in a safe city. You don't have to worry about drug dealers. You don't have to worry about pimps, prostitutes, gangs. You can walk down any street and you can feel safe because I know we all want that Mr. Speaker, each and every one of us. But you know what? I don't want to hear about olive branches. I don't want to hear about trying to move this way or move that way. I want us to do the right thing.

The one thing I will say to you whenever Councillor Gerbasi speaks, and I hope she will agree with me, I listen attentively to every word she says. Whether it's on the floor of Council, whether it's a delegation at EPC and I will do the same for every Councillor as well. But just because I don't agree doesn't mean I'm not listening Mr. Speaker. If I have a proposal to make on Friday and someone from Council comes forward with a suggestion that will make it better, I can assure you I will act on that proposal. And as Councillor Smith, I can bend as far as a willow Councillor Smith and I'm happy

to do that and I'll change two or three times if I have to.

Amendments have been made. Open and transparent. We want to be that. There is an amendment coming forward, you're a part of that, meetings will be open, meetings will be transparent. Sensitive information go in-camera. Who could possibly disagree with that? I mean we are moving forward. We're doing good things, yes. Do I want to see this be 16-0? Of course. Does that happen very often Mr. Speaker? No. But you know what, we move on, we do the right thing and as elected officials, I am not the Mayor of West Kildonan or the Maples or Charleswood Tuxedo or the inner city or Windsor Park, I'm the Mayor of this entire City, Mr. Speaker and I will speak on behalf of every citizen that lives in our City.

And do you know what? The point was made that we don't have members of the inner city on EPC. Yet there were accolades to Councillor Wyatt, accolades to Councillor Nordman, who represent the suburbs. You know what, they represent all the citizens. God willing, each and every one of us do, okay and do you know what? Our mandate has been downtown first. Councillor Smith will know I will attend any school, any forum and talk about safety and crime and problems. I'm not afraid to go anywhere. And do you know what? That's how you learn by attending and speaking.

And Mr. Speaker I want all of Council to support this. I want all of Council to know that this is the right first step. I want all of Council to know that we need, we need to desperately make sure that we have input and hire the right Police Chief because we won't get a chance to do it again and it will cost us. We want to make sure our police officers still have the pride and passion to go out there and risk their lives day in and day out Mr. Speaker…

Mr. Speaker: (Inaudible) moves extension of time.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Katz: because you know what with what's been going on in the Police department today, they are losing that passion Mr. Speaker. They are taking early retirements not because they want to because they're not given the opportunity to Police. And that's what they want to do.

We all want Winnipeg to be safe. This is a good step. The next step will be hiring a Police Chief. I hope this is supported by all City Councillors and if not, I know everybody at least expressed their opinion and I respect everybody for that. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. Let me tell you this. You know I attended the State of the City Address and I heard our Mayor get up and promise a Police Commission and I was overjoyed. I thought he has got the message, we're going ahead. And then he changed his mind.

Now let me tell you this. From the communities there is greater support for the Police Commission largely because LERA has been so pathetically bad. It hasn't done its job. So the communities have reacted and said look we want a voice, a greater voice in our how communities are being policed. We don't want all the, that number of officers at the Police service station when they could be out on the streets.

You know the meetings, I attended Kelvin as well as R.B. Russell School on the whole question of what we wanted to do and see in a new Police Chief and you know, everyone was in effect wanting a Police Commission. They wanted the communities to be able to voice their opinions and to be heard.

Now, it's not by the way, it's not just a number of radical people who are agitators and wanting to see something happening. They're, for example at R.B. Russell, the executive director of the West End BIZ was there and she was saying she wants a Police Commission.

She wants to see the communities being able to voice their concerns.

Now, I don't know if any of you saw the story in today's paper “Anger aimed towards Police". I read the story. I went to the web site you know and you saw individuals stealing a bicycle, breaking into a garage, you know and the response time was just not there. So it's important to look at the response time.

I talked to police officers about Central Park. Police officers won't go into Central Park unless there is two of them in the evening. You know, they tell me that quite often there are gunshots. Not reported. So I had a resident from Arlington Street come into my office to see me. He came home one day and found his TV set had, his house had been broken into and his TV set was gone. He decided that he should check with the taxi cabs because someone probably who stole his TV set didn't have enough money for a car and probably got a taxi. So he found one of the companies actually had sent a cab there. This robber had taken the TV set in the cab. The Police have still not responded to this day to this person with this information.

What's happening is in my neighbourhood there is a breaking down of communication. There is a lack of response time and they want to be able to say very clearly that we need better policing than this.

Now obviously a Police Commission is not going to do all of the job. But what the Police Commission will do, it will go ahead and make people in the community feel that they are in effect, having been heard and they have someone to go to other than the Protection and Community Services where an Item is on the agenda, you know like it's bureaucratic. It's important to have a Police Commission to respond to people.

I should tell you this however. I do congratulate the Mayor because he does want to make the Police Service more accountable. You know, I think that's important. I think it's important to have a business plan on how you are going to reduce crime and be measured with the results in a given period of time. I think that concern is, I really appreciate, Mr. Mayor. I think that's really well. You know I’m with you all the way on that but I really do believe a Police Commission will earn the respect of the citizens of this community and you will get better results with the same number of officers that we have now. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's been an interesting discussion. And I want to begin by thanking those residents, those citizens and those representatives of organizations who came out at the July public meeting. Who came out to the Protection Committee and who came out to the Executive Committee to let we politicians know how they feel about this subject.

I think in very many ways this is the strength of our City. We have people who care deeply about making this City the best City in which to live and we can't minimize their commitment to wanting to contribute. I think it's dangerous when we try to cavalierly dismiss 20% of our City. And you know what, what are we? 640,000 people? 20% of that is over 120, 130,000 people. That's a sizable number and I think we have to listen to what 130,000 people say on a particular issue. So I want to begin by thanking them.

I also want to thank Mayor Katz because I believe he has shown some guts and some leadership in bringing this issue to the forefront and I believe that in the end we're all looking for the best solution for policing, for reducing crime, for making our streets safer.

When I look at this issue I ask what is it that we do know for sure? We do know that there is an incredible amount of tension in our City when it comes to police/citizen relations. I read that article this morning that Councillor Smith referenced and response times is absolutely essential. Not just for the inner city but for the entire city. I remember sitting at home, at my home and calling

the Police on an act of vandalism and break and enter and three hours later, there is still is no Police officer and I was a City Councillor. That's a problem that I think that our entire City faces and it creates, it contributes to the tension.

We've talked about relations between the Police and our aboriginal community. And I think that the statistics that Mr. Simm's brought forward this morning are shameful. That 80% of the youth in custody in Canada and probably in Winnipeg and in Manitoba are aboriginal. Is a Police Commission going to turn that around? Of course not. But a Police Commission is part of the piece of the solution, I believe.

And that when you look at the issues facing our poorest and our most disenfranchised and politically oppressed citizens, it's a shame when we go into our institutions and the people the Police are dealing with, night in and night out, and I think that's going to take a community effort to turn that big ship around. And it's going to take the leadership of the City, Councillors, politicians over on Broadway, all levels of government including First Nations and Métis government and we need to provide the forums necessary to bring that forward. Which is why an aboriginal youth strategy is more important than ever and why we need to be walking and chewing gum at the same time, and probably doing a couple of other things.

The 911 fiasco, I was actually chairperson when that occurred. And there were all sorts of allegations as to why that occurred. We never did get a satisfactory answer. We tried to put progressive measures in place to make sure that that doesn't occur again but there was no satisfactory solution to that.

The Driscoll situation which revealed some absolutely stunning allegations, which have never been discussed in this chamber at least not in a public forum.

The monthly budgetary concerns that Police Services and we Councillors have, turn into theatrics. It's nothing but bad theatre most of the time when we get an opposition Councillor bringing forward, standing up next to a Police Chief advocating for more money. And at least in my time when I was chairperson it was bad theatre and clearly the Protection and Community Services model of police governance can be improved.

Response times I've spoken of and that's really the most important issue for average citizens throughout the world. As our City grows like this, throughout the City. As our City grows like this everybody wants four minute response times. But everyone wants their taxes cut at the same time. So it's this constant push and pull that we're going to have to wrestle with over the next three years. Is a Police Commission going to solve that? Is a Police Advisory Committee going to solve that? Absolutely not. It's a part of the solution.

Commissions appear to be the model of choice across Canada. And whether we talk about Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver, Regina, go out east, they have some form of Police Commission with some type of representation which is mixed between city, provincial and citizen. That's not saying, Councillor Steeves that we're handing over the governance of our Police department to the Province. That is simply implying that in order to address all those issues that I've mentioned it's going to take partnerships. It's going to take real partnerships.

And I'm one that believes that a Police Commission, and I firmly believe in the long term a commission is the best solution. We can't do it today but in the long term we should at least be working towards that. I'm one who believes that a Police Commission's mandate is not simply adjudicating disputes on Police misconduct. That is the job of, that's part of the job, that's a very important part of it, but part of a commission's mandate is setting policy that is reflective of the environment in the City of which we stand. And what is unique about the City of Winnipeg and what is unique, what are the trends that are going forward?

I think we need a Police Commission eventually that is reflective of the

community that it serves. And that's a strong aboriginal representation. I'll say it. I think we need to be working towards that. And it's not going to happen today. It's not going to happen in three months or six months but we need to involve everybody, from the Province to the community to get there.

This situation has galvanized the inner city and some groups that I know and respect tremendously, unlike any other ones that we've discussed. Throughout the consultations we've heard almost unanimous direction on where we should be going. I think that we were this close to a solution yesterday and when I asked myself why aren't we there, I'm really at a loss to explain why we can't just cross that hump and have this voted on unanimously this afternoon.

Councillor Swandel said it was cheap politics nothing more, nothing less. I couldn't agree more. I think when you go out to the community, you ask for input, you receive it, you listen intently and then you turn around and almost do the contrary to what was requested unanimously…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt moves extension of time.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Vandal: that is an excellent way, and I said it this morning, I'll say it again, it poisoned the well. And let's be very specific. Let's look at these Motions. We talked about the conference this morning to study best practices. Well that was deep-sixed. For reasons I'm not sure.

We look at within 18 months do a review of the advisory board to determine the overall effectiveness. Well we want to replace "within" with "after 18 months". Semantics.

We look at No. 3, the City of Winnipeg shall request the involvement of the Province of Manitoba to participate in the review of police governance as it pertains to the Provincial Police Act and The City of Winnipeg Charter, which involves looking at the effectiveness of LERA. And that's a whole other conversation. When people call my office and they have a complaint about Police conduct, my response is always the same. You go to the Public Safety Building and you file a complaint and you wait for that process which is usually faster than going over to LERA and waiting in line for about eight months or nine months. And then you go through that process. This is a way to put LERA, civilian oversight investigation on the table while the Police Advisory Committee is doing its work and I really don't think they are mutually exclusive. In fact, I'm at a loss to explain why this Council would not endorse that?

We have the issues in front of us. We have the Motions. I do believe that we were very close to a solution yesterday. I spoke several times with Councillor Wyatt and I want to thank him for his leadership on this issue. I think we're almost there and I'm going to listen to the movers of the Motions wrap up before we vote. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I stand by my comment. I still believe there is a lot of cheap political rhetoric going on here and we're not really serving the people that we were elected to serve. It never ceases to amaze me when the very left leaning members of this Council who sat as members of the former Executive Policy Committee failed to hear the voices of the disenfranchised, the struggling, the downtrodden folks that cry out for help on this matter from the inner city. You know the voices are being heard and the voices are being acted on and responded to. They stand up as contrarians. Never ceases to amaze me Mr. Speaker.

I want to start with a little story of my own. It's not going to a baking lesson. There's an old story of a man who was up to his chest in flood waters and the water was rising and he was stuck in the flood waters. And a rescue boat came by and said "jump in and we'll save you". And he said "no the Lord is my Saviour. He will save me" and he sent the boat on.

And a little while later the water was up to his neck and another boat came by and you know “jump in and we'll save you”. “No the Lord is my Saviour” and he sent the boat on.

And a while later, you know he was just barely keeping his nose out of the water and a helicopter came from above and dropped a line down and yelled “grab the rope, grab the rope, we’ll save you”. “No the Lord is my Saviour” and sent the helicopter away.

Well sure enough the man drowned and when he arrived at the gates there was Peter and he said to Peter he said “where was the Lord in my hour of need”. And Peter looked back at him and said “what do you want I sent you two boats and a helicopter”. But that’s pretty well around here today.

You know where we are working so hard to get something done. This Mayor and this Executive Policy Committee but what do we have? The contrarians. They stand up. We own the social agenda. How is it that these people that sit on this Executive Policy Committee that we are not a part of can actually solve a problem that we couldn’t address? How can they hear the voices? Heck we've even awakened the voice of the Councillor from Point Douglas. Look how far we've gotten.

Now when I asked Mr. Simms about the history on this I wanted to hear some of the things that brought us to the point of requesting a Police Commission and how that came about. There was a lot of things that happened. A lot of things that had happened that were in the media. A lot of it was grandstanded on. You'll all recall the death of a young man involving a Police officer, a child. And that was there and it was an overreaction. There was an overreaction, a misinformed response that went out very, very quickly. That was quickly corrected. But those people were there. They were there to political grandstand.

But when you really went out into the community, you went out and you looked and talked to the community and want to find out, it wasn't about that type of overreaction and grandstanding that people want to talk about. What they really wanted to talk about is what causes young people to be put into a situation like I just mentioned? What causes them to be there and on many occasions they would talk about building community capacity and a desire to seek solutions.

You know, a Police Advisory Board, a Police Commission, a review of Police practices and better ways to get our Police connecting with our communities is part of that community capacity. As of many of the organizations that appeared in front of Executive Policy Committee, from the Inner City Safety Coalition and the different housing groups that showed up, they are all part of an intricate weave that has to happen in order to build this community capacity.

But to stand here and suggest that this Mayor and this Executive Policy Committee are not hearing the voices. We heard the voices. We're acting. There has been deaf ears before this. Action is being taken.

Best practices. You know I did some review on best practices. There is numerous web sites that talk about best practices and police commissions and police governance. Some recommend an elected body. Some recommend an appointed body. Some recommend advisory boards. There is no consensus on best practices. I would say going forward one of the things our Advisory Board might want to do is recommend to us best practices.

You know I'm a little angered by this today. I know it's not like me to raise my voice but, (laughter) but I'll tell you, it is somewhat disheartening to sit here as a member of this Executive Policy Committee who goes out of its way to address the social issues and needs of this City and to hear those voices that others say we don't hear and to act, to walk the walk where others have talked and never walked to get something done.

And I want to finish with a little bit of Shakespeare from Macbeth, Act 5, Scene 5 - “Tomorrow and tomorrow and

tomorrow creeps in this petty pace from day to day to the last syllable of recorded time. And all our yesterdays have lighted fools the way to dusty deaths." Tomorrow, if you carry on the way these Councillors, the opposition to this have carried on, you can be yesterday's lighted fools.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers? We'll start with the Motions in reverse order, No. 6, 5 and 4. In closing. There will be closing. Councillor Fielding you'll have the first opportunity followed then by Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Fielding: Great thank you Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today to speak to the Police Advisory Board today. I would first like to state that crime is not just something that happens in the inner city it also happens in the suburbs. It's a major issue and I campaigned pretty much a year ago now, every second I was talking about a major crime issue. People had crime stories whether it affected them, whether it affected their neighbours. It affected my household three times in one year, so it's a very important factor that's there. It's an issue that a lot of people are working very hard to fix and to address. And I have complete faith that everyone here at this table, whether you agree with the advisory board or commission that is being proposed or not, you want to ensure that our streets are safe.

I want to begin by saying that I agree with the direction that Council has taken over the last number of years in terms of fighting crime. I think the Mayor referenced the number of new police officers that have been on the streets in the last number of two to three years and then Crime Stat, it's a great initiative and I'm glad to see that the Mayor and Council have made funding priorities, more police officers on the streets a priority here at City Hall.

I support the 2006 commitment to create the Police Commission and agree with the ideas in the election campaign. I know that from other jurisdictions Police Commissions have had a positive impact in terms of accountability and transparency for our citizens. According to the 2007 budget spending figures if you look at our spending figures we spend the most on crime fighting out of any other areas that we spend money here at City Hall. So fighting and preventing crime is a complex issue. It involves many levels of government, not just the City, the Province, the Feds. A lot of it has to do with the revolving door justice system. That's not something that we can take of here at the City. What we can do is in terms of Police and making it more accountable.

Therefore it would be unfair to just look at the crime situation here in Winnipeg and say that the men and women of our police force are not doing a good job. We know that we have some of the great, we have, I would argue the best police force within the country and working very hard to keep our society and our neighbourhoods safe. Our officers are risking their lives on a day in and day basis. They need to know that our City Council supports them and stands behind them and I for one am very much supportive of that.

With that being said I also know that we spend some of the highest dollars per capita on Police as well as fighting crime throughout the country and you cannot just ignore those facts. So the relationship as I mentioned cannot be ignored. There is room for improvement in how our funds are spent, our strategies are used. That's why I support the Mayor's commitment to introduce the Police Commission back in 1996 or 2006. However as they say the devil is sometimes in the details.

I was very strongly, had some strong apprehension about supporting this initially but I do believe the amendments that we're putting forth here today are a positive step in the right direction. We are essentially creating a new body that has a lot of potential to have some success in terms of accountability, in terms of transparency but it also has an ability to fail.

And I'm pleased to introduce the Motion here to have a complete top to bottom review of the body within 18 months. I also believe that 18 months is a significant amount of time for us to take a

look at the systems, see what is working, what isn't working, review the process and tweak it, massage it or kill it. It depends on where we're at. So I do very much support this time period that we have put in place.

Over the next number of months we'll continue to push for more powers from the Police Advisory Board because I believe they do need it. Ultimately we can be the body that, we can be even better than what we're proposing here today.

The second issue that I'm very pleased to be in support of is the Speaker's Motion in terms of, and Councillor Steeve's Motion in terms of the transparency and openness of it. During the election campaign I attended a transparency session that was put on by a number of stakeholders and I believe that's a very important process. So I stand behind that commitment and I'm pleased to see the public will have an opportunity to attend and partake if this friendly amendment that we are talking about here is taken into account ensuring that the management of the police force are held accountable by having them report to meetings which are open to the public to address these concerns I think is a very positive step in the right direction.

This will also allow the public and the members of the commission to have a voice at the table. When you look at new strategies or consider the police force as a whole. Of course discussions as you mentioned, some need to be behind doors in terms of the confidential matters, of course and I very much accept that. We should never forget the public is the one that's paying for the Police Commission/Advisory Board. They are paying for the Police Services. They have the right to know what's going on with the Police Service as a whole. I'm glad the Motion is before us today alleviated most of my concerns around the openness and the automatic review of this body that potentially could be in place.

One concern that I still have is ensuring that the police force is indeed accountable to the people. For most corporations, the board of directors is responsible for hiring and dismissing the head of their organization. Members of the Police Advisory Board and Council should have a say in the hiring of the head of their organization in this case the Police Chief, in my opinion. I believe that the Advisory Board should also have the ability to carefully scrutinize funds that we spend as well as play a part in whether it be labour negotiations or setting some performance standards.

These are issues that I believe strongly in and I will closely be monitoring this to make sure this has actually taken place. Although the proposal before us doesn't address all these elements, I do feel that some of these have been considered and this 18 month time period is something that I very much support and it gives us enough time to look at it.

So although the Police, the public are supportive of this to handle complaints, the topic of LERA has come up. Whether the Police board should handle LERA, I very much support the process that's in place with LERA right now. The expression goes if its not broken don't fix it and I support that in terms of that element. As most people know, the Provincial body, LERA is doing a good job so we should maintain that in that capacity.

In terms of composition of the board, I believe the Mayor should have the ability to appoint the majority members of this board. It's nice to have these experts that are there but I think it's very important to have people that understand the whole justice system, to have a strong minded crown prosecutor on board, people with the law enforcement background, whether it be through the R.C.M.P., you name it, but also have that citizens component because these are people that are experiencing this and looking at the Police overall and are part of it.

So further, in closing I believe the proposal before us today is a positive first step. I don't think it's a perfect solution but I feel it's one we can start to make some changes along the way. In and I hope that we end up with a better system that's in place, more transparent open system, so

I will support this Motion. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Fielding. Councillor Pagtakhan closing on your Motion.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I remember when we talked about the operating budget how this Council voted unanimously and how that was such a hallmark event you know at this Council here. It hadn't been done in I think at least a decade and I have to thank the Mayor for that.

I'm still optimistic but I think that we can get that unanimity for this Police Advisory Board. Mr. Speaker we're one Motion away from a unanimous support on the Police Advisory as its tabled today. Two clauses away and I think two clauses that are in the spirit and intent of where this Police Advisory Board was coming from initially, in the initial stages back in July 19th, 2007 with EPC and with the advice and direction from our CAO and the former Chief of Police.

Mr. Speaker these clauses are extremely friendly. They are very similar to what's Motion, Item No. 6 which is really not, which is moving further away from the spirit and intent of the original documents that spawned the Police Advisory Committee.

And not only that but Mr. Speaker, this City of Winnipeg, I look around and I see the crest above you, I see the crest on our name tags, it's in the Mayor's foyer "UNUM CUM VIRTUTE MULTORUM - One with the strength of many". May we be the strength with many of the citizens of Winnipeg to have an unanimous vote on this similar to our operating budget earlier this year.

I think it's still possible Mr. Mayor and I'm very hopeful that we can have support for Item No., for Motion No. 5 as it stands, just as it stands because it really is within the spirit and intent. And that's what we're known for in the City of Winnipeg. Canadians across this country look at us in our housing initiatives and how we work together not only Federally, Provincially but also municipally and with our community partners in that. We're well known across this country for that. We're the poster child for partnerships with the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement, with our MRIF. And I hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we can carry that sentiment on as we've done with our operating budget and now with the Police Advisory Committee.

We need to do this together and I think what's really important is that a lot of the constituents from across our City, from the inner city, from the downtown, from various ethnic minorities, from aboriginal communities, have come out in full support of a model that works. And I think that these two clauses and this one Motion really captures that. And it's something that we definitely need to be open-minded about and I hope that our Mayor with all his zeal and exuberance that he spoke to earlier can ignite this Council and unite us around this issue. Because that's, I think that's what, we're almost there and I think that's, you know, whichever way this goes Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us around this table here today, in this chamber will work positively on a go forward basis.

But let us listen too Mr. Speaker, and I hope we can listen and acknowledge the work of the activists who have come out here today from various neighbourhoods, specifically the north end and the inner city to voice their concerns and to say we want to work with you. Let us embrace that relationship Mr. Speaker. The relationship that has been yearning in the community for many years now. So I hope that we support it, No. 5 as it is tabled today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves on Motion No. 4 and Item 1, both.

Councillor Steeves: Thanks very much Mr. Speaker. A lot of talk about what happened back in '03. I'm just going to clear the record here and let people know. In February of '03 the Motion was passed by Mr., was set forward by Mr. Speaker, seconded by Councillor Wyatt. And Councillor Wyatt read out the Motion as to what was talked about with respect

to the former Police Commission. In looking back to seems a fair enoughly worded Motion. From there, that Motion went to the, I guess the Executive Policy Committee and was referred back.

On May 28th of 2003 because of concerns of Council this matter wasn't being addressed, the, sorry, June 9th of 2003, because of concerns at the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, mostly Councillors Pagtakhan, Wyatt and Smith, they figuratively slapped their chair upside the head and passed a Motion at Committee stating the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services requested the EPC clarify the status of the administrative report with respect to re-establishing the Winnipeg Police Commission and to advise the Committee when the report will be considered. We all know what they are saying here. There was concern in the community at the time. There was concern at Committee that nothing was being done.

These three Councillors and for this reason I have to excuse them in terms of my criticism, they took their chair at that time and they said you, chairperson, EPC, now, fix this. What is going on? Unfortunately for those three Councillors, the chair had some friends of her own and she fought back. She took this to EPC and with her colleagues Councillor Vandal and Councillor Thomas, she punched them right back in the mouth.

What they did at EPC. Figuratively. What they did at EPC is telling. And before I tell you what they did at EFC I'm going to ask you to think back to this morning and what Councillor Vandal said about receiving reports as information. And while you're thinking about that I'll tell you that's exactly what the Executive Policy Committee did.

That's why Mr. Speaker, we have a certain level of frustration here. That's why we wonder if sometimes there's not a teeny-weeny, weeny, little bit of politics going on here. Is it fair for us to think that way? Is it fair for us to consider that is potentially a possibility? I don't know. Maybe it's not but anyway we're back and we have an idea.

I want to ask again. Take the Province out. Leave the Province aside. They will do whatever we ask them to do, all right? Councillor Vandal if, I could speak to him through you directly, I would say this. I know you don't mean to offend this Council. You don't mean to offend me. But I find the idea of us passing a Motion, asking the Provincial government to deal with what I see as our responsibility, mildly offensive. We are elected as City Councillors and a Mayor to deal with this problem.

The specific issue with Motion No. 5, Item No. C) is that it is purporting to hand over our responsibility to the Province. That's not our job. That's not what our citizens and our constituents expect of us Mr. Speaker. If they're watching on TV right now do they want to see us say whoa, whoa we can't do this ourselves. We can't do policing all by our lonesome. Uncle Gary has got to handle that. No siree.

Let's not do that. Let's deal with it right here, right now. Let's talk about compromise. Let's talk about the Councillors in this debate who have not spoken who we all know do not want really to move much from the current status quo. They've been respectful of the process. I think they are going go along with the deed of compromise.

We've now moved even further in terms of opening up by way of Motion No. 4, some of the in-camera motions and rules, we're going to change Item No. 1 to read except in the month of August, don't want a monthly meeting there because that's our prorogue period. That's a friendly amendment from somebody. And then we're going to vote on that. We're going to also expand and talk about a review after 18 months.

Let this thing go and try to work for a year and a half. We'll put it in writing we're going to deal with it. We'll talk about it at that point. We'll bring it back and say hey what do you think? It's in the Motion Mr. Speaker, it can't be avoided. More compromise. More olive branches.

So you recall what the committee can do - business plans; the effectiveness of the

Police Service and deployment of resources and tactics in crime prevention; neighbourhood safety efforts; pose as a measure of achievement of an annual business plan targets and as a value for money function that budget allocation be to City Council; effectiveness of the Police Service to efforts to liaise with community groups; effectiveness of the Police Service of reporting regularly to the public on crime trends and occurrences in all districts of the City; responds to the Chief of Police to findings of LERA related accusations of Police misconduct. Can we set him lose to do that Mr. Speaker? Can we put this in place and allow this group to try to work within that mandate and we'll watch them for 18 months and see how they do with their expanded ambit? What are we going to do?

There has been a little back and forth today between myself and my learned friend Councillor Gerbasi, whom I love more than the sun. I stated, I stated that during the debates, during the public consultations people would come forward and say this is worse than nothing, this is less than nothing, we don't like this. Don't do anything instead of doing this. Councillor Gerbasi corrected me and she said no, no one said that. Nobody said that. Everyone has always agreed this was better than nothing. That's what Councillor Gerbasi said on three different occasions today. That's what she said. Three times. I wrote it down every single time.

So what is she going to do today? What is Councillor Vandal going to do? What is Councillor Thomas going to do? When it comes time to vote, and people have said their piece, we've all had a chance to be heard, at the end of the day, the Motion is amended, wording changed, admitted that the Police Advisory Board is a great first step. Admitted that it's better than nothing. What are we going to do? The desire for unanimity. My friend from Point Douglas let me tell you something Mr. Speaker, 51, 50, 49 seconds from right now we are going to have a chance to achieve unanimity. Right around the corner. In this age of sound bites and in this age of technology where feedback is instantaneous we are going to have a chance to see if truly we are going to be unanimous or not. Or are we going to select this as an opportunity to vote against something for spite? I'm curious to see what happens when we call this vote Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Thank you Councillor Steeves. We'll vote now okay. I guess recorded vote for all three Motions are in order.
On Motion, Councillors on Motion No. 6 moved by Councillor Fielding, seconded by his Worship Mayor Katz.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Smith, Thomas and Vandal.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 5.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, so now, Mr. Clerk, this will change No. 5. No. 5 as amended. Okay a recorded a vote on this one. Motion No. 5 moved by Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor Gerbasi. All in favour please.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order Mr. Speaker, this is as amended so it's basically Motion 6 and 5 combined right? So it takes out clause 3?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, yes. As amended Motion 5 as amended. 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, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt and Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Smith, Thomas and Vandal.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 5.

Mr. Speaker: Carried. Motion No. 4. All in favour of Motion No. 4 moved by Councillor Steeves, seconded by myself please rise. Recorded vote was called on all three. You got a winner. Gord you got a winner! You wanted that. Read them out. Unanimous. Okay it's a unanimous decision on No. 4. Okay now on Item 1 as amended, all in favour?

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote. All in favour please rise. As amended, Item 1.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Smith, Thomas and Vandal.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 5.

Mr. Speaker: Item 1 as amended is carried.

Consideration of By-laws Councillor Steeves will you please do the honor.

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

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 173/2007 and 180/2007.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 173/2007 and 180/2007.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-laws No. 173/2007 and 180/2007 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 173/2007 and 180/2007.

Councillor Steeves: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 173/2007 and 180/2007 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question period. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. There was some discussion today about the involvement of Councillors in the operations of the Police; I think it was Councillor Wyatt who talked about that. I guess I just wanted clarification from the Chair of the Standing Policy Committee because it's my understanding that it's not the role of

politicians to get involved in the operations of Police, that we've always taken that approach in the sense of you know, the policy, the policies yes, but to get in there and have politicians directing you know where exactly a Police car should go for example on a certain night and get right down to the nitty-gritty is not something we've certainly done in the past and I just want to clarify, have clarification from the chair of the Standing Committee there's been a change on direction on this.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I'm not aware of any policy change that's been proposed or adopted by the Police Service in this area, if the person who's asking the question has anything specific to refer me to.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: My second question has to do with the hiring of the Police Chief, it's on the same lines and the process under the former CAO was an administrative hire with input from chairs of the Standing Committee, input from community, there is people and it was the CAO's decision and administrative decision. Since then I've heard comments by the chair saying you know well we won't have her input into that decision. She wasn't giving input, she was receiving input, so I'm just wondering if there's any change in the approach of this being an administrative appointment or will it simply be the work of our CAO getting input from politicians or is it going to be a political decision?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I'm not sure I completely understand what the question was precisely. It is what it is. I mean the system; the process was put in place by the former CAO. Obviously she is not there any longer. We will continue with the same process. I'm not sure if that qualifies as political or not political in the eyes of my colleague, that's the part I don't understand.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question.

Councillor Gerbasi: My final question is, does Councillor Steeves believe that the appointment should be made by our Chief Administrative Officer primarily or does he believe that it should be made by the Mayor and Council primarily, the hiring of the Police Chief?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I believe it should be done in accordance with Council policy. What I believe is of no moment.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal, first question.

Councillor Vandal: Can you give us a critical path as to when the Chief will be hired?

Councillor Steeves: Fair question, tell you what, I will undertake to give a critical path. I have to be a little bit mindful in these matters of hiring of personal as to what I can give. I don't want to overstate my authority but I will ask our Acting CAO to give what the CAO feels is appropriate in terms of critical path and I'll ask that be forwarded to Councillor Vandal and entirety of Council.

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

Councillor Vandal: Just for clarification, are you going to be sitting on the hiring committee Councillor Steeves?

Councillor Steeves: You know what, again, what I'm going to do just because this is a personnel matter that involves hiring, I'll ask for disclosure of what the CAO feels is appropriate. I don't want to sort of get into a bit of a dangerous area in terms of hiring of personnel because of course people might be applying from different places. There is some concern about confidentiality and things in that strip so we have to be a bit careful, not trying to avoid the question.

Mr. Speaker: Good answer.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Councillor Vandal your third question.

Councillor Vandal: Would you consider a civilian appointment Councillor Steeves?

Councillor Steeves: A civilian appointment to the Police of Chief, to the appointment of Chief? Okay, I would consider anyone who applied. I'm not, there's probably some minimum, core requirements that are set out in our terms of reference for the job that we've already distributed. If a person doesn't meet some of those minimum requirements, I would suggest they be a bit behind the eight ball in terms of the application process.

Mr. Speaker: It would be upon qualification. No further questions?

Councillor Nordman could you do the Secretariat report and move that on my behalf? Introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item 1. Could you do that Councillor Nordman?

Councillor Nordman: Sure.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE DATED JULY 16, 2007

Councillor Nordman: I'd just like to move…

Mr. Speaker: Would you please stand?

Councillor Nordman: the July 16th report.

Mr. Speaker: Grant stand up and do it.

Councillor Nordman: I would just like to move the July 16th report from the Secretariat Committee.

Mr. Speaker: And move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: Adjournment who is moving adjournment?

Councillor Swandel: Point of order Mr. Speaker just checking but I think on the computer agenda there is actually a By-law with Secretariat.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Okay. Councillor Nordman moves adjournment.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

ROLL CALL

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

Council Adjourned at 4:20 P.M.