COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, March 19, 2008

The Council met at 9:32 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 O'Shaughnessy.

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.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Pages none. Welcome of Guests and Announcements. I understand Councillor Pagtakhan, you have an announcement.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker I just wanted Councillors to realize and members of the public who are listening here that March 21st is the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

There is a bunch of events happening throughout the month of March, April, and May. Some of them tomorrow, there's the 12th Annual Multi-Cultural Festival organized by the Boys and Girls Club of Winnipeg. In April we have Building Peace in a Multi-Cultural Society and from April 28th to May 4th we have Holocaust Awareness Week.

I just want to put that for the public record and to urge members of Council to attend as many events regarding International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor.

MINUTES

Councillor Browaty moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on February 20 and 28, 2008 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Delegations. First delegation, Chris Lorenc, Chair of the Mayor's Trade Council and President Manitoba Heavy Construction Association, in support of Item No. 1 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated March the 12th of 2008, regarding the Mayor's Trade Council Final Report. Mr. Lorenc, you have 10 minutes sir.

Chris Lorenc: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Good morning Mr. Mayor and members of Council. I consider it a privilege on behalf of the Mayor's Trade Council, MTC, to present a quick synopsis of the report.

Members of the MTC who unanimously endorse each of the recommendations and which Council I had the privilege of chairing, included Dave Angus from the Chamber of Commerce, Jim Carr, Business Council, Stu Duncan, Destination Winnipeg, Jim Eldridge, former Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Kerry Hawkins, retired CEO with Cargill, Eugene Kostyra, former Chair of the Economic Development Committee of Cabinet, Maureen Prenderville, President of Prenderville Industries and Greg Dandewich of Destination Winnipeg, provided invaluable resource support.

The primary recommendation is that Winnipeg with its geographic location in the centre of the country and continent and with its inherent existing advantages should, following the MTC report recommendations, reposition and market itself as Canada's Centre for Global Trade.

The MTC is convinced that the changing dynamics of global trade spurred by

explosive growth in the Asia Pacific Rim countries and the need to maintain an enhanced trade with the United States, our largest single trading partner, present a unique opportunity for Winnipeg to become Canada's Centre for Global Trade.

The economies of Winnipeg and Manitoba are driven by trade activity and as a result, we have developed some inherent advantages quite apart from our location. As Canada is a trading nation, so too is Manitoba with exports exceeding $11 billion, accounting for 62% of the economy and Winnipeg accounts for 64% of Manitoba's G.D.P.

Our airport is ranked fourth in Canada in air cargo handling by tonnage, 17th out of 160 airports in North America, first in Canada in the number of dedicated cargo freighters. CN and CP maintain existing yards and employ 4,000 people. We're the only City where the two major rail lines intersect and maintain extensive yards.

OmniTRAX provides a key link to Churchill, a strategic link to Murmansk, Russia and trade opportunities in Eurasia. Manitoba has the only deep sea inland port in the middle of the country. Shipping via Churchill is nine days shorter to Murmansk and Eurasia than using the St. Lawrence Seaway. A huge competitive advantage.

We are the centre for Canada's trucking industry. We are at the epicenter of trade in Manitoba with east-west and north-south connections. The border at Emerson is the second busiest crossing in western Canada with volumes exceeding 1,000 two-way crossings representing $11 billion dollars in trade.

Trade impacts lives and jobs. 200,000 Manitobans depend for their jobs on trade and over 125,000 in Winnipeg, your constituents, depend on trade for their jobs.

All of this means that efficient movement of trade and goods and services in and out of the City is critical to sectors including manufacturing, agribusiness, construction, information, communication, and so on. These export oriented sectors are key to wealth creation investments and jobs and the future growth of our local economy and jobs for sectors related to trade and transportation.

Our challenge and opportunity is to expand our trading sectors and efficiency of our infrastructure and services supporting this trade, to improve our competitiveness and reach our growth potential and reposition and legitimately market ourselves as Canada's Centre for Global Trade.

China recognizes the importance of trade and is making massive investments in its port facilities. Let's just compare what we're doing compared to China. The Asia Pacific Gateway and Corridor initiative of a billion dollars, each of which dollar now has now been accounted for, is investing in part in Deltaport in Prince Rupert. That program consumes $1 billion dollars. The Deltaport capacity is 2 million, 20-foot equivalent units, teu's per year. Prince Rupert, a half a million. Sounds like a lot.

By comparison, Yang Jiang port in China was built on a 3.3 square kilometre of reclaimed island connected to the mainland by a 32-kilometre bridge. Project investment, $16 billion dollars. Capacity, 15 million teu's a year.

China's container traffic to and from the west coast is projected to triple within the next 20 years. Canada's Deltaport is one day closer to China and Prince Rupert two, a huge economic advantage. These changing trade dynamics are causing geographic re-alignment and reprioritization of trade routes to respond to economic growth. Within these changing dynamics Winnipeg and Manitoba at its eastern terminus can capture new economic activities associated with trade and resulting value-add activity.

There is recognition by all three levels of government that trade and transportation are economic enablers. This is reflected in the Western Transport Minister's report of March 2005 which proposed a $16 billion dollar multi-modal investment

which report was accepted by the Premiers in December of 2005.

The Manitoba and City of Winnipeg government's consistent support for the Mid-Continent Trade Corridor, NASCO, the development of the Manitoba International Gateway Strategy, the Federal policies which are all reflected in the report of the Council, the establishment by the Premier of Manitoba of the MIGS Council and the appointment of the Mayor's Trade Council, the first such initiative in this country.

The recommendations of the MTC report are highlighted as follows:

- That the City of Winnipeg and Province of Manitoba governments collaborate and harmonize their trade policies consistent with Provincial priorities; that those sum reflect Federal trade criteria to create a seamless trade and transportation investment priority. And on that front, we briefed senior Deputy Ministers of the Provincial government, of the Federal government. We met with the Premier, and we also met with Minister Toews to ensure that the directions we were pursuing were not in conflict with either of those two levels of government;

- That a formal senior committee be established with public and private sector participation to coordinate the investment decisions co-chaired by Winnipeg CAO and the Deputy Minister of Trade from the Province of Manitoba;

- That Winnipeg support the objective of creating an inland port primarily based at the James Richardson International Airport;

- That trade routes connecting trade activity be established. These trade routes, by the way, will not only ease congestion but reduce greenhouse gas emissions;

- That enterprise zones deferring, not forgetting taxation, be established to encourage investment in trade activities;

- That we access private sector investment through strategic use of public-private partnerships;

- And that political and business leaders champion this unique opportunity to jointly press the Federal government for required support.

There is a certain sense of urgency attached to these recommendations Mr. Speaker. With timely action, Winnipeg can become the eastern hub of the Western Canada Transportation System, the northern hub of the Mid-Continent Trade Corridor linking Canada, United States, and Mexico, and the first or second port of entry for polar trade linked through the Port of Churchill with Russia and Eurasia. Hence Mr. Speaker, members of Council, Canada's Centre for Global Trade.

Within this context, Winnipeg working cooperatively with senior levels of government and the private sector must connect with trade, therefore growth and opportunity. There is uniform recognition that the area of consideration, that the era of consideration, of procrastination, of navel gazing is over.

In its place, we have entered a period of time referred to as consequences. The legacy of action versus the consequences to our economy of inaction. Whether Winnipeg seizes the moment, connects its economy into these opportunities or lags behind competing jurisdiction is the choice before Council, the citizenry of Winnipeg and the Capital Region.

We look Mr. Speaker, to this Council for its leadership, its commitment to a vision and strategy to reposition Winnipeg as Canada's Centre for Global Trade. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and members of Council for this opportunity and would welcome any questions.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Lorenc. I believe there are. Councillor Gerbasi you have the first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you Mr. Lorenc. My first question is, I'm wondering what kind of

consultation was done in the making of this report? I'm chair of the Mayor's Advisory Committee and I don't believe that Committee was consulted and I'm wondering what other community people, other than the people appointed to the Committee itself, what kind of consultation there was in the making of this report?

Chris Lorenc: Thank you for that question Councillor. First of all it was open to any member of Council or any member of the public quite frankly to approach us and offer opinions. We did extensively consult with the community. We met with the commercial realtors. We met with the rail companies, with the manufacturers and exporters, with truckers. We met with the Winnipeg Airport Authority. We met with senior Deputy Ministers of the Provincial government. We met with the City's transportation department, we met with the City's planning department.

We heard a number of presentations that were made to us about the International Gateway Strategy that is being proposed and directed by the Provincial government. We heard from the Deputy Ministry of Trade on trade priorities. We met with Transport Canada to understand exactly what the Federal priority and criteria are with respect to Federal participation in the funding of infrastructure and transportation investments in this country.

We sought and received assurances from Transport Canada that Winnipeg could and would be considered if the transportation proposals or the applications for funding reflected criteria that the Federal government has announced in its national framework document.

And we did all of that recognizing that it is absolutely critical that the priorities of the City, the Province, and the Federal government are seamless with respect to these objectives.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Another thing I'm curious about is the Rapid Transit Task Force for example, costed out all of its recommendations, at least as a rough estimate. So, I'm wondering why there's no numbers in this report when there's huge recommendations for very specific infrastructure projects. I'm quite concerned about that. Maybe you can clarify why that isn't there.

Chris Lorenc: That's a fair question Councillor. The mandate of the Mayor's Trade Council was quite specific. We were not tasked with providing the detail of specific costs on projects. Rather, our mandate was to provide an overview, a strategy, a picture of the opportunities that Winnipeg as a community and Manitoba as a Province could plug in to as it relates to trade.

The specifics of cost, of course, are dependent on the strategy that you develop. For example, if you decide to proceed with traditional funding, you may find one level of cost. If you try to access public-private partnerships that may provide you with significant advantages. If you are able to framework your trade route system along side the five lens approach of the national framework document of the Federal government, you may be able to access Federal funding. You may be able to access Provincial, sorry Federal funding under the $1.25 billion public-private partnership fund.

So we have provided a strategy, a picture, and portals of entry that will assist the City of Winnipeg in ensuring that the costs for whatever strategy you choose flowing from the report is the most cost efficient to taxpayers.

Not only that, in our review of the trade route system, one of the specific recommendations that identify costs, is the bypass around Headingley. That is in the Provincial capital plan, and it is estimated, we're told, to cost in the vicinity of $200 million dollars.

Our view was that if you were going to take a look at where your priorities for investment would be and which bypass would be of more critical importance to Winnipeg and Manitoba, it would be the bypass around St. Norbert because it's

Highway 75 that carries roughly $11 billion dollars worth of trade annually north and south between ourselves and the United States, and we opted for modifications to what would happen west of the Perimeter through Headingley at a saving estimated in the vicinity of about $180 million dollars.

We were mindful also of the fact that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities in a report, I believe in November, identified the national municipal infrastructure deficit to hover in the vicinity of $132 billion. We're mindful of the fact that in the Province of Manitoba, the investment deficit for highways alone is $8 billion dollars. The investment deficit for land drainage in rural Manitoba in the vicinity of $2 billion dollars. The investment deficit in the City of Winnipeg in excess of a billion dollars. We're mindful and aware of the fact that the City of Winnipeg, nor any municipality on its own, can't fund that scale of investment.

And therefore, what we tried to do was prioritize those investments which we think would provide the City of Winnipeg with its greatest return on investment. We prioritized that in the report. We offered what we think are practical, realistic, doable, and affordable recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Thank you Mr. Lorenc. The report doesn't say much about rail, in terms, I realize that you didn't have time to look at the motion on relocating the yards, but, apparently, but the motion, the report recommends specific roadway widening and extensions of building of new roads.

And I'm wondering why, Mr. Speaker, you would have not consulted with environmental groups or found out information about greenhouse gas emissions and so on with the global climate change crisis and you're recommending all these roads, nothing about rail, nothing about public transit, and the shift of infrastructure priorities from public transit to that.

So why is there nothing on the environment? Why were the environmental experts and the experts on climate change related to transportation not consulted? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Lorenc.

Chris Lorenc: There's a whole bunch of questions in that one question…

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm sorry.

Chris Lorenc: and I'll try to answer them. First of all, in 1994, in 1994, I wrote to the City, to the Province, and to the Federal government, a fairly detailed proposal for the three level governments to consider which;

Would have seen, as an outcome either the twinning of the tracks of CN and CP east from Portage la Prairie entering the City through the northwest and going out the northwest;

Would have established what was then referred to as a rail port, which in today's terminology is called an inland port which;

Would have removed the CN mainline from south Winnipeg and would have stopped the triple separation or division of the City as a consequence of the two mainlines;

Would have provided for contiguous development through the south of the City of Winnipeg;

Could have provided the CN mainline as a transportation corridor;

Would have meant that we wouldn't need to build the Kenaston underpass or the Waverley underpass, or further invest in the structure of the Main Norwood Bridge;

Would have removed noise and congestion from the downtown of the City of Winnipeg;

Would have focused infrastructure investment along a route that already has most of the infrastructure invested;

Would have eliminated the need for many of these structures to be built. And as you know, Councillor, the cost of a bridge say is $40 million dollars is only the capital cost. It's the life cycle costs that are the expensive part of an asset.

Regrettably, that was not accepted by either of the three levels of government. And so when you fast forward to 2008, some 14 years later, we have as a community, as a Province, and as a Federal government participated in the investment of infrastructure because we missed that opportunity in 1994.

So if you take a look on the one hand at the needs that face the City of Winnipeg with respect to its own infrastructure, the question then becomes what's affordable, what's practical, what's doable, and what is realistic?

Now, unless the Federal government were suddenly to announce that the City of Winnipeg would be entitled to a pool of a billion dollars plus that it could spend on whatever it wanted to with respect to infrastructure, I would submit to you that rail relocation could be funded.

But we don't have that opportunity. We don't have that billion dollar fund. We don't have a program dedicated exclusively by the Federal or Provincial governments to relocating the yards or making major or massive infrastructure investments.

So in that reality, what we said was we didn't ignore the rail industry or the rail connections. We didn't ignore some of the other things to which you made reference, but we said to ourselves, given the pressures facing the City of Winnipeg and given the urgency that's associated not only with trade between the United States, our largest single trading partner, but the fact that China's economy is going to be the largest by G.D.P within the next 20 to 30 years, being larger than the United States followed by the United States and then India, what are the strategic investments that we ought to be making as a community given that time is of the essence? We are competing with not just ourselves. We are competing with other jurisdictions.

The Federal government on January 12th announced a $27 million dollar investment for an inland port project in the City of Regina. It's announcing or about to announce funding for similar investments in the City of Winnipeg.

The Asia Pacific Gateway Corridor Initiative of $1 billion dollars, $800 million of that went to the Province of British Columbia legitimately. Why? Because trade is expected to triple from China within the next 20 years, and the ports at Deltaport and Prince Rupert need to be able to handle capacities that are well beyond quite frankly what their capacities are now.

And so the idea is that you move goods quickly from decongested ports of Rupert and Deltaport inland through rail or road, whichever is the most practical and cost efficient, and we submit that its final destination or a primary destination is in fact an inland port in the City of Winnipeg.

So we could have said City of Winnipeg spend whatever, half a billion, or a billion, or $750 million dollars, whatever the cost is to relocate the yards. It's not at this point in our time, in my opinion, practical, realistic, or doable. Let's deal with the assets as we have them. Let's invest in the opportunities as we see them.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Lorenc. The time, Question Period is expired.

Mr. Lorenc: Oh, on the environment, I would just refer you to a Conference Board of Canada report dated December 12, which will explicitly provide you with the answer to the question on the environment, and the answer is that improving roadway surfaces actually reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Chris Lorenc: I can give you that report if you wish.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Lorenc.

Chris Lorenc: Mr. Speaker thank you. Members of Council, I appreciate this.

Mr. Speaker: Like the good old days eh?

Chris Lorenc: It is.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The next delegation in opposition to Item 1, the report of the Executive Policy Committee, dated March the 12th, Mayor's Trade Council Final Report, Mr. Ken Klassen.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker if I might. Mr. Speaker while we're waiting for Mr. Klassen, Mr. Speaker if I might, just with your indulgence, while we've had former Councillor Lorenc here today, I would like to direct Council to the gallery. You see former Deputy Mayor Guy Savoie has also joined us today. I'd like you to welcome him. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Welcome Councillor Savoie. Mr. Klassen, 10 minutes. And you will hear the beep when your time is up.

Ken Klassen: Okay, thank you. Mr. Mayor and Council, not since the release of the Watts Study in the 1960's has a Mayor, a Council, and taxpayers been asked to endorse such a huge and costly expansion that seeds a regional street system with so little evidence.

The Winnipeg Area Transportation Study released in 1968 recommended that the City of Winnipeg build an extensive freeway system, five radial freeways in Winnipeg in an inner ring road. The authors of the study admitted that the recommendations would appear at first glance to provide "facilities of a more substantial and costly nature than the greater Winnipeg area needed or could afford." Mr. Mayor they were right.

Upon closer public scrutiny it was found that the forecasted growth used by Watts dramatically overstated the need for freeways and the inner ring road. An economic analysis demonstrated the proposed freeway and inner ring road were a poor value for money even when the inflated forecasts were used.

The Trade Council report, quite frankly, uses an obsolete 1960's approach that's been abandoned by almost every major City that I know of. It uses what's called DAD - decide, announce, defend. Also sometimes called predict and provide. It is premature and it is fiscally irresponsible quite frankly, to endorse the massive expansion of the regional streets that was recommended by this report without a more thorough analysis.

Before directing the civic administration to develop an implementation plan the Council should really do four things:

Number one, you should expedite development of a plan to reduce community wide greenhouse gas emissions. You committed to do this nine and a half years ago. You don't even have an inventory. We know that transportation is the largest single source of greenhouse gas emissions in Winnipeg. I agree with Chris Lorenc improving road surfaces reduces greenhouse gas emissions. I also know it's one of the most costly, least effective ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Number two, investigate whether there are less costly alternatives to renewal strategy of regional streets recommended in the report.

Number three, insist that an independent cost benefit analysis be conducted on the new or expanded regional streets proposed in the report. There is a legacy in the City of Winnipeg of understating the capital costs of new infrastructure, overstating the benefits, and the civic administration when they make a mistake trying to hide.

Mr. Mayor, I bring several different perspectives. I derive about half my income supporting Canadian companies from Vancouver to Halifax who export abroad, including China. I travel to China on a regular basis. That allows me to travel to other Canadian cities and see how they deal with the movement of goods and services and they deal with congestion. I also get to travel to what I consider a lot of really interesting, cool world-class cities.

The other thing that I do is I do provide planning and policy advice to the Federal

and Provincial governments. I'm hired as a consultant to do that. So I think I have a different lens. I also served on the City of Winnipeg's (inaudible) Truck Committee along with the City's Civic Environmental Committee. So I think that's a little bit unusual.

So you're being asked to ram this thing through the administration within 120 days. Kind of interesting, your first Rapid Transit report by the way, 1959. And we are still waiting for the implementation plan for that, but its roads 120 days.

The Winnipeg Free Press has really confused me in recent days. On March 15th, they had an editorial entitled "Clogged Arteries". A few days later, they claim "City traffic is already too congested and many motorists face commute times that are equal to those of much larger cities".

I was confused because I have a clipping from you Mr. Mayor, The Winnipeg Free Press in November, when you were asked the five things you liked about Winnipeg what did you say? Number four, "our drive times, our commute times are minimal". So who's right? The Free Press or you Mayor? Mayor you are right.

What happens, if you look at statistics Canada 2005 Community Study, if you look at the average commute times of the nine largest cities in Canada, Winnipeg has the second shortest commutes. And that bears out my own experience when I travel across Canada, the second shortest commutes in Canada. Our average commute for people, for workers, round trip 61 minutes per day, Toronto 80 minutes, Montreal 76 minutes.

So I agree Mr. Mayor, congestion is not a big problem, and I think if you did an ad hoc poll, and you asked people to raise their hands here they would say that's (inaudible) in Winnipeg. It is not a very congested City. We do have congestion, but it's moderate.

And the fact that we have low congestion isn't a surprise. We have very low population growth. I looked for the last 10 years at the 1996 to the 2006 census. Ten largest urban centres in Canada, what City has the slowest growth in population? Winnipeg.

Now, I also look, you know that my heart is with Kenaston Boulevard. I've looked at the traffic counts in the last week, I worked with Tom Price who is your traffic count supervisor and low and behold I found that the traffic counts at Kenaston and Academy, Kenaston and Taylor, a street which this report says needs to be widened, are lower today than they were 14 years ago. Thousands of cars lower. St. James Bridge is 8,000 or 9,000 cars per day lower today. So the traffic may have increased since the Charleswood Bridge was open but it hasn't come back to levels it was previously at.

So what are other cities doing? When I look at B.C. and Vancouver, they have a gateway project. The B.C. government recognizes you can't build your way out of congestion by adding more roads. They've committed to spending $14 billion dollars to expand public transit systems to double the ridership. This includes four new rapid transit lines in metro Vancouver, upgrades to rapid bus and 1,500 new buses. They know you just can't build new roads. Ontario agrees. Ontario has announced $11.5 billion over 12 years for new public transit. 50 rapid transit projects are being funded in Toronto and Hamilton; 50 projects.

And if you don't believe me about you can't build your way out of congestion, let's talk to Robert Cervero, he's a professor, probably one of the best known authors in urban planning in North America. His quote here, "preponderance of the research suggest that induced demand effects of new or expanded roads are significant with most added capacity being absorbed by increase in traffic".

So all these new roads that Mr. Lorenc wants to build, yes, they will initially allow the freer movement of goods and services, but if you're only doing that what's going to happen is you're going to attract more people to drive more and you're going to lose that benefit and it will

degrade over time. It'll be back to the same place.

So where's the cost benefit analysis? I find it really interesting that the you, the City has endorsed the Strategic Infrastructure Renewal Policy. A key report recommendation said "any new publicly funded infrastructure should be accomplished by a cost benefit analysis which establishes new sustainability and clearly justifies its construction'. I was equally amused that the co-chair of this report is Chris Lorenc. So I assume that he still believes that you should do cost benefit analysis.

And we know that you're not doing cost benefit analysis. We know that in 2007 and 2008 Capital budget, you had $278 million dollars of road expansion projects or functional design studies for new roads. Four to five are not in Plan Winnipeg. I asked for a cost benefit analysis. I was told we have a cost benefit analysis, but only for one of the five Mr. Mayor. I said can I get a copy of it? They say file a Freedom to Information request. That's not how a government should run, Mr. Mayor. I'm sorry.

I would also like to say that what other cities are doing is transportation and land management. There was a national web conference yesterday that I attended here in Winnipeg. In Vancouver, there were 15 planners from the City of Vancouver in streets and transportation and transit; Mississauga 13 and so on, all across the country, on things that you can do to reduce congestion that cost less than expanding the road system. You know how many people were from the City of Winnipeg Mr. Mayor? Zero.

The people have, the Transportation and Land Management Association had their first national conference in Calgary last year. Every major city in Canada was represented except, Winnipeg. So, you know, I respect and honour the work that the people have done to produce this report but quite frankly, none of them have a background or expertise in transportation and land management. Mr. Lorenc is the Heavy Construction Association. They build roads. They focus on supply, not demand.

Mr. Mayor, you talked about integration and environmental economic decision making when you ran for government. You said that your decision making approach would be one of the triple bottom line. Not only must your decisions make good economic sense but they must also protect our environment and enhance our quality of life.

I talked to Alec Stuart, Civic Environment Coordinator. Nobody talked to him about this report. Mr. Lorenc rattled off all these other people he talked to. He didn't talk to your Civic Environmental Coordinator. And we know roads and transportation are the largest single source of environmental impacts in Winnipeg. There's an Environmental Committee, Councillor Gerbasi, not since she's been chair they haven't been talked to. Talked to Ken MacKinnon who's here, he's a member, nope nobody talked to him either.

So, and the ninth thing here is Plan Winnipeg commits to citizen engagement by actually assisting input into policy formulation, political decision making through meaningful public input. There has been no meaningful public input. I knew nothing about this until I read it in the Winnipeg Free Press. And I would argue that I'm as well informed as anybody in the City of Winnipeg when it comes to jurisdiction of civic matters. And if I had known, I would have made this presentation to them and not you and take up your valuable time.

So what I'm going to do is I'm just going to conclude with a few remarks again from professor Cervero, University of California. "Our biggest obstacle ahead may very well be one of less of gridlock and one more of mind lock". Last sentence "Institutional inertia in particular stands in the way of the most meaningful reforms in the urban transportation sector". Mr. Mayor and Council, let's get on board. Let's not think that we can build our way out of congestion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Klassen. I believe there are some questions. Councillor Gerbasi. Your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation Ken. What is your view on the issue of, I'm just curious, on the issue of the rail relocation or not even just the relocation, but just the whole issue of looking at rail as one of these forms of transportation and how the report addresses that? Did you have time in the last week that you've suddenly seen the report to reflect on that?

Ken Klassen: Well I probably would tend to agree with Chris Lorenc. I think that we probably have missed the boat on the whole issue of rail line relocation. What I do know that is movement of goods and services that I experience and I see is through containers or intermodal in scoring at about twice or three times the rate of general freight traffic. So we need to be cognizant and aware of that that it is a more energy-efficient form of shipping and that it needs to be encouraged. To that, I have nothing else to add.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Klassen, if we turn this down today, how do you think we should proceed?

Ken Klassen: I'm not saying that you should ignore this report. I think there is a lot of good in the report and I do support you know a lot of the broad concept in the report. What I don't accept here is to advocate such a large expense to the regional street system without evidence, without looking at alternatives.

So my four options were, you know, it is crazy, like if you talk to anybody who knows anything about urban planning to endorse and then ask for an implementation plan of all these streets and roads without first having in place a strategy of how you're going to reduce your greenhouse gas emissions is stupid. It's bad public policy, you know. I charged the government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba good money to hear that type of stuff. You're getting this for free.

The second thing is investigate whether there are less costly alternatives. Raise your hand. Who here is against saving money? If we can reduce congestion in other ways other than expanding the regional street system, should we not do that?

Third thing, independent cost benefit analysis, you know, I like it, Chris Lorenc likes it, SIRP likes it. It's your policy. Please follow your policy.

And last, a meaningful public consultation. This whole thing is going to collapse. You know, again, I think Mr. Lorenc and his Committee did a wonderful job of consulting with other levels of government, the railways and all these other kind of things, but at the end of the day, who pays for this?

You have to get the general taxpayer on board and they're going to revolt when they start seeing the bills. We know that every dollar that goes to expand the regional streets that are recommended in this report, is a dollar that doesn't fix you know residential streets, back lanes, sidewalks, crumbling riverbanks, leaky civic buildings or whatever.

So you have to engage in proper public consultation, get the public to buy into this and that hasn't been done yet. So that's, that's an oversight and maybe it's part of the mandate. Maybe they didn't have the mandate. So it's not their fault. It's a bad mandate.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith that's it? Councillor Swandel, your first question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Mr. Klassen have you read the EPC recommendation with regard to this matter?

Ken Klassen: Yes I have.

Councillor Swandel: Are you aware that it says that the public service is to report back to EPC with recommendations on implementation?

Ken Klassen: Yes I am. The motion before you is to endorse. So it's asking you to say yes, we endorse in principle, we agree in principle that the way to deal with congestion in Winnipeg, the only way to deal with congestion in Winnipeg to speed up the movement of goods and services is to expand the regional street system.

And I submit to you that there is no other major urban centre in Canada, I've been to no other major urban centre in the world. When I go to Shanghai, I do work in Shanghai, I do Chengdu, Winnipeg's Sister City, even in the third world, they do not rely on massive expansions of the regional street systems to the exclusion of everything else. You need a balance between what we do.

And that's what they do in Toronto, Vancouver, and all the other cities that we compete with. They all have rapid transit. They're all into transportation demand management. Yes, they built some new roads, but they have a balanced approach. We have a lopsided approach.

Mr. Speaker: That's it? Your second question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Are you aware Mr. Klassen that the City has procedures and policies that would direct the administration to review those matters in bringing forward its recommendations on implementation and adoption in principle of the recommendations in the report?

Ken Klassen: Well the only thing that they've been asked to do is to look at how we implement building all these new roads. Have they been asked to do a cost benefit analysis specifically? No. Have they been asked to investigate less costly alternatives which is transportation demand management?

You know, you're talking here about over $91 million dollars to expand Kenaston. We have a rapid transit report that says $13 and a half million dollars to put rapid transit on Kenaston. Would that do more to relieve congestion on Kenaston and speed the movement of trucks? Maybe, maybe not. I don't know. You don't know. Nobody knows. We need to do that analysis and comparison. Let them compete.

Mr. Speaker: Your final, that's your final Councillor Swandel? Councillor Vandal, your first question.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Klassen, thank you for your presentation. Are you aware that this City Council has approved an expansion of the ring road and the Chief Peguis Trail from Henderson Highway to Lagimodiere and that those costs have gone from $32 million to $64 million in one year and that those costs were approved without a cost benefit analysis? Are you aware of that?

Ken Klassen: Well, I know there's no cost benefit analysis. I know that the construction costs have gone way up. City of Winnipeg quite frankly is not unique in underestimating costs.

I have a really good paper that I can share with you if you want, where they looked at many cities, and it is common practice not just in Winnipeg but everywhere for transportation planners, you know, they have their pet projects, to understate the capital costs. They get you hooked and then you know once you're hooked, you're hooked, and the costs go up, but you still remain committed.

The report found that about 90% of all the capital projects that looked after expansion of regional roads and streets and freeways low-balled the initial capital cost. So it's not unique to Winnipeg. I have no, it's not.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Would you not think Mr. Klassen that that's the reasons why we should have cost benefit analysis done before we approve projects?

Ken Klassen: Well, you know, I'm just gobsmacked at how the City does capital spending because you know I've done a lot of Treasury Board submissions in my time. I've briefed ministers, cabinet committees, and premiers, and I know

that what they do and what they want to see is they want to see a range of options. Show me the costs and benefits. Like allow Chief Peguis Trail to compete with a southwest rapid transit corridor. You know things like that.

And you make a more informed decision. It may not change your decision in every case, but it allows you to make a more informed decision, and to know where you're getting the biggest bang for the taxpayers' bucks because we have so much that needs to be fixed, we have to be very careful when we put in any additions. The Mayor himself has acknowledged that the foundation of your house has to be solid before you put on an addition.

So we need to be doubly sure that whatever we do, whether it's Chief Peguis Trail or any other addition to the regional street system, it's cost effective. And if we as a City invest in things that are not cost effective and Edmonton and Calgary and Toronto and Vancouver do, we lose.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor Vandal? No further questions? Thank you Mr. Klassen.

Ken Klassen: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Next delegation is Ken MacKinnon, Crystal Properties in support of the EPC recommendation to file February 20th, 2008 Council Motion regarding the Proposed Development of Upper Fort Garry Site. Mr. MacKinnon.

Ken MacKinnon: Hi Mr. Speaker, I'm here also with Brian Tokar of Friesen Tokar Architects and Rubin Spletzer of Crystal Developers. I'll let Brian Tokar introduce.

Mr. Speaker: You have 10 minutes.

Ken MacKinnon: Thank you.

Brian Tokar: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, Councillors, the reason Tokar requested to be put on the agenda this morning, to clarify any misunderstanding of the facts associated with Crystal's residential redevelopment of the site. The site which is located adjacent to the Upper Fort Garry site and is definitely not encroaching on it.

In fact, the previous location of the west wall of the fort has been set back one metre from the west boundary of the site as established by the City of Winnipeg. We propose, we are proposing a 21 storey building with a transparent facade that will respect the heritage site in a non-imposing manner.

Ken MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I do have a handout I'd like to distribute to Council.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Clerk have you got, do you have the names of the delegation? Would you be able to provide the names of your delegation to the Clerk? Okay thank you, proceed.

Ken MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, Councillors, and members from the administration. My name is Ken MacKinnon, I'm with Friesen Tokar Architects and we're here today to reiterate what we said at the Downtown Committee on Property and Development and make sure that it is public knowledge that our client Crystal Developers is not, I repeat, is not building on the former Upper Fort Garry site.

This past Saturday's Free Press was the first factual reporting I've seen on the issue. Even CBC this morning was reporting that this was the last chance to save Upper Fort Garry. This misinformation campaign is completely false. The development impedes in no way on any plans to develop a park or interpretive centre on the grounds of the former demolished Upper Fort Garry site.

It is quite clear from my handout that Crystal is intending to build on an existing parking lot to the west of the demolished Upper Fort Garry walls. The drawing shows where the old fort was thought to be and where our property line was developed after the foundation of the bastion was unearthed.

Crystal has worked with the City, archeologists, and the Friends of Upper Fort Garry to ensure that the proposed

apartment does not impede on the historic value of the neighbouring site. Crystal worked closely with archeological digs that took place and found nothing of value outside of the fort walls where the development will be built.

Crystal Developers applied to the City advertised expression of interest and was awarded the purchase rights to the property over two other proponents. Crystal not only entered into the expression of interest with the full intent of working with the Upper Fort Garry, with the Friends of Upper Fort Garry, Crystal's proposal itself draws special attention to the historic aspects of the neighbouring fort site and works to complement the site through its architecture and by providing housing for more than 300 residents in the area. Such an influx of living units will complement the park with benefit of mixed use environment. These are density, security, street life, amenities and most importantly tax revenue.

Not only has this situation been very unfair to Crystal Developers, Crystal has been more than fair in allowing the Friends the amount of time for the property that they have entered into the purchase agreement for. Time is up and any further delays will jeopardize the 150 units of much needed affordable rental housing in the downtown.

The treatment that this message also sends to other developers of Winnipeg is clear. That legal agreements are not binding with the City of Winnipeg. Political will has the opportunity here to ensure that future contentious properties will sit undeveloped for years.

Many of you on Council know me as a person of very high integrity. I've been counseling the City on issues of the environment, urban renewal and heritage preservation for years. I don't believe that this, that development is good for the sake of development, but I do believe that development of complementary projects that are well done have symbiotic opportunities that are far greater than developing single parcels of land in isolation.

I also believe that Crystal Developers are by no means typical. They are committed to quality projects and they continue to operate these projects long after construction. The intent is to complement a world-class park with a project that will be well done, enrich the historical setting, and provide a prominent and distinct building to our downtown skyline.

I don't pretend to have all the answers to the development at the former Upper Fort Garry site, but I do know that bringing multiple proponents to the table and developing a shared vision for the neighbourhood, is a far better long-term solution to the Friends' response of digging in their heels and declaring that they want Crystal's property for an interpretative centre and nothing else will do.

After the expression of interest for the property in question was awarded to Crystal Developers, Councillor Wyatt described that providing downtown housing and a heritage park on the former Upper Fort Garry site was a win-win scenario. My question to Council would be why has this view changed?

I'd finally like to introduce Rubin Spletzer of Crystal Properties.

Rubin Spletzer: Mr. Chair, Your Honour and the Council. Our development team is committed to providing housing for the downtown of Winnipeg, which is very much needed. We have changed the agreement to allow the Friends of Upper Fort Garry to raise the money for the development of a heritage park. I'd like to point out that we honour our agreements.

Our interest is only in a small piece of land next to the large historic site. You still have a large historic site to create a wonderful historic park. You can have a new housing program and a world-class historic park side by side. And we also committed to work with the people of Upper Fort Garry, with the Friends of Upper Fort Garry.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. You still have three minutes and twenty-five seconds.

Ken MacKinnon: That is our presentation but we will take questions if there are any.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, thank you. First question Councillor Vandal. You have the first question.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. First of all I want to thank you for your commitment to the City. My position is clear on this but in no way have I ever meant to disparage the integrity of your development or your development company.

You've taken a leap, on December 13th you allowed the Friends of Upper Fort Garry three months, a little bit more than three months to raise some money, at which point if they had raised the $12-1/2 million dollars, you would not develop your building. I'm trying to understand the rationale behind your decision to do that. Why did you agree to those terms?

Rubin Spletzer: Our commitment to the City is very clear, and if you have an historic park and historic site that is so important, we want to give everyone a chance to raise the money in time. It is not only three and a half months. It's now just about two years that the site has been available, the site has been discussed about, and the Friends of Upper Fort Garry knew about this site for more than a decade.

We feel that working with the Friends of Upper Fort Garry would make a complement to both, if we can achieve both. And so we said we'll give that opportunity, and quite frankly, if the Friends of Upper Fort Garry are able to raise that, I would congratulate them and I would step aside.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: And you would step aside willingly without any legal consequence to the City of Winnipeg if Upper Fort Garry were to reach their $12-1/2 million dollar fundraising goal?

Rubin Spletzer: I have, I have said if they reach, if they comply to the agreement as we have signed, I fully understood what I signed, and therefore I will keep my commitment. I wish that everyone else will keep their commitment. So I understand very clearly what I signed. If the money is raised and the curling rink, what we know about is in their possession that means they have a commitment, received a commitment, I step aside.

Ken MacKinnon: I should clarify that the time, deadline is part of that agreement and if that time deadline were extended that would change the agreement. So what Rubin is saying that the agreement that he adhered to has a time deadline in it.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: How far is the lot line of your development to the former gates of Upper Fort Garry?

Ken MacKinnon: That I cannot answer quickly. It's scalable on that drawing if you want to look but the Upper Fort Garry demolished foundation is a metre away from our site. The gates themselves are very far to the north of our site. The existing gates that remain standing are very far to the north of the site.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor your first question.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all thank you very much for appearing here today. You mentioned twice, the architect mentioned and Mr. Spletzer you mentioned yourself, that you were prepared to work with the Friends, and I'm just wondering did anybody ever take advantage of that opportunity and come and sit down and discuss maybe the opportunity to work together on this project?

Rubin Spletzer: The discussion, I received one call that would say to meet with them. We at that time already signed an agreement with the City and we felt that that would not be appropriate. However, if, if the agreement is completed and let's say the Friends of Upper Fort Garry are unable to, to, or they have not finalized their full purchase

for the whole land, we would be willing to discuss it with them.

If however we are successful to retain the parcel of land that we are asking for, which is beside the footprint of the Upper Fort Garry, we also would sit down with them and see if we can come up with a complementary type of a design, not to take away from the design of what they are planning but enhance it if we can.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I also want to clarify one thing. If the Friends of Upper Fort Garry were to have received the monies that they requested from both levels of government, which is $4.5 million each for a total of $9,000,000, and to date we've all read they've received commitment for $3,000,000 which leaves a shortfall, and if that were to happen, that would put them at the point where they have reached the level they needed to fulfill their commitment. You still as per your agreement of December would graciously walk away and let them go forward with this project. Is that correct?

Rubin Spletzer: The understanding of the agreement is such - if they reach the goal as set out by the agreement we are going to keep the agreement. That means we step aside.

Mayor Katz: No further questions.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions. Councillor Vandal, you get a second time now, your first question.

Councillor Vandal: So the lot line from the westerly gate is a metre. How high is your project? How many stories and how high is it in feet?

Ken MacKinnon: There's a setback requirement at the lower levels that's different than the upper levels for that.

Councillor Vandal: That wasn't my question.

Ken MacKinnon: Okay, but the lot setback, this was Provincially determined by the archeological dig from the unearthed foundation. It requires a minimum one metre setback for the property line next to the Upper Fort Garry site.

Then there are further setbacks based on building code for building standards based on the property line. So that has to, the property itself has to be determined based on the height of the building. And right now, the height of the building is 21 stories. So the setback that's determined on the sheet that you have as a handout is a property line. That's where the new property line was determined to be.

Brian Tokar: Can I just add to that. Our building will comply with all the applicable zoning by-laws. The gates of Upper Fort Garry are located on the north and the south side. Our development is on the west side. I'm sorry our development is on the west side, yes. So we're nowhere near the gates.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal your second question.

Councillor Vandal: Nevertheless there was a west wall to Upper Fort Garry. My understanding is that the Province needs to issue a heritage permit prior to any development occurring. Where is that in the process?

Ken MacKinnon: The way it was established based on the archeological dig was a number of strips of land were unearthed to determine the heritage value of the property in question. They also unearthed the former bastion to determine the location of the fort because it was in question up until the time of that unearthing.

What the Province determined based on the archeological dig, what there, there was nothing of merit within the lands for purchase. In fact, the historic value of that site is largely limited to the fact that the fort was on the west side, not on the property. The fort is the historic value that is being sought after by the Province. There's no protection implementation strategy in place for development on that property as of yet.

Right now, there is no mandate historically to preserve that site or the site adjacent to it, and the Province will make sure that the guidelines during the excavation of any foundation for a building are in place so that an archaeologist is on site to encounter anything that they might find in the ground. So that's where it's at. There's no historic value associated with the site that we're talking about today.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: So my question was have they issued a heritage permit yet?

Ken MacKinnon: For the development, no.

Councillor Vandal: And there will be an archaeologist on site…

Ken MacKinnon: No we are not at that stage.

Councillor Vandal: when the digging will occur. So there is great potential for change…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor.

Councillor Vandal: depending on what the digging unveils?

Ken MacKinnon: I think that would be your understanding of it.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Councillor Vandal. Councillor Steeves, your first question.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you. In the Winnipeg Free Press this morning, there was an article that was written by a reporter who stated they had spoken to the Premier of the Province. And the Premier of the Province had stated that in his opinion, the plan being proposed by the Friends of Upper Fort Garry was too rich. And that he was proposing that this development that you're speaking of, that you're supporting today go ahead, and that a scaled down plan with respect to Upper Fort Garry be proceeded with that would allow Upper Fort Garry to be developed as per the footprint, with your project going ahead as well. How did you feel about that? How do you feel about that prospect?

Ken MacKinnon: Well I was a little surprised by the Premier's expression of interest, but the greenway that he talks about is certainly an opportunity. And the whole goal I guess of our presentation here today is saying that we're willing to work with the Friends in any manner to develop the entire block together. So what that means is entirely up to the vision of the people at the table and the City, but we would like the property that we've entered a purchase agreement for.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period is over. Thank you gentlemen, for your presentation. The final delegation, Dr. Jerry Gray, Chair of the Friends of Upper Fort Garry, in opposition to the Executive Policy Committee's recommendation to file. Mr. Gray, if you're present. You have 10 minutes.

Dr. Jerry Gray: Thank you. I have some things to be handed out if I could please, three, one for, one copy for each. Thank you. Thank you very much. Good morning everybody. I'm Jerry Gray, I'm Chair of the steering committee of Friends of Upper Fort Garry.

I will make some comments based on what the previous delegation said in just a few moments. Let me deal with the obvious issue; has to do with our funding campaign. We had a goal of $3.5 million for the public campaign. We have exceeded that. We have right now $3.6 million. I think that if we, well we do still have almost two weeks to go. We'll probably raise more than that. We do have other asks out okay for some substantial contributions.

Having said that, if we take our current $3.6, which is all likely we have in the bank right now so to speak, and we take the $1.5 from the Province and $1.5 from the Feds, that would give us $6.6 million, which is considerably short. In fact it's $3.4 million short of our goal. Given the recent announcements from the Federal government, and I did not hear the one from the Premier this morning but I've heard about it here in Council, it looks like

the prospects of that funding coming through are very slim.

So our choice is twofold. One of course is to support this motion, which would do away with the conditions. And secondly, is to try to raise $3.4 million dollars in the next 11 days from the public. I frankly don't think that's possible. It would be a nice goal to have and I might be wrong, but I think it's probably unlikely to happen. So now here we are and we have a deadline looming of March 31st. It looks improbable.

By the way, we still have a meeting with the Premier coming up but again based on what I've heard so far, I don't anticipate another contribution coming. So we have to face the fact that we are probably short of our goal. Pretty disappointing in the sense that the public has really ponied up. Again we are $3.6 over, $100,000 over our $3.5. If we get the ask we have outstanding we'll probably go over $4 million dollars but all this is for naught if the two levels of government don't come through and so far they haven't.

So here's where we stand. The deadline looms. I mentioned last week at EPC and I apparently took somebody by surprise that we had no plan "B". We only had plan "A", which is being handed out to you right now and those three diagrams. There is some reason for this and I have to go back into history and explain how this came about.

This project is not two years old. It is 10 years old. It started in 1999 with a group of people who got together, did a study funded by The Winnipeg Foundation and The Thomas Sill Foundation, on the assumption that the 100 Main Street property would become available and declared surplus. These were historians, they were archaeologists, they were architects, they were all sorts from all walks of life and they put together a vision for the site. What you have in front of you is not the vision. It's a diagram, it's a plan. The vision that went behind that was a lot of people, volunteers putting in a lot of hours talking about what the site could be.

And if you think a compromised site would work, I cannot disagree with that because work is a very qualitative term. Any number of developments are possible on that site. It could be landscaped. It could be just simply grass. It could be park benches and plaques. What this group did 10 years ago was start a concept they thought was fitting of the site itself. And as it happens, important in that concept was the southwest corner. As you know that's where the interpretative centre is designed to sit.

There are many visions possible. There is no such thing as a right vision or a wrong vision. There are just different visions. But what we have done is built a vision and more importantly, we have gotten some citizens of Winnipeg to invest in that by showing them what we thought could be done with the site. I am not convinced that this vision has changed but that vision is going to be possible.

For example, I will read to you just very briefly from one, a letter I received from one of our large donors. "Our pledge is based upon the concept as currently presented and if it were to change materially, that we reserve the right to review our commitment." We raised $3.6 million on that idea and I just cannot guarantee you that those people will back a different idea.

There's a thing about visions. People who have visions have a right to lead them. We've led ours. If it's unsatisfactory, if it's not acceptable, fine. There is a great saying, I wish I could tell you the author but I don't know it, it's a great quote and it said "the pain of lost opportunity is zero". If we don't do this, we will never know the difference. There would be nobody unemployed, nobody, this that and the other. It would simply be a floor blown opportunity and probably one of many in the history of mankind.

But to tell us, or ask us to lead a vision that we were frankly opposed to from day one, which is sell off part of the site, is asking a heck of a lot of us and asking a lot of our donors. So, again, I repeat, if there are other visions out there, and

there are many, and they're not right or wrong, they're not better or worse, those people have the responsibility to lead the charge of that particular vision.

So with that, I in one sense hate to leave this at the hands of City Council, at your feet. You are the one group that can guarantee that vision will happen. If you pass the motion, the conditions go away. I agree it's not without risk, as I said last week at EPC, but we will get the rest of the money to do the site. If the deadline comes, March 31st and the decision is implemented that you have already passed in previous committees, then the jury's out quite frankly.

One of the things, let me just make one final comment and then I'll be through here. If there's a mistake made and I don't blame people for this because you know history in hindsight is always perfect, the property, the entire piece should never have been put up for sale. It is declared a historic site, the entire block not just the fort, by Heritage Canada. In hindsight maybe it should not have been put up for sale.

Given that it was, and we are in this situation today, it's a very awkward situation for City Council because now you have competing proposals, you have some potential of liabilities and so forth on a piece of property that should never come up for sale in the first place in our view.

Unfortunately from our standpoint and from yours the only way out, to guarantee the site will go as we have proposed, is to pass the motion. If you don't, that simply means you're willing to settle for a different kind of development, and there's nothing wrong with that whatsoever.
We have a vision. It's to be spectacular, it's to be world-class, be educational, be a major attraction, but there are other visions that are certainly possible. With that I'll happily answer any questions.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you sir. First question Mayor, Mr. Mayor please, first question.

Mayor Katz: Dr. Gray thank you very much for being here today. It seems like you and I have been meeting like this on a regular basis.

Dr. Jerry Gray: We have to stop meeting like this as the phrase goes.

Mayor Katz: At least I'm in good company. My first question, 16 days ago, you and I along with some other supporters of Friends of Upper Fort Garry met, and I know you were disappointed and you did not receive the funding you were looking for from the other levels of government. It was decided right then and there that if you got that money, we don't have to have any more debate in committees or on the floor of Council, the deal was done.

I know 16 days ago, you were arranging to have a meeting. Can you give me the results of that meeting please and what has happened since your request for $4.5 million dollars from both the Federal and Provincial governments?

Dr. Jerry Gray: Yeah.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Gray.

Dr. Jerry Gray: We have asked for a meeting. We are still assured we will get one. We hear it's going to be later this week but right now Mr. Mayor we do not have an actual meeting with the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: So 16 days have gone by and no meeting whatsoever on a matter of what you would call urgency.

I'm wondering if when you talked about the vision, and this is a wonderful vision, and it's also done by a wonderful landscape architect, and I'm sure there are other landscape architects that also have wonderful visions.

When it comes to a priority, would you consider reclaiming property that actually sits on the footprint of Upper Fort Garry to be more important than land adjacent to the footprint? I'm curious to hear what your thoughts are.

Dr. Jerry Gray: All I can say is I was involved in the 1999 work okay, but in the work of that particular committee which was widespread, the entire site was deemed to be critical to the development and deemed to be historic. There are many things that happened outside the walls of the fort, Thomas Scott being shot being one, for example, okay. A very unfortunate one. But a lot of activity occurred outside the fort. So from day one, our vision has been on the entire site.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I never got an answer, but I'll leave that one alone. You also mentioned specifically and you actually read a letter. And as you and I both know, approximately five or six individuals or families have basically made considerable sized donations which have got you to that $3.6 and I think you should be commended on that, that's the majority of the money. Have any of them said that if this plan is altered in any way, shape or form that they would pull back their money?

Dr. Jerry Gray: Not in those words you've just used. Downsized, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Go ahead please.

Dr. Jerry Gray: We've said from day one, we're not wedded to every brick and piece of mortar on that site as depicted. We are wedded to the importance of having an interpretative centre because without the interpretative centre all you have is a nice peaceful, restful park. We have that. We have it in Bonnycastle Park. How much is that used? It's not used at all. So critical is something that will attract people and that required the whole site. But wedded every little piece of metal on there, no not at all.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's been talked about that there's been a vision of this project for a long time, as long as 10 years people have been talking about it. In fact, I have heard from Bill Norrie they were talking about it even longer ago than that in terms of if the land ever did come up.

But in terms of fundraising and doing a capital campaign, were you really able to start a capital campaign until you knew that you actually had the land and that there's a possibility the City would give you the land. Which only happened about 3-1/2 months ago right?

Dr. Jerry Gray: No, we had two problems. One was, when we replied to the EOI, we were of course going to start our campaign and we were told we couldn't and rightfully so because we had signed an agreement for confidentiality. So the whole process was confidential until the decision was made by the Downtown Property Committee.

And we had a line that we used and the (inaudible) is still there. This is a heartstring versus purse strings debate, okay. And the only way you can get heartstrings support is by public support because it does not make economic sense then as way of a commercial holding. So we were behind the eight ball to start with. We couldn't go public.

Then, listen I raised money my whole life. That's all I've ever done, I suppose. You cannot go to people and raise donor money on something that you don't have any control over. It's very, very difficult to do. And give us your money on a hope and a prayer it just doesn't work that way.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Dr. Gray. And the terms imposed in this agreement, I know you agreed with them and said you would try to raise the money. Did you have a choice really when you made that agreement? I mean did you have another option other than to agree or just to walk away?

Dr. Jerry Gray: The option was to walk away, the option was to walk away or take the agreement offered. Yeah.

Councillor Gerbasi: Did you…

Mr. Speaker: Your final question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, actually I'll just leave it. I know there's other people that have questions.

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

Councillor Smith: My question really Mr. Gray is, I don't understand why you didn't come out strongly against the terms of that agreement.

Dr. Jerry Gray: You mean the one (inaudible)

Councillor Smith: The choice that you had, yes.

Dr. Jerry Gray: We had no choice. I mean they said here's the agreement, either do this or... Yeah, yeah… Actually, it, well it was my way or the highway. That was what was done. But I mean, but we accepted that. I mean we said, well, we'll give it a try, and we've tried. And we've been very successful on the public side, not on the government side.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor Smith? Your second question.

Councillor Smith: My second question is, I'm wondering about the Province of Manitoba, what in discussions with you, why have they not increased the contribution over what they have stated?

Dr. Jerry Gray: I don't clearly know the exact answer to that. But I will tell you this, and this is the reason why we're supporting this motion. The word from the Federal government to us and the Premier's, the first conversation was this is all we can do in this period of time. And I think the timing issue was really an issue for government. But I think that.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor Smith? Next, Councillor Thomas, your first question.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. The Province has given you $1.5 million to purchase this property in there. Is it the, is it the problem with the motion that makes it difficult for you to outright purchase that piece of land and then raise the rest of the money later, the City Council motion?

Dr. Jerry Gray: The issue with the $1.5, you're right, that's what the Premier said. As it turns out because we checked this out, the property is not for sale. So the $1.5 million was a short-term thing to try to get control of the property. We couldn't do that. And I'm assuming that $1.5 is still there, even though we (inaudible) the property. I mean it's certainly in the figures I gave you this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas, your second question.

Councillor Thomas: So, even if you raised the, the property is not for sale? My understanding is that it's a City property. Why won't we sell it to you? I don't know. Okay, have to ask our administration that question. I guess after the vote.

I'm looking at these pictures that you sent us, and I'm looking at this huge shadow that's going to be cast over a significant portion of the land. Can you comment on the impact that that will have on your project having that next door to you?

Dr. Jerry Gray: Yes, in fact, thanks from me, I forgot, I handed it out and forgot to mention it. You have two other diagrams. One shows the nature of the proposal we have in terms of development of the site, and you see the interpretative centre on the southwest corner of that site. The other shows kind of an aerial view of a computerized diagram, same thing. Then the third one I've handed out shows with the computerized edition what, and by the way, that is a 13 storey building, not a 17 or 21 as you heard today, so it would be higher, but that shows you where the building would be and the impact it would have.

The shadow by the way, and computers do this, this is the shadow you would see on the equinox on March 21st every year, the shadow cast by the sun. Also notice in that diagram, because that's part of our original plan, the building on 100 Main Street is not there. There are other

visions out there who say that building should stay. So now imagine the apartment building and 100 Main Street is still there. Now you have a canyon that's roughly about 150 feet wide overshadowed by a 21 storey building and a 3 storey other building.

But you know, just to show you and having said that, as I said at the outset, beauty is in the eyes of the beholder. Okay, our beauty was one thing and others have other perceptions of it.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: No, thank you (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal your first and I believe your last question. You have 28 seconds.

Councillor Vandal: Are you aware that when 100 Main Street went out of the Downtown Committee that it was an expression of interest and it went from an expression of interest to an outright land sale and that's very, very, very unusual at City Council. Are you aware of that?

Dr. Jerry Gray: Yes we knew that. We replied to the expression of interest, and yeah, the next step apparently was to sell the land.

Mr. Speaker: There it comes. That's it. Dr. Gray thank you very much.

Dr. Jerry Gray: You're welcome.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker I'd like to suspend the rules so that we can hear from Guy Savoie on this issue.

Mr. Speaker: With no questions. But no questions. Councillors, you heard the motion.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Give him 10 minutes. Five minutes. Okay, five minutes. He's an additional.

Guy Savoie: Mr. Speaker…

Mr. Speaker: Howdy.

Guy Savoie: Monsieur president de l'assemblée, Mr. Mayor, Monsieur le maire, Councillors, membres du conseil. Gosh, it's been several years since I've had the honour to address this august chamber. I do so because I'm concerned.

Many times I've been asked to come as a delegation to the City about issues that have come up or not come up or whatever, and I've always read and listened to issues at Council with great interest, but I've always refrained from coming and putting in my two cents worth. And the reason being that there's nothing worse than "when I was there, I used to do it this way." So really, this is something that is adverse to me.

But this issue has really woken me up and it's really taking me. I think that the heritage, the cradle of Manitoba, the cradle of western Canada is of great importance, and I think its value is more than simply a building or two.

And after hearing the delegations and so on, everything I've sort of prepared in my mind, it certainly, it changes and it comes and goes, but the issue really is I'm reminded of the St. Boniface Museum when the building was allowed to be proceeded next to it, and it was really a question of time.

It was on the market, there was a deal that was made, and the people at the Museum really never had the time to address the issue properly and see the Federal government because it's a heritage site, or see the Provincial government. There was, time was lacking, these institutions our Federal government, our Provincial government, are not known to act hastily. It takes time to put these things into place.

And hence we've got this beautiful building next to the St. Boniface Museum, the oldest structure in Manitoba, the oldest log structure in Manitoba which was the first hospital, which was a residence of the Grey Nuns and so on.

You're faced somewhat with the same issue today, one of time, one of relevance.

But let's look at the site. I don't want to go through all of history, but one must realize that it is indeed very important not only to Winnipeg, not only to Manitoba, but all of western Canada. We realize that indeed it did greet the first settlers that came to the country, to this country, to this area.

It was the site that Riel's provisional government, and as Mr. Gray said it was also the site where Scott was shot, it was the execution. And there are indeed many other important assets of our history, aspects of our history that the fort represents, and we're going to do away with it in a sense.

And let me move out of Winnipeg and out of Manitoba, and I'll tell you why. The way we've stifled the Museum, we're about to do the same thing here. Have you been to the Alamo where millions of visitors visit every year? Have you been to the Plains of Abraham, that are vast? Have you been to the gap at (inaudible) where Wolfe brought up his cannons?

Have you been to Fortress Louisbourg in Nova Scotia where the Federal government, over some 30 years have spent millions upon millions of dollars? I think they're up to somewhere around $40 million dollars and its taken 25 to 30 years to rebuild Louisbourg. Have you stood next to the cannon and looked across at the ocean?

Have you been to the gate, where it's stifled? Why don't people visit the gate today? It's there. Where do you park? How is it accessible? And where is our vision? You can't get to it. And we're going to do the same thing now.

Let's take the vision, let's look at it a little bit. It's the link to Bonnycastle Park. It's the link to the Forks. It's the link to this new museum that will be placed, will be built. It's the link to Provencher Bridge. It's the link to Norwood Bridge. It's the link to across the river to the St. Boniface Museum, the St. Boniface sector, which is our history.

And we're going to stifle it with a building. We're not going to allow any area to greet the people, and we're going to simply have a gate and some interpretative centre and we'll be satisfied with that. And where will our students come, our generations to come? Where will they arrive and how will they visit the centre to learn about our history? To learn where we come from?

And we're going to do this for the sake of time gentlemen and ladies, because we're in a hurry. We're in a hurry to develop it because we have some agreement in to place that terminates on the 30th of March. Well members of Council, I'm well aware that agreements are extended, by cooperation between the parties. I'm well aware that other land in the City coffers can be advanced for a trade-off and development can take place in other areas.

Mr. Speaker: Your time has expired.

Guy Savoie: And I'm quite ready to answer any questions Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No questions.

Guy Savoie: But please, I would support the agreement, and that's what I'm here for, the extension. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Savoie. Words well spoken. Thank you sir. That's through. We're finished with the delegation.

The Executive Policy Committee Report "A" of February 27, 2008, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT "A" OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 27, 2008**

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

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

The report of March the 5th of 2008.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 5, 2008**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker I would introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 6.

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

Report of March the 12th of 2008 Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 12, 2008**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 4.

Councillor Thomas: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: You've got a motion on No. 1.

Councillor Thomas: There is Motion No. 3, it hasn't been written on it but it's an amendment to report no. 1.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. There is a Motion on No. 1. Numbers 2, 3 and 4?

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 1, Mr. Clerk.

**Item 1 - Mayor's Trade Council Final Report - Winnipeg Canada's Centre for Global Trade
File GG**

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. We all had the opportunity today to listen to Mr. Lorenc as he explained to us what the game plan is and keeping in mind that if this goes forward, it will go to the public service which will come back with recommendations and do the due diligence that has to be done.

And I thank the committee who volunteered countless hours of time bringing this forward to basically grow our City, make sure we create jobs, make sure that we are a modern city competing with the rest of the world.

And at this particular point in time Mr. Speaker, I'd like to hear from the other Councillors, and I will respond at that particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors Motion No. 3 that is moved by Councillor Gerbasi, seconded by Councillor Thomas. Councillor Gerbasi would you like to introduce it?

**Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi
Seconded by Councillor Thomas**

Whereas the Mayor's Trade Council Final Report contains recommendations for massive changes to the City's infrastructure priorities;

And Whereas there are no cost estimates or cost/benefit analysis associated with the infrastructure recommendations;

And Whereas many of the infrastructure recommendations are not within the City of Winnipeg's 6 Year Capital Budget Plan or within Plan Winnipeg;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Mayor's Trade Council Final Report be referred back to the Administration for further review;

And Be It Further Resolved that a Council Seminar be held to discuss infrastructure and transportation priorities.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes, please. Thank you. The Motion is very straightforward. It obviously would be elaborated more in the debate, but the point, the simple points are that because the report recommends massive changes to the City's infrastructure priorities; and that there's no cost estimates or cost benefit analysis associated with these infrastructure recommendations; and whereas many of the infrastructure recommendations are not within the City

of Winnipeg 6 Year Capital Budget Plan or within Plan Winnipeg; the Motion asks that this report be referred back to the administration for further review; and that a Council seminar be held to discuss these infrastructure and transportation priorities.

So I'm not speaking to the whole, I'm speaking just to this Motion because I would like to speak to the clause if this motion isn't proceeded with? Is that okay in terms of process?

But this is, what we're saying is there's a number of members of Council who only saw this report last week. Many people, maybe we could have approached the Council and put in some input, but I don't, nobody approached us to ask us and I guess you know we didn't realize this was coming until last week. There hasn't been adequate time for consultation.

These recommendations are sweeping and huge and have huge implications. So I would like to ask that Council, do we debate this, I'm sorry in terms of process, I'm really not clear. Do we debate whether we're going to refer it back and then debate the actual clause? Depending? Okay.

So I would urge Council, all of you to support rather than adopting it in principle, which means that we accept these infrastructure things as things we're going to do without having the information, without having any costing whatsoever, I remind you in the Rapid Transit Task Force, we had to estimate the costs of the things that were recommended. I mean, this is crazy.

So I urge you, and I don't mean disrespect to the people who wrote the report, but for Council to adopt EPC's suggestion of simply adopting the report in principle and then asking for an implementation plan, I think that's a very dangerous move and I urge everyone to support, just to refer it back for more discussion. It can always come back. But I think this is a prudent move and I'm just speaking to the Motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Steeves, and O'Shaughnessy and Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I thought there might be a longer list before I got up here to speak. First of all, I want to commend Mr. Lorenc and the people that he worked with, with respect to tendering this report to Council. I always find Mr. Lorenc to be a very well prepared and articulate advocate for the ideas that he's trying to advance. I think all of us regardless of what side of the issue you may be on this morning, could not help but be impressed with the breadth of knowledge, both I guess, practical and policy-wise that Mr. Lorenc brings to the podium.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that this is a person who has done his homework with respect to the ideas that he is trying to advance on behalf of the MTC that has been put together by the Mayor and this Council to address some very, very serious issues.

I want to remind Council Mr. Speaker, of what we're doing today because I think it's important and I think it has been alluded to already, we're asking that today, the recommendations contained in this Trade Council Final Report be endorsed in principle as Councillor Gerbasi alluded to, and that we ask our public service to be directed to review the final report and then report back to Executive Policy Committee in I guess 120 days with an implementation plan; and that the proper officers of the City of Winnipeg be authorized to do all things to implement that.

In short Mr. Speaker, the hard work with respect to this report and where this report is going to wind up in terms of Council priorities…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves, if I just may. Councillor O'Shaughnessy, thank you for pointing this out on your first one, two, three, in the fourth line, "therefore be it resolved that the Mayor's Trade Council Final Report be referred back to the administration", it should be back to the "Executive Policy Committee".

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes that's what I, I'm sorry Mr. Speaker, that's what I intended it to be. I missed that. It's changed. I have no problem with that.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Mayor, if I may suggest a friendly amendment, that the wording be changed to "be referred back to the Executive Policy Committee with instructions to refer it to the administration for further review". That is exactly what she has said, but it makes it a legal motion.

Councillor Gerbasi: That's fine.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: (Inaudible) as well (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi and Thomas, you both agree? You both agree to that? Mr. Clerk, you have their wording? Okay, Councillor Steeves I'm sorry for the delay. Proceed.

Councillor Steeves: Penmanship changes notwithstanding Mr. Speaker, I doubt it will receive my support in any event.

If we look at what the report says, I'm surprised that there would be this much disagreement at this stage about what was talked about in the report. Now, I want to remind Council that this is a report that is coming back, and like most reports, it is very, very unlikely that we're going to have global buy-in on every single issue existing in the report by every Councillor. That is not the nature of these reports. And frankly, it's unfair of Council to ask that of any report.

It is I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, perfectly acceptable that a report would come forward and people might have some differences on the details and the write-ins of the report, but we can still endorse the report in principle to sink it back into our public service and to come back with an implementation plan so that those specific tenets of what we are going to do with the report can be debated in time.

And again Mr. Speaker I want to emphasize that there is lots of time to do that and I anticipate we're going to take advantage of that time as a Council, as Executive Policy Committee, to go through that larger process. That is really the way we do, we do the process on these reports generally. It frankly is a system that I think works and it will work in this circumstance if we just allow it to run its course.

Because if you look at the recommendations of the report itself, it talks about prioritization of infrastructure investment, financing infrastructure and then it goes into some details about P-3s, and I recognize there is some challenges on this Council as to agreement on P-3s. But doubtless, there is an opportunity that exists at the Federal government level to access specific monies that exist for P-3 funding from the Federal government. It would be irresponsible, I would suggest if something like that wasn't in this report.

And it talks about gaining efficiencies, harmonizing compatibility, rationalizing routes, upgrading trade routes and support at the airport on a 24/7 basis.

And we move over to the other side. It talks about our priority and partnerships with other levels of government, again, confirming and rationalizing priorities, special coordinating committee and supporting the Province's role on trade.

Of course, they talk about the Mid-Continent Trade Corridor. In-depth discussion about the inland port and of course our newly expanded, or to be newly expanded airport and some interesting conversations, a discussion about enterprise zones.

And then, of course, looking at it through the Federal government's idea of the national policy lens and trying to, I guess blend our priorities with the priorities of other levels of government. That's how I take this report.

With respect, and I don't know if I'm going to gain the confidence of all members of Council this morning, but I think there is easily, Mr. Speaker, enough commonality in broad vision in this report for this Council to endorse it unanimously at this

stage and, again, to bring it back to our public service, to bring back some specific recommendations in 120 days. And at that time, at that time I think it will be perfectly appropriate for us to have the more detailed debate and discussions about some of the specific tenets of the report.

But where I do disagree with potentially one of the delegations and potentially with my friend Councillor Gerbasi is that by us endorsing in principle today, that we are endorsing every specific thing that we're going to do with respect to that report. That is very, very hard work, and that is what we're going to have to work on from this point forward, and I anticipate there is going to be some disagreement.

But what this does represent and what I'm worried we might, what I'm worried we might lose as a Council this morning, is the opportunity for us to step forward as a group of 16 or I guess 15 today and say, we as a City Council want to play a role in trade for our City. We have kind of I would suggest been blocked out of the economic picture of the City of Winnipeg for too long.

To me, and you may or may not agree with me, this report represents if not our first, our biggest and most deliberate step into the realm of economic development for this City. And I as a Councillor of this City think it's very exciting.

I am disappointed with the way that our City is funded and we've all said that at different times of our Council development. None of us, I don't think, particularly agree that the way that the City of Winnipeg has to raise money to pay for the things that we do is particularly fair, or particularly efficient, or particularly smart.

We've always maintained I think as a group, in unison at different times, that there should be better ways for the City to play a role in economic development. The most I guess direct expression of that is our consistent wish, again as a Council, that we be involved in growth-based revenues.

Now, that's not part of this discussion today, and I guess that's something we'll still have to chase as a Council, but to me, this report is saying we're not going to worry about that for the time being and despite those challenges, we're going to step over that threshold and we're going to play a role. We're going to get started. And in 120 days, we're going to come back and have, I would suggest, a pretty robust discussion about how we're going to move this report forward.

So for me, I don't see this as our Council standing up and saying we're prioritizing roads over top of rapid transit or we're ignoring this or we're ignoring that. What we're saying today is this is a responsible, rational, reasoned report that allows the City of Winnipeg to deliberately step into the realm of its own economic development. I'm going to ask all of Council to support this step.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Chairman my point was made with the amendment to the wording.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Under 22(1) Motion to Refer Taking Precedence, I'm going to be speaking only to the Motion to refer and I'll speak to the clause after we've dealt with the Motion to refer.

In so doing, the Motion to refer is that with regard to a Council seminar being held, this is, is…

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to my colleague Councillor Thomas. I think there's some confusion here on, as to...

Councillor Thomas: Only on your part.

Councillor Steeves: I don't know about that. But I think… My Point of order is this. My understanding was is that after Councillor, after the Mayor and then Councillor Gerbasi introduced the two motions on the floor, that every Councillor

has the one chance to speak. I don't know if that's correct or not. That was my (inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: No.

Councillor Thomas: That's why I actually quoted the part of the Rules and Procedures so that you can look it up, a Motion to refer takes precedence under 22(1). Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas continue. Councillor Thomas continue.

Councillor Thomas: In speaking to the Motion to refer...

Councillor Swandel: Point of order Mr. Speaker. I believe there's been a Point of order here. Can we get a ruling?

Mr. Speaker: I have just been conversing with the clerk and my understanding was that Council had decided to deal with this and then, on this Motion No. 3 is before us and then we'll deal with the, you know deal with the clause. We'll deal with this Motion. Whether we accept it or don't accept it, and Councillor Thomas, she's read it perfectly you know from the Procedural By-law. So this is the will of Council. If you want to debate it, you can speak. Councillor Thomas, continue.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. In dealing with the Motion to refer, this is going in a different direction than our previously approved Capital budget priorities, and thus it's important that we debate it amongst ourselves in a Council seminar. It is not uncommon, in fact it is actually the usual for before we have a fairly substantial report, that we have a Council seminar to ask all our questions of the administration and of the persons who have written reports.

We have had this in the past with Councillor Fielding's paper that he did on the Economic Opportunities Commission. I can cite to you a number of reports that have been handled this way within this Council's term and in the length of time that I've been on Council I could probably cite many instances where this has occurred and we have a Council seminar before it has come to the Council floor.

Now I'd also like to say that timing is the issue here. We are actually in the middle of current or operating budget debate. And while I had received a lovely invitation from the chair of the report to meet with him, we have not been able to get together because I have been focusing on our operating budget which is our premier document that we will be guiding the rest of our decisions for in this year.

So I have quite a few questions of the chair, and I know that a number of people on this Council floor have questions of the chair and have not had the opportunity to ask these questions. I think it is important before approving the directions that we have had that opportunity.

And finally, I believe that this document should be analyzed in reference to previous documents. Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Gerbasi were involved in the Rapid Transit Report that has gone through which has actually been approved by this Council and there may be conflicts with this document. There's issues about how it coordinates with Plan Winnipeg. All these are questions that I have which is why I seconded Councillor Gerbasi's motion to refer this back. I'd like the opportunity to ask those questions before we debate this document on its merits.

So thank you very much, and I hope that Council will respect this Motion to refer and perhaps if it comes back in a month, we will have had the opportunity to all ask these questions of the people who have written the report and do it after we've dealt with the operating budget, and we'll have a bit more time to give this I think the kind of scrutiny that a document of this type merits. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I guess I'm only speaking to the Motion. The Motion makes no sense to me whatsoever in that when Executive

Policy Committee dealt with this matter, we realized that there were, there was a great deal more information to be gathered and much more consultation to be done with our public service and with the other members of Council, and that's why the Motion from Executive Policy Committee was to involve the public service and to have them make recommendations.

So basically adopting in principle some concepts, that you know, that are the future of the economy of the City of Winnipeg, we saw no harm in doing that. We certainly realize that you know some people might want to get on their soapbox on P-3s or, you know, there may be some environmental issues that need to be addressed as we go forward, that the public service is more than capable in providing us with that information and going in to a research phase and pointing out some of the potential pitfalls or minefields that we might encounter on a go-forward basis.

But on principle, when you talk about things like an enterprise zone around the airport, the opportunity to suspend materials, you know, in a tax-free area, until they're ready to go to market, when you talk about adding infrastructure that will enable enhanced trade for the area and improved connections to our partners to the south and most of the east and west as well and even to a certain extent to the north, it's one of the pieces that hasn't been brought out here is that we need to look at that polar connection as well.

So when you look at Councillor Gerbasi's Motion and you listen to what Councillor Thomas' concerns are, it's quite evident that the opportunity on a go-forward basis is there. The Motion makes no sense to me. Other than the Labour Council's desire to shoot down P-3s wherever possible and their duly elected representation here might have a problem with that particular...

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah they endorsed you when you first ran.

Councillor Swandel: Actually, no, I turned their endorsement down to be true, if you want to get in to that and I'll gladly do it. I turned the endorsement down. I didn't want to be beholden to any one particular entity when it came to making decisions for the best interests of all the citizens of the City of Winnipeg. So Mr. Speaker, for the record, I did turn the endorsement of the Labour Council down, thank you very much. Unlike some of my colleagues here, who probably can't say the same thing and seem to be making representations and decisions on behalf of the citizens of this Council and may only be here to serve one particular special interest.

So, but anyway, getting back to the matter at hand. But I'm sure Councillor Thomas has a Point of order here.

Councillor Thomas: Oh you bet you.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Councillor Thomas what is your Point of order.

Councillor Thomas: This is a Point of Personal Privilege. I'm trying to look up the exact clause, but to ascribe motives to Councillors' voting records, I'm sure I'll find it eventually, but this is inappropriate.

Mr. Speaker: We understand. Thank you Councillor Thomas. Are you through?

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I'd like to just publicly apologize if I ascribed motives to any member of this chamber that they would consider in any way harmful to them. I certainly do apologize, and I can understand why Councillor Thomas wouldn't want to have her motives ascribed to the wishes of the Labour Council. Certainly I don't want my motives to be ascribed to a relationship with the Labour Council, and I do indeed apologize Councillor.

So back to the Motion. The Motion is to refer this matter to the public service, or to have it go back to Executive Policy Committee so that we can go to the administration, so we can come forward and do some more consultation with other Councillors and perhaps take a look at things from an environmental perspective.

I'm comfortable standing here in front of you today Mr. Speaker and saying that I have faith in the public service. I think I understand the mandate that the Trade Commission was given, and I believe what they've brought forward to us was an excellent report, some, you know, positive recommendations. You know, we can stand here and we can shout loudly about all the things that we want to do, and, pardon me? It's a figure of speech, Councillor Thomas. I can take the time to give you some definitions if you like.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Councillor Swandel, continue.

Councillor Thomas: Point of order Mr. Speaker. First…

Mr. Speaker: What is your Point of order?

Councillor Thomas: First I'd like to say that the person speaking is supposed to direct their comments to the chair and not at an individual Council member, but my bigger Point of order is a matter of Personal Privilege. If the person is going to direct comments at another Councillor, perhaps he should notice that there is a difference between a male and a female and that he should notice that there is a difference in someone on his left hand and someone on his right hand, and finally, he should note the difference between someone who is talking to him and someone who is sitting quietly.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Thomas. Councillor Swandel has apologized. Please continue Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I did notice that Councillor Smith has a beard. Thank you.

Now, back to the matter at hand, which is this very important matter, the Mayor's Trade Commission, and whether or not we need to create some sort of process of delaying bringing these recommendations and looking at them by the public service.

I guess the easiest thing to, perhaps it's obvious now I won't be supporting this Motion Mr. Speaker. It makes absolutely no sense to me. I think that the work of the Trade Commission should be applauded, and I think we should all embrace it, and I think we should start moving forward in looking at these, the principles and the recommendations, seeing how they adhere to the rest, or how they connect to the rest of the policies of the City of Winnipeg and let's try to improve the trade in our City.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker, I can understand Councillor Swandel not understanding this Motion. You know, he has a difficult time understanding things. Therefore, be it resolved, this is what it is. "Therefore be it resolved that the Mayor's Trade Council Final Report be referred back to the administration for further review; Be it further resolved that a Council seminar be held to discuss infrastructure and transportation priorities". It's very clear. Why don't we go along with it? It makes sense.

You know, I'd like to deal with Councillor Steeves' few words. You know, when we adopt something in principle, we're saying we like that direction. You know, we heard, we heard Mr. Klassen say there are other options. We don't know what those other options are. He talked about other cities doing other things. We do not know what they are doing.

You know, we need a Council seminar. We need more discussion on this. You know, we should support this Motion to send it back. It makes a lot of sense. It doesn't make sense to Council Swandel but we all understand that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith the Motion has been changed by a request of a member of Council that it's not referred to the administration, it is to be referred to the Executive Policy Committee, and the clerk has that down. That's down for the record, so there's no such a thing as the administration.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker are we clear now that Councillor Smith understands the Motion?

Mr. Speaker: I think he understood it right from day one. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all, I want to thank Councillor Lorenc and his committee for doing the work that gave us this report. There are items in the report I agree with and there are items in the report I am 150% opposed to.

I think it's a start. I think it's something that should have been referred to the administration for more work, for more information, bring it back when it's a more complete document, and we can continue the conversation.

First of all, I think, to respond to Councillor Steeves, I don't think anyone in this Council chamber wants to, wants to do less trade across the world. In fact, I think that's a strategic direction we need to be going in to and it's almost, you don't even have to speak about it. We're all on the same page.

But one of the disappointments in the report is when you compare it to the Asia Pacific Gateway report, which this has obvious ties to. The Asia Pacific report was very, very heavily accented on rail, rail, rail. Part of the reason for that was to decongest the ports obviously near the Pacific Ocean but to take, to minimize the infrastructure requirements and to take truck traffic, needless truck traffic off of our roads, that was a major priority of the Asia Pacific report, and in no way, shape, or form…

Councillor Swandel: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Swandel: Are we on the Motion now or on the clause?

Councillor Vandal: I'm on both.

Councillor Swandel: Are we doing both together now?

Mr. Speaker: We're doing both now yes.

Councillor Thomas: No. No.

Councillor Swandel: No I believe Councillor Thomas has insisted that we only speak to the Motion.

Mr. Speaker: We have, look, Council, right from the beginning when we started, the Motion that came, No. 3, you could speak to the Motion No. 3, and if you so wish, you can speak to the clause when it's before us.

Councillor Swandel: So if we are only speaking to the motion right now…

Mr. Speaker: You can speak to either one. You can speak to both or you can speak to one and speak again. That's Procedural By-law.

Councillor Vandal: So you can speak again. So you can speak twice?

Mr. Speaker: You can speak to the Motion that's before you now, Motion No. 3, and then you can speak to the clause. Either of them.

Councillor Vandal: Okay.

Councillor Swandel: So what are you doing? Are you speaking to the Motion or to both?

Councillor Vandal: I'm going to speak to the Motion. I'm going to speak to Councillor Thomas' Motion. Mr. Speaker is that your final answer, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, go ahead. Come on, let's get on with it.

Councillor Vandal: Okay, we're speaking to the Motion. I think the Motion is very self-explanatory, no cost estimates, no cost benefit analysis, the radical restructuring of our transportation priorities.

Words are important to us as politicians. Especially words in the recommendations. Endorse in principle means endorse in principle, and when you start implementing something, that's a very strong words, that a very strong word in this Council chamber. Implementing means you're actually doing it. You're going to spend money. There's

no cost estimates in this report. So that's why I'm going to be supporting the Motion of Councillor Gerbasi and Thomas. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: See what I'm getting at? He would have taken 10 minutes. He took only five minutes. Now we can get on with the business. Next to speak is Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will be speaking specifically to the Motion and nothing but the Motion. Mr. Speaker, what we're being asked today is to adopt in principle, and we all know that if we adopt in principle the next step that follows, that's when the public service comes into play and basically does the due diligence on how things would or would not be implemented.

I heard earlier today where Mr. Klassen came down and made the comments about has there been interaction with people from an environmental point of view? Well, obviously the answer was no because that's where our public service will obviously do what has to be done and then report back to Council.

From my point of view, we know where we're going. We know what we want to do. There is no need for this Motion. I believe we have faith in our public service. Let them do the work. I will not be supporting the Motion.

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

Councillor Leipsic: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I won't take up much time this morning of Councillors here. I want to clarify two issues Mr. Speaker, if I may.

First issue is, I have never, and I guess I direct this to all the Councillors, to nobody specifically, I have never been approached by the Labour Council, and I want you to know I'm not going to take it personally, but would be nice and when Councillor Swandel can make berates like that…

Anyhow, the other thing is I want to say, I will not be able to support my neighbour, Councillor Gerbasi's Motion here because I think Mr. Lorenc and his group have done an incredible job, a task for us gathering information as citizens, volunteers helping us out here. I know the knowledge and the time is extremely valuable to these people, and I will say as chair of Kansas City Winnipeg Economic Agreement, I have seen firsthand the inland port in Kansas City, in Fort Worth, and they're phenomenal.

And I think one of the points we aren't mentioning, and Mr. Lorenc did a few times, but we should mention it here, time is of the essence. We're going to be left behind by all these cities that are building the inland ports. They're trying to get them in other parts of western Canada. There's one in Guanajuato, Mexico that opened a couple of weeks ago. Again, I'll just leave you with this. Time is of the essence, and we're going to miss all the trains, planes, and boats, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I too will not be supporting the Motion. My reasons are few, simple. One, the motion isn't much different from what EPC recommends anyway.

Number two, the Trade Commission had more expertise on it than the City has in its administration, and that's no insult to the administration. This is brought together as a panel of experts for this specific purpose.

EPC, the clause from EPC says refer it to the administration to devise an implementation plan. When this plan comes forward, that is the time for a Council seminar. I don't think we're here to debate nor do we have the expertise to debate whether this panel of experts is wise or stupid. I don't think none of us have the narrowly channeled wisdom to do that. I think how we implement it and what we implement from it is subject for debate and is our job.

So let's just get on with it. Let our administration devise the plan that EPC is asking them to do, then bring all of

Council together for a seminar at that point.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor O'Shaughnessy. There is no further speakers, Councillor Gerbasi, you'll close on your Motion No. 3.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and I know the Labour Council endorsed Councillor Swandel once, but I don't think they'd do that again.

But I'd just like to say that the problem I have with proceeding with this, no disrespect is meant to the panel, but words do matter as Councillor Vandal said and we are adopting in principle something that many of the things in the report may well be good, but there is very specific recommendations that we are saying we are adopting in principle.

And then when our next Capital budget comes out, I'm going to hear people around this chamber say, we adopted it in principle widening Kenaston and doing this and doing that or whatever else, and the specific streets are named in here and we're adopting that in principle. So let's not kid ourselves. We are making a decision today. We're not just referring something back.

We could accept this as information and refer it to the administration. But we're not doing that. We are taking a step further, if we don't support by motion to study this further, by adopting in principle the idea of building this road, this road, this road and this road that are written in this report.

So I'm not fooled by the words. Those are the words we're voting on right now. So let's have that vote and then let's have the debate depending on how that vote goes on why that's a big concern.

And I think, you know, by the way, the P-3s, you know, might be the Labour Council's concern and some of our concern, but a lot of this has to do with urban planning and transportation issues and a lot of that is what drives me Councillor Swandel. So I just wanted to respond to that comment because you know because it isn't owned by anybody.

Councillor Swandel: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute.

Councillor Gerbasi: So I just, so that, so this…

Councillor Swandel: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel what is your point of order?

Councillor Swandel: The Councillor from Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry is required to speak to the chair not directly to me. If she wants to step aside and I'll gladly go downstairs and have a conversation with her, but the rules in the chamber are quite clear.

Councillor Thomas: Take your own advice.

Mr. Speaker: Well taken, well taken Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: I apologize to Councillor Swandel. It's a very, you know I apologize. It's a very important debate today and emotions are running high when they have a budget. I think everybody is a little testy. So I apologize as well. I appreciate that he apologized earlier and I apologize as well.

So with that, I would like to ask that Council really think hard before they adopt in principle building these specific roadways that are listed in this report. It's not just the idea of building them, it's the, pardon me?

Councillor Vandal: Implementing.

Councillor Gerbasi: Implementing, and also they're asking for an implementation plan.

Mr. Speaker: Let the speaker continue.

Councillor Gerbasi: But it's similar, when the Rapid Transit Task Force Report came back, we adopted that in principle and then we referred it to an implementation and plan. And now we're doing the things in that report and I think

we all expected that that's what it meant. At least we hope that's what it means, that we're going to be doing the things in that report.

So that is what we're doing today. We're deciding that we think at least in principle we should do all the things in that report, and many of the things in the report are good, but there's a big section of it that is very, very frightening and has un-costed implications, huge un-costed implications.

And it doesn't address the environment, it doesn't address a climate change plan, and no one on those issues was even discussed, discussed, pardon me, no one on those issues were consulted as part of this process.

So I think that before we adopt it in principle we should have some discussion with all members of Council. And I think that's a reasonable thing to ask and I would urge you to support it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillors, what's before us is Motion No. 3…

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: with a revised line taking out the word "administration" and in its place "to the Executive Policy Committee".

Okay you've heard the question that has been put.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas and Vandal.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 10.

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 3 is Lost.

Item 1, Councillor Gerbasi, what have you got a Point of order?

Councillor Gerbasi: No I just want to be on the list to speak.

Mr. Speaker: Okay fine. You're going to be speaking to Item 1. Okay fine. Any further speakers to Item 1? Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Thomas, to start off.

Councillor Gerbasi: You know I'm sorry people are disappointed that we're spending you know an hour or two on the massive infrastructure priorities and transportation planning for our entire City. I think that's what we were elected for. So I apologize if I'm using up too much of people's time.

I'm rising in opposition to the Motion to endorse this report, even if it's only in principle, and I don't agree that we should move forward with an implementation plan at this stage. And I say this because the report is fundamentally flawed and takes the City in the opposite direction of where we should go.

The priorities of the City should be first to maintain our existing infrastructure and to invest in environmentally sustainable alternatives such as public transit and active transportation. New expansions of automobile infrastructure should be third on the priority list.

The Mayor's Trade Council is a lofty title and the people on it are respected citizens. This makes it a little more difficult for the Councillors to see that this whole thing is utterly misguided. The most glaring, and I'm talking about the infrastructure recommendations. I'm not saying every aspect of the report but that's a big part of the report. So I just want to be clear. No disrespect intended on some of the other issues in the report because frankly, I haven't had time since I only saw this report a week ago to figure out all the implications of everything else. I know enough about the infrastructure and transportation planning to be able to have an opinion.

The most glaring problem with this report is the recommendations to undertake a massive investment in new roadways and widening existing roadways. The report calls for a reprioritization of investment in our street system.

These are some of the projects the report identifies as priorities: Waverley West connection road from Bishop Grandin Boulevard to the Perimeter Highway; widening Kenaston from the Assiniboine River to Taylor Avenue, which I believe was over $90 million or so in an estimate a while ago so when it's actually built, Lord knows; Stage completion of the inner ring road including further extension of Chief Peguis Trail beyond what we are doing now without cost benefit analysis.

It is amazing to me that the report contains no cost benefit analysis to justify spending what will be hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars on road expansions. Imagine if we were trying to build transit with these kind of conditions.

The report further suggests that public-private partnerships should be used to finance these projects, and even those who are very keen on public-private partnerships acknowledge, and this is the point about P-3s I want to make, is that P-3s are simply a different form of borrowing money. So we're still borrowing money and yet the report contains no numbers or science or analysis that justifies incurring this massive debt. And how can the massive mortgage on our grandchildren's future be justified? Where are the meaningful, where is the information about the meaningful benefit to citizens? They certainly aren't spelled out in this document.

And it is amazing that the report is silent on the climate change crisis and the environmental impacts of our overdependence on the automobile. Yes, there's some mention of greenhouse gases about, you know having better roads slightly reduces them, but it's not looking at the environmental impacts. It's not looking at alternatives that are better to the environment. It's focusing on expanding car capacity.

As chair of the Mayor's Environmental Advisory Committee, it is pretty startling that we weren't consulted. We are advisors to the Mayor or the people that, the group that I have been asked to chair, and we were not even consulted on this report and it's all about transportation and infrastructure priorities. So I'm not sure, you know, what that committee, you know, what I'm going to tell them to explain why we weren't consulted.

For issues as significant as this, there should have been a much wider public consultation, not just the City staff or the people in the industry. What about the citizens, what about the Council of Women? What about the Labour Council? What about…? You know aren't they part of this City? You know, the tent is really too narrow here in terms of consultation.

I'm also disappointed that the issue of the rail relocation was not addressed. I realize the motion was referred later in the process, apparently after this report was already gone to the printer. The rail relocation motion was sent there. That's pretty cynical. I mean, obviously they're not going to do, you know maybe they did look at it, but that motion, so why did EPC refer a motion to a report, to a committee that the report had already gone to the printer?

Maybe they didn't know that, but I hope that EPC is going to address the motion that Councillor Vandal moved and I seconded so that we can actually look at that because it hasn't been looked at anywhere that we know of, other than the comments from the chair of the Trade Council's personal opinion. So I just wanted to make that point.

The recommendations of this or any other report should not be blindly accepted without fully understanding the costs and the benefits. As I mentioned earlier already that the Mayor's Rapid Transit Task Force was adopted in principle and an implementation report, but that report contained numbers of the costs fairly extensively, as best as they could be nailed out, at least estimates so you at least have a ballpark of what you're recommending. And there was extensive

information about the benefits of public transit as well in other ways. But also, it contained funding suggestions as well in a fairly detailed way.

So what I'm saying to you is it's really unfortunate that this Council would not take more time on this. I'm not sure where the fire is. I mean these types of things do take some time to even have members of Council consulted enough to have a discussion. You know, to get a report of this magnitude a week before Council with no public discussion, no discussion with non-EPC Councillors and then to refuse to even have a Council seminar before we adopt it in principle, which means we agree with it, is insulting and a very dangerous road to go down, if you'll pardon the expression.

And so I've already, I have to change my speech on the fly because many things happened fast this morning, but I think this Council is moving at lightning speed to nowhere with no plan except, wow, this sounds good, you know.

Let's look at the costs. Let's look at the benefit. Let's wake up and be accountable for what we're doing. And I think I'm going to have to vote against this, and I'm very sorry to Mr. Lorenc and all the work they did, because I don't want to insult, much of the work they did was positive, but this stuff on the roads and transportation, where's the land use planning understanding? Where's the understanding of the fact that we're in a global climate crisis? Where's the understanding that investing in roads to expand car capacity doesn't benefit us? It doesn't work and no other cities in Canada are doing that. Wake up Council.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas you have the floor.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Where to begin? Mayor's Trade Council Final Report be endorsed in principle and then directed to administration for report. This is unusual. Usually after a report is submitted, it goes to the administration for an analysis, and then we come back with it. So it's, see it, approve it, then get the administration to tell us what the problems are with it. And there are quite a few problems.

I've got an MA in Sociology, specializing in research, and may I say that the research hasn't been done of all the groups that should be involved in this. I've also taken urban planning courses and community development courses, and this is not the way you go about it. This is why this particular Council drives me crazy, Mr. Speaker.

I'm disappointed a lot of the times when I come into this, hallowed halls, and disgusted on a few occasions, and it's this right here right now Mr. Speaker, that I find one of the most disgusting things because instead of taking the opportunity to educate to the issues and to look at the fact that we've had many reports, and this report is going in a different direction than our Transit report, it's going in a different direction than Plan Winnipeg, it's going in a different direction than our approved Capital budget, let's not deal with that. The administration will fix it later. Well, that's not making decisions as far as I'm concerned. It's abrogating decisions and running off in all directions, and that's a mistake.

There are some interesting things within the Trade Council document that should be looked at. But the big problem with the document is when they decided that they were going to instead of looking at the issue of trade, when they decided they were going to fix the streets and made a lot of comments on fixing the streets rather than looking at trade issues.

And several Councils have said that they were against a ring road system. And if you look at Lensky, an urban sociologist who studied this issue, had problems with community issues that ring roads present around the City and how they create buffers between the urban and the rural areas and lead to more down, more turning down in housing values and create buffers between the haves and the have-nots, and was very much concerned about the 1950's movement to create ring roads in many cities, and many communities have stopped doing that. So this is a back to the 50's direction that has

been clearly, by many sociologists, clearly stated as a wrong direction in which to go.

But this Council doesn't need to look at those things. They have administration to do that. But let's approve it first and then let the administration fix it up. Mr. Speaker, that is why this Council is losing so many planners, because they don't even have the opportunity to make appropriate recommendations to this Council because this Council chooses to remain ignorant.

This report, when it goes off the rails, and that is a pun, creates problems in our City by its move to vehicular transport and doesn't consider the implications of rapid transit; doesn't consider the implications of rail; doesn't consider the implications of destroying communities; doesn't consider the implications of poor urban planning. It is one report, and it needs to be looked at in the context of other reports, and it is in conflict with those other reports.

And I would have liked to have had the opportunity to talk to the chair of that, who was a former City Councillor who when he was a City Councillor voted against the establishment of ring roads. I'd like to know what happened there. But because we're in the middle of our operating budget and a lot of us are spending a lot of time with all the goofy things that are happening in that budget, that this report should not have come at this time.

This report has come without a Council seminar. Very unusual move. I think this Council has decided that they don't want to know the good news and the bad news and the indifferent news. They don't want to be edified, they just want to vote and get out of here. I am disappointed, disgusted, but sadly enough Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to point out this is the Mayor's Trade Council. It has nothing to do with our public transportation policy. It has nothing to do with bike paths or other forms of active transportation. It's how you move trains and semis around this City, how you get this to be a major trade centre, and that's what it focused in on. Nothing to do with bike paths.

Why they didn't consult the Council of Women I can't figure. Why they didn't consult the Trade Council? Hell, where's the ballet? This is about commerce!

Why they didn't listen to our City. If our City administration was equipped to do this, we wouldn't have needed the Mayor's Trade Council. These are the experts. And get it, hold it, hold it, this is it. All my time here, this is a first, this Council is moving too fast. This Council is moving too fast. When is the last time you heard that other than never?

You know there's, you get to my point of view, these roads in here that are against Plan Winnipeg, that are against our budget, every one of them, every one of these has been endorsed by Council.

The inner ring road. What is the eastern leg? Lagimodiere. We built that 20 years ago. The southern leg, Bishop Grandin, three quarters built. The northern leg, did we not just last year unanimously approve the eastern section of the northern thing, the Chief Peguis Trail? Has the western section of it not been in City plans endorsed by Council for over 20 years? Is it not in dotted lines on every one of our maps for the last 20 years? The western leg, we got a bit of a problem. A lot of it is in Rosser, but, you know, the bridges have all been built. And the Charleswood Bridge, which goes up Moray, which goes up Sturgeon Road, oh that's the western leg. It's just not widened enough yet. The inner ring road is there.

And Kenaston, for those uninitiated for the last five years has been in our Capital budget for engineering studies on how we're going to widen that roadway. We have a plan. Kenaston will extend beyond Bishop Grandin through Waverley West, to the west of St. Norbert and rejoin Highway 75 as our major route to the States. We're going to do this without widening Kenaston? We're going to do this with a 50 kilometre an hour speed limit? These aren't new. These are all approved.

What we have here are points of the view to help us move ahead. We are going to be referring them to our administration. They are going to be coming back. Everything in here may possibly not be adopted, but to approve this very well thought-out intelligent document in principle, I find is pretty common sense and pretty basic, and let's get on with it. Heaven forbid we should move too fast.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel, you are the final speaker, followed by, the Mayor will be closing. Now there's more. Go ahead.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. You know, it struck me that we're guided by Plan Winnipeg in much of what we do. In Plan Winnipeg, I'm going to read you some pieces from Plan Winnipeg that tells us what we as a Council should be doing.

"Develop and implement a long-term economic development strategy. The City shall develop and implement a long-term economic development strategy by" and it lists six items. Two of them say "participating in strategic trade initiatives and undertaking other support efforts to capitalize upon identified export growth opportunities and seeking strategic opportunities to improve access to international markets".

It goes on to say that "the City shall facilitate opportunities for business growth in Winnipeg. The City shall capitalize in the comparative advantages Winnipeg has over other urban centres for attracting new business to Winnipeg by promoting the City's central geographic location and time zone. The City shall implement an industrial land planning strategy".

Those of you who are paying attention will know we have an employment land strategy in the works. It's close to completion. We'll be coming forward to Council hopefully for adoption. It makes some very specific recommendations of what we need for employment lands and what type of investments we need to make.

Plan Winnipeg also tells us "that we need to partner with the Winnipeg Airport Authority, participating in the development of intermodal transportation linkages to the airport". Sound familiar? It's Plan Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker. Way before my time, I'm not sure who was here when this document was made.

"Participating in the development of intermodal transportation linkages to the airport including supporting the construction of a new east-west linkage to the west perimeter as noted in policy plate "b" subsequent to a business case analysis".

That's what our public service is going to come back and tell us when they look at this, you know, when we look at implementing, Plan Winnipeg tells us that although the Trade Commission makes this recommendation, we must do a business case analysis.

It goes on to say that "partnering with the Winnipeg Airports Authority includes improving street connections, urban design and signage along the designated route between the airport and the downtown and working with major industrial users of airport facilities and aerial landowners to identify their future needs in support of strategic economic development."

There's a lot of you know, a lot of good language here that really hits home at what the Mayor's Trade Commission is saying to us and asking us to put in the hands of our public administration, to look at their recommendations, and apply them to existing policies that we have in the City of Winnipeg and give us a strategy for implementation.

We know that when we get recommendations, not all can be implemented. You know often times we find that because of costs, because of other priorities, we're not able to go down exactly the path of what recommendations were, but we are on the path of what Plan Winnipeg tells us to do here today. "Encouraging collaborative ventures between the private and not for profit sectors and the City's various

agencies". You know we can go on and on here in this document right in our own Plan Winnipeg.

You know, I don't know if those of you have received your Maclean's magazine lately. Well, the most recent issue has a piece on crime and how our Mayor has stood up and said, yes, we have a crime problem, and I'll read the exact quote to you, because this is about taking action instead of stepping to the sides and throwing a little bit of political rhetoric out there and not doing anything. Putting it in to some sort of a space where we can stand up and we can bat it back and forth. Maclean's magazine says "Sam Katz is not most Mayors. We have a problem with crime. We're going to address it. End of story."

Well, when it comes to trade and the economics of this City, I hope that the rest of this Council stands with me in supporting the motion that was put forward by Executive Policy Committee and that we start addressing the issues of trade and economy as well in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors it's 12:00 o'clock. Councillor Smith?

Councillor Smith: Are we not? We should be adjourning for lunch.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: How many speakers have we got?

Mr. Speaker: We have three more, three more speakers, so far.

Councillor Smith: So I move that we adjourn until 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors? You want to finish it? Who wants to finish it?

All in favour? Okay, let's continue. Are there any further speakers? Are there any further speakers?

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker we've got all sorts of work to do after this issue anyways, so why don't we just take our regular lunch and come back at 1:30 p.m.?

Councillor Swandel: Let's deal with it. Let's go.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors.

Councillor Vandal: There's three more speakers. I'm not... There's three more.

Mr. Speaker: There are two speakers left and the Mayor closing will be three. So do we want to continue? Okay, Justin decided. Do you want to finish this item? Okay Councillors you want that? We shall have it. Councillor Browaty, you're next to speak.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. As my colleague from East Fort Garry was suggesting, she's apologizing for the use of our time. This is a very good use of our time and a very good use of the resources of the Mayor's Trade Council putting together this report.

Trade brings in money to our City. We could spend government money until the cows come home, but we need to bring money into our City to create wealth and create a better City. Trade means jobs, jobs mean young people and young people especially before they have families want to live in dense areas with lots of people and lots of amenities and they want things like rapid transit. It's all a piece of the puzzle. You can't have one before the other. It's a chicken before the egg type thing.

And I think by doing this exercise and looking at our transportation infrastructure shortfalls, by going to business and figuring out how we can improve the competitiveness of our City, we are doing the right thing here.

You may have realized, you may not have noticed but rail lines throughout the City are disappearing. The main long haul routes are there, but a lot of the little spurs that go into industrial parks and stuff they're not being used anymore.

Intermodal is the way of the future. To get things from all our various industrial areas in the City to our rail lines to do the long haul, we need to have a proper inner ring road. We need to have these

infrastructure pieces completed. That's where we're moving and that's what's identified in this report.

Costing these options and moving forward from here is the next piece. We're not saying today that we're going to build all of these things tomorrow. We're looking at a layout, we're looking at, to the administration to look at how this is going to work moving forward.

And again, it's just a piece. We're not saying today we're signing a blank cheque to do all this. We're looking at the next piece. The concept is good. Are there pieces that make more sense and are higher priorities than others? Absolutely. So that's why I will definitely be supporting the adoption of this report and looking for an implementation on it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Final speaker before the Mayor closes, Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. There's many things in this report I like and as Councillor Swandel has pointed out are in Plan Winnipeg. The key question is how do we finance them? How do we put them into the queue with all the other priorities that this City has?

I find the report doesn't explain the whole rail option very much. I think there's two paragraphs on inland ports. And I think if we're really going to maximize the potential that the City has for trade, there's got to be more of a fleshing out of what exactly that is, how much it would it cost? Where would that be on the priority? It's going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars, if not a couple of billion. Where is the, where are, how do we potentially finance that?

And if the benefit is there, why would we spend hundreds of millions of dollars on other priorities such as a ring road priority? Councillor O'Shaughnessy is right some of the ring road has been constructed. Significant pieces have not been constructed and we're looking at hundreds of millions of dollars of expenses.

The Asia Pacific Trade Initiative, I have a copy, I've read several, there's a whole section on the rail option and essentially the rail option is deemed as where you get the biggest bang for your dollars because you lessen the, there's environmental benefits, you lessen the infrastructure requirements, it's quicker, it's more efficient, it's faster. I find that part of the report not there, but these are volunteers.

Priority one, there's a whole bunch of infrastructure priorities including the famous ring road system which has been around since the 50's. And quite frankly, to be succinct, the ring road priority is not the transportation priority of the City of Winnipeg. It's certainly not mine. It's not the priority of Plan Winnipeg. And I believe it's not the priority of the majority of Winnipeggers.

And we need to have a detailed discussion on what our transportation priority is again through Plan Winnipeg. I'm not sure where that is. Perhaps the Mayor can expound on that later, but these are Plan Winnipeg type discussions we should be having before we start using words like approve and implement.

The implement word really has me stuck. The recommendation coming out of Executive Committee, we're going to implement this plan, there's no cost estimates and we're looking at hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars and we're going to implement the plan. No cost benefit analysis.

I've talked about the Plan Winnipeg strategy. I think that there is many things in there that I can endorse. Everyone knows we need a new entryway from, to the City of Winnipeg from the south, Pembina Highway is clustered. We need a road from the airport to the west perimeter. We actually have a ring road and that's the perimeter. I'm not convinced that we need another inner layer of ring road at the cost of who knows what because there is no costs in here.

So Mr. Speaker, as succinctly as I can say, that's my concerns with this. I think

we should have sent this to the administration for more analysis, more detail, bring it back. Bring it back, have a Council seminar and then talk about using words like approving and implementing. I mean its common sense. That's where I'm at. That's where I'm going to be voting.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, closing.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, there is no need to apologize. She can take as much time as she wants. I will listen all day long on any point because everything we discuss on the floor of Council is of utmost importance.

Mr. Speaker: At any given day.

Mayor Katz: Any given day, seven days a week I'm available. And I mean that sincerely. There's no need to apologize for taking time. You're not taking our time. That's number one.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, you know its interesting listening to the Councillors speak. You hear one Councillor say I support a lot of things in here but there's some I'm not sure of. You hear Councillors reading from Plan Winnipeg basically endorsing a lot of what has been said here today. All we're trying to do today is to move forward, and I'd like to think everybody here wants us to move forward.

The realities are Council Browaty discussed the importance of commerce. Trade is commerce, quality jobs. Young people staying here, young people moving here, raising families. We heard earlier today by the delegation that we are the slowest growing City, okay, of all the major cities in Canada, and that was Mr. Klassen who put that forward. I mean, I think we all want the common goal of growing, but all we're trying to do here today is to move forward and let the public service do its due diligence.

When I hear Councillor Vandal say I'm leery of this one, you know what, maybe he has a point, and maybe that point will be raised by the public service when they do their due diligence, but you have to do the due diligence. And when the due diligence is done, we'll be able to make decisions, what to move forward on, what not to move forward on.

The realities are this, hundreds of millions of dollars could be spent, maybe a billion dollars. We know we don't have that money. This report from the Trade Council specifically says we have to work in partnership with all levels of government; the Federal government, the Provincial government, as well as the private sector. This is not happening on our own initiative. This is a partnership because this is the way to go. This is the direction. We want to grow.

And most importantly, acknowledging the fact that our City has inherent advantages over many other cities in North America that we have not taken advantage of for the last 40 years, and maybe it's time we do, Mr. Speaker. I will be approving this, supporting this and I certainly hope every Councillor does as well. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: A recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote has been called by Councillor Gerbasi.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas, Vandal.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 4.

Mr. Speaker: It's Carried.

Councillors we have two, one report of March 17th and also a walk-on item I don't think there is an issue. Can we just deal with those real fast before we get on to…

Councillor Thomas: No, no, no. There are people that are, that have (inaudible) and they have other commitments during the lunch hour.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, so adjourned until 1:30 p.m.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of March 19, 2008 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, let's get on with it. Mr. Mayor, addendum report of March the 17th of 2008. Will you introduce it?

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 17, 2008**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and that Item 1 be adopted by Consent.

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

The walk-on report of March the 19th, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 19, 2008**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated March 19th, 2008 be considered.

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

Item 1 – Memorandum of Agreement – United Fire Fighters of Winnipeg, Local 867, File GU-4.9

Mr. Speaker: All in? Continue.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that Item 1 be adopted.

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

EPC Motions, Mr. Clerk.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Just one.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order.

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

**Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi
Seconded by Councillor Smith**

WHEREAS the Federal Government has announced in the recent budget that 18 million in funding for the Province of Manitoba can be used for Public Transit;

AND WHEREAS the Rapid Transit Task Force in 2005 recommended building Bus Rapid Transit with Phase One being the Southwest Corridor utilizing matching funding from the three levels of government;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg endorses utilizing Manitoba's portion of the Federal transit

money to build Phase one of BRT from downtown to Jubilee Avenue;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg will negotiate a cost sharing agreement with the province in addition to using the recently announced Federal funding to be spent on phase one of the Southwest Bus Rapid Transit Corridor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Most, well it's not a Point of order it's a Motion that I would like to ask Council to suspend the rules to debate because, the Motion No. 1 for EPC, because it's about the Transit funding which it's been publicly stated the date, the decision has to be made by March 31st, so if its deferred there won't be an EPC meeting until after that date. So I'm asking if Council would suspend the rules to hear this Motion, to debate this Motion now.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors you've heard that Motion.

All in favour of suspension of the rules? Opposed? Want a recorded vote?

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay recorded vote then.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas, Vandal.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Leipsic, Nordman, Swandel, and Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 7.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is Lost. Automatic Referral.

And Mr. Clerk we have another EPC…?

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz

WHEREAS malaria is the leading killer of children in Africa, taking a child's life every 30 seconds;

AND WHEREAS on April 25, 2000, at the African Summit in Abuja, Nigeria, Africa Malaria Day was declared as April 25th as a commitment by all nations to halve the burden of Malaria by 2010;

AND WHEREAS April 25th is also known and recognized as World Malaria Day by the international community;

AND WHEREAS the United Nations acknowledges the importance of the need to halt and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria not only as a goal in itself, but as an essential path toward achieving all the Millennium Development Goals by the target year of 2015;

AND WHEREAS Canadian citizens make an immense contribution to improving quality of life in communities around the world through their efforts as volunteers and supporters of international cooperation and partnership;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is committed to international cooperation and partnership to improve the quality of life of all people as demonstrated by its "Sister City's" projects;

AND WHEREAS the BUY-A-NET Malaria Prevention Group, a registered charitable Canadian citizen and volunteer- driven initiative, based in Kingston with an active Winnipeg branch, believes that together, as united citizens against malaria, we can prevent malaria and alleviate the pain and suffering inflicted upon people [particularly children and pregnant women] in Africa through the procurement and distribution of long lasting insecticide treated bed nets and anti-malarial medicines free of charge, one village at a time;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is known as "the Gateway to the West";

**AND WHEREAS it takes so little to make a difference by providing nets to protect whole villages in Africa from malaria;*

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Mayor Katz and City Council express support for the outstanding efforts of community groups such as BUY-A-NET for their work on Malaria Prevention.

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 2. It's Notice of Motion.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

I guess that's it for Motions. Consideration of By-laws Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 43/2008, 46/2008, 51/2008 and 52/2008.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 43/2008, 46/2008, 51/2008 and 52/2008.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws No. 43/2008, 46/2008, 51/2008, and 52/2008 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 43/2008, 46/2008, 51/2008 and 52/2008.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 43/2008, 46/2008, 51/2008 and 52/2008, 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: Questions? Whose going to be first? Who wants to flip a coin? You guys both had your hands up. Councillor Gerbasi, followed by Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Smith: You never look over here.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm sorry, you know what let Harvey go first. I always go…

Mr. Speaker: Now let's quit playing games. Now go ahead Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm not playing a game I'm trying to be nice. All right I'll go first.

Councillor Smith: I missed him both times.

Councillor Gerbasi: All right. Mr. Speaker I'm raising a question about the process around the budget because I asked a, I asked a question when the delegations came last week and found out that there was indeed a reduction to the graffiti budget, cut in there.

But what I also found out was that there is going to be a service-based budget tabled Thursday which, and that that's where I can find the information about the specific cut to graffiti, which I understand was one-time money last year that won't be in there this year. So I am aware, I figured out what it was, later, after some time and effort. But my point is we've had the public…

Mr. Speaker: What is your question?

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm getting to it. I'm allowed a preamble and I won't be much longer if I can continue.

I was pretty shocked to hear that there's another budget document that contains more details of which, impact on services, when the public's already used up their opportunity to speak and the Council Seminar has already been had, so there will be specific cuts that will become understandable and are detailed in the

budget after the public delegations that can be heard.

Would the Mayor confirm that a service-based budget document is going to be tabled tomorrow as I was told by the public service?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker first I want to address the first question, regarding graffiti. There is no decrease in the budget for graffiti. As Councillor Gerbasi did mention that there was one-time money in '07 and other than that the budget remains exactly the same. So there is no decrease. That's number one.

Number two, the public service has already said and we have stated prior, that our goal was to have a service-based budget on the table and available for everybody. That still is the goal. Always has been. And I know as a result of time, it's been difficult to accomplish that but I know the public service has worked extremely hard towards that goal and I hope they will be able to accomplish it.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: I agree, I understand that graffiti because I had realized it was one-time funds that won't be there this year, but what I'm saying is is how will the public and non-EPC Councillors who haven't had the time to work on the budget, without seeing that service-based, with that budget coming so much later, just before the vote, how are we going to know the impact on service of the operational efficiencies that are listed in every department that's just a big number, without detailing what that means for service. How do we know what is going to be in the budget before we have to vote on it in a few days?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker the answer that I can give Councillor Gerbasi is that when we were dealing with the budget, the focus was to make sure there were no cuts to the gains that we've made in the last four years. As everybody knows we have frozen our property taxes, hopefully it will be for 11 straight years.

The reality is in previous years we froze them by cutting back on services. And I think it was the former CAO who said "death by a thousand cuts". We all know that we used to have tree pruning every 42 years. We are now down to 12. Grass used to be cut every 14 days. We're now back to what should be the right number approximately 7 or 8.

We've been restoring services. I have said on the record many times that our goal is to maintain the gains that we have made and not to go backwards. And in conversation with all department heads, that has been the focus on any conversation that's taken place, maintaining the services that we have today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Your final question Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well one of the gains that we made last year was an enhanced graffiti program and is it accurate that that graffiti program, the enhancement of $200,000 dollars that was last year will not be there this year?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, and I believe Councillor Gerbasi knows the answer to the question. When you pass in a budget one-time money, I think everybody knows what the term "one-time money" means. I don't think we have to elaborate it or explain it. As far as the annual line budget item. It has stayed exactly the same. No gain. No loss.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Mayor I'm wondering if you've sent Councillor Wyatt on a secret mission and that's why he is not here today. Can you explain what the secret mission is?

Mr. Speaker: That's not really a right question Councillor Smith.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I think Councillor Smith is very much aware of the fact, if I were to send anyone on a secret mission, I would send our best, the bearded wonder, Councillor Smith.

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

Councillor Smith: My next question is about the Police service station. You know when we dealt with the Capital budget the cladding was very expensive over the years. In fact we could build a new building. What's happening with that? Are we proceeding with the cladding?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I thank Councillor Smith for that question and obviously he's aware of the fact that once again a project that we were looking at has increased significantly from where we started to where we are today. Where the question had to be asked, is that the right direction to go? Should you be exploring other options? And that is exactly what's taken place right now with the public service. They are exploring the option of re-cladding along with other options.

It comes to a certain point in time if you're spending X-amount of millions of dollars, maybe you should look at the option of a new building. Maybe you should look at relocation. So right now, through you to Councillor Smith, all options are being explored to make sure we do what's right and what's best for the taxpayers of Winnipeg.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker, to the Mayor. It's becoming increasingly likely that the Friends of Upper Fort Garry are not going to meet the fundraising conditions which was imposed by the Downtown Committee, and it looks like the Executive Policy Committee led by yourself, are going to have the votes and defeat the motion I have introduced, I introduced to this Council last month.

The reality of that is that we're going to have a 230 foot 20 storey condominium building with a lot line of one metre, 39 inches, a lot line of 39 inches from the actual private lot to the western gates of Upper Fort Garry; 230 feet high, a one metre buffer zone.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, Councillor Vandal, what's your question?

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker I'm allowed a preamble on my first question.

Mr. Speaker: No if you're not, you know this is getting carried away here.

Councillor Vandal: My question is…

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Vandal: My question is do you sincerely believe that this is the best way to celebrate, to pay homage to the birthplace of Manitoba?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I thank Councillor Vandal for the question. And what I would like to do Mr. Speaker is focus on the real issue. We have here an $18 million dollar project, just so everybody understands that. You hear $12.5. The people seem to forget that the value of the property that the City of Winnipeg is contributing is between $5 to $6 million dollars. So I'll count it as $5.5, added to the $12.5, we now have an $18 million dollar project.

The City of Winnipeg has committed $5-1/2 million dollars to the project. We have now heard officially that the other two levels of government combined have contributed $3 million dollars. When their ask has been $9 million dollars.

So what I think would be really nice if everybody direct their energies where maybe they should go. Maybe Councillor Vandal, who I know has a good relationship with Broadway, should go there and get the other $3 million dollars. We wouldn't have to have this conversation. It would be all over. And then we know that sometimes how it

works is one level of government commits the other follows. As you saw, the Province committed $1.5, the Federal government followed with another $1.5.

That is the issue, and they still have plenty of time to address that issue. It was over a month ago, a month ago Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial government committed $1.5; plenty of time to make a commitment. Unfortunately the ask was for $4.5. That is the issue. That's what everybody here should be working on, and maybe everybody will take up that challenge. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker I beg to differ. I did not get an answer to my question. The issue is is that you're going to have a 20 storey condominium tower, which you cast the deciding vote on, one metre from the westerly walls of Upper Fort Garry. Do you think that's a proper way to celebrate the birthplace, to respect the birthplace of the Province of Manitoba? That's my question. Yes or no? Answer the question.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I will answer the question the way I deem appropriate thank you very much. And just to correct it, I did not cast any deciding vote. Long before I even came along Mr. Speaker, the Committee for Downtown Development made this decision. And during that meeting, there were delegations there as well. Friends of Upper Fort Garry were there. The developer was there, Crystal Builders, along with another developer that was declined. If this was such an important issue, I beg to wonder why Councillor Vandal wasn't there.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker I'll try one more time. 230 foot high building, one level of underground parking, four above ground, 15 towers. Do you believe a 230 foot building high is the proper way to respect the heritage, the birthplace of the Province of Manitoba?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'm not an architect. I'm not an interior designer. What I believe is appropriate is that we protect the historical site known as Upper Fort Garry. That's what this Council is committed to doing. That's what this Mayor is committed to doing. For the first time, the only Mayor and the only Council that's actually addressed this issue. Everybody else had the opportunity years ago to do something Mr. Speaker. Nothing.

We for the first time are doing something to make sure that historical site is there and maintained. As well as the fact to pursue other properties that sit on the historical site known as Upper Fort Garry. And as the Councillor is aware of, just across the street, there is even a taller structure.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel, your first question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I believe I heard the…

Mr. Speaker: What's your problem now?

Councillor Thomas: I thought I was next on the list.

Mr. Speaker: No you're not. You're not even on the list.

Councillor Swandel: I'd be more than willing (inaudible)

Councillor Thomas: Pardon?

Mr. Speaker: I don't even have you on the list. You didn't indicate to me. I didn't see you.

Councillor Steeves: I think someone's not listening Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I'm more than willing to allow Councillor…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas will be next.

Councillor Swandel: Next or do you want her to go now Mr. Speaker? I'm more than willing to let her go now.

Mr. Speaker: No continue.

Councillor Thomas: That's fine.

Councillor Swandel: Continue. Mr. Speaker, I heard the Mayor mention a commitment of $5.5 million dollars, the value of $5.5 million dollars of land from the City of Winnipeg towards the Friends of the Upper Fort Garry or in some way to make this site work and give us the opportunity to celebrate the significant heritage that exists at this site. Are we getting credit out of the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement for those monies if this is to proceed?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Through you Mr. Speaker to Councillor Swandel, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel that's it? Councillor Swandel that's it for questions? Councillor Thomas your first question.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Mr. Speaker through you to the Mayor. Last week I believe you announced increased dollars for inner city youth for programming and I've become aware that there's actually going to be a drop in recreational programming and some staff are going to be released. Can you explain to me the contradiction between the announcement for more programming for at youth risk and the actual reduction of recreational programming staff?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker number one, I don't recall making any specific announcement. I said I was very supportive and that the stakeholders were discussing basically more programming for our youth, and I believe that is what Councillor Thomas is referring to. And if that is what she is referring to then I basically say I totally agree and concur with that.

As far as what may be taking place from potential cuts Mr. Speaker, I don't think any one of us right now know exactly where these cuts are going to be, and if Councillor Thomas is aware of that, I would love to hear the details, and then I most definitely would respond specifically.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Okay, well, my second question was going to be what of those funds might be directed to the Chalmers, Glen Elm neighbourhoods which have lost their community centre that had over a hundred volunteers and twelve operating programs because there has been no replacement and no one has contacted any of the volunteers and offered them a different location for the programming, but my understanding now is that the Mayor's not aware of what additional program is going to be in. So I guess that makes my question moot.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Since the question is moot by her definition I would still be happy to answer it Mr. Speaker. First of all, the Community Services are discussing with the Winnipeg Police Service, and they are involving the stakeholders to try and address the issue. As you know, there have been media reports of meetings taking place. I think it's important the stakeholders are playing a role. I will wait for their recommendations to come forward and then hopefully all of Council can discuss these recommendations and decide what makes sense.

I think we all would agree that this most definitely is a priority, especially when it comes to the discussion of crime and safety. We know what the alternatives are. We know it's important for youth to have alternatives as opposed to gangs who are hanging on the streets, which is why we've committed $43 million dollars to date to our recreational infrastructure. And I believe we need to continue to commit as much money as we can, keeping in mind there are always priorities and it will be this Council that decides on what the priorities are.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Are you aware of where the children who were going to Kelvin Community Centre might be displaced to, since it is now my understanding that Bronx Park will be closing shortly for any programs? Although I'm not aware of any that they actually took over from Kelvin, any programs that might be operating there that would take Kelvin's, plus the programs that were operating out of Bronx are not going to be able to be operating from them.

Are you aware of where those programs might be displaced to and where the children from Kelvin who now have to walk in excess of 1.6 kilometres, some a maximum of 3 kilometres, where they might be going and how far they'd have to walk to get there?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Thomas, I know that Councillor Thomas was totally supportive of Bronx recreation facility. Also knew exactly what that meant as far as monies. To try and address the specific question of what the alternatives are as far as if the facility is going to be closed, part or all of it during construction, I would be happy to get a report back from Community Services and send it on to Councillor Thomas with as much detail as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions before we go in to second round? Councillor Gerbasi and then Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor. Mr., the Mayor has stated that he supports the $18 million dollars in funding that was announced by the Federal government for, that can be used for public transit, that he supported the use of this for the phase one of the bus rapid transit corridor, and he has said he has spoken to the Province and asked for it to be used for that funding.

So will the Mayor explain to me why he would not support the motion simply making that a Council resolution that that is what this Council wants to do, that our Council supports spending that $18 million dollars and that our Council will match that funding with the Province and work with the Province to build the first phase of the BRT? Why will the Mayor not support a motion when it's exactly what he had said to me…

Mr. Speaker: Give him a chance to answer.

Councillor Gerbasi: and to many other people?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would be happy to address that and I will probably repeat the exact same conversation I had with Councillor Gerbasi late yesterday afternoon, when she asked me to second this motion which I have had to decline.

Number one, we have contact, first of all just to give you the history Mr. Speaker. When the announcement was made by the Federal government that there was going to be $18 million dollars, not $500 million, $18 million dollars for the Province of Manitoba, it was Councillor Gerbasi who had a conversation with Minister Ashton.

As a result of that conversation, Councillor Gerbasi was kind enough to contact me and to ask me if I would speak to Minister Ashton. As a result of that, I did speak to Minister Ashton, and I put the question on the table quite clearly. When it comes to rapid transit, is the Province prepared to match the amount of money that will be required for rapid transit with new dollars? A very simple question, all right.

I then also had communication with the Premier's office. It was obviously pointed out to us number one, what the deadline was. It was March the 31st. We have now been informed by the Province that the deadline has been met, they have contacted and communicated with the Federal government to let them know that

the Province wants that $18 million dollars. Out of that $18 million dollars, I've also told the Province that I believe we should be getting 97% of that money. That's directly related to the amount of ridership that we have as compared to other municipalities in the Province.

We are still waiting for the Province to communicate with us as far as is there matching new money available. I've said on this floor many times before that when I negotiate with the Province, I like doing it one on one. I like having conversations. I don't box anybody into a corner. This is exactly what I said to Councillor Gerbasi yesterday. I will repeat it today so it will be on Hansard, and that's the way I will continue to do it.

The Province has been approached by the City, and it's fulfilled the commitment to make sure that we get the $18 million. The deadline no longer exists. It used to be rumoured that there was two years to spend the money. There is now a scenario whereby that if the money comes into the Province, we don't have a two year deadline. We can spend it when we spend it and when our project is going forward.

And the other scenario that some people seem to forget, it's not that I just get lobbied by one group Mr. Speaker, there are many Councillors here who said wait a minute, what about active transportation, what about bike paths, what about new buses? These are all on the table. So what I have done is told the Province where we're at and to please give us an answer as soon as they can. And you know what, sometimes you have to wait. You don't put a gun to the Province's head. I have no intention of doing that, which is why I did not support the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. So what I understand is that, I was under the impression that you had, that the Mayor had asked the Premier for all of the money to go to the BRT, but what I'm hearing is that you may have asked him for other priorities that other Councillors have come to you about. Is that what you just said?

Mayor Katz: Absolutely not. The only conversation that I have had to date is will the Province match the approximate $18 million dollars, and you can do the calculation what 97% would be and if we get it all, terrific, with new money for rapid transit, period. Had no discussion on any other topics.

Mr. Speaker: Your final third question Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: So if your intention would be to use all of the $18 million if the Province will match it, why again, I still don't understand why you couldn't endorse exactly what this motion says which is exactly that, that if the Province will match, that that's what we'll use the money for. That's exactly what this motion says. Why would you not second it? I still don't have an answer. I don't understand.

Mr. Speaker: Okay thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Gerbasi: No he didn't.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I could go on for the next 25 minutes on this topic and I'm happy to do so until you've cut me off, so I'm going to try this maybe in a different way. Is, number one, Councillor Gerbasi is totally aware of the conversation that I have had with Minister Ashton. There's no secrets here. There's no meetings behind closed doors. I can also tell you that I have shared these exact same thoughts with Councillor Wyatt who was head of the Rapid Transit Task Force. He's aware of them as well.

We moved on from Minister Ashton. We're now dealing directly with the Premier's office, and we have told and shared our thoughts with the Premier's office, and I would like to think that if I were asked a question, someone would wait for my answer before they move a motion as well. Just doesn't make any sense to me. It's not the way the Premier and I have done business together. I think we've accomplished a lot of things for the City because of the working relationship

the City and the Province have, which they haven't had in the past.

I have no intention of basically jeopardizing that relationship. I'm trying to do things aboveboard. I'm trying to give the answer to Councillor Gerbasi. I'm sorry that she doesn't agree with it, but I have given the answer, and I hope that she understands it's the same as I gave yesterday, it's the same as I gave two minutes ago. I think I've been very clear on this one, and if not, I apologize to Councillor Gerbasi.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Vandal your first question. Now this is the second time around.

Councillor Vandal: Question on, I think it's the third actually. Question on Upper Fort Garry. Have you had conversations with either Premier Doer or Minister Toews about the Provincial and the Federal role in the Upper Fort Garry vision?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: I have had conversations with both the Premier and Minister Toews, which is why 16 days ago I had no doubt in my mind, and I shared this with Friends of Upper Fort Garry that the Federal government would definitely match what the Province has done.

I obviously read in today's paper where the Province is focusing on basically broadening the acquisition of property to acquire more of the site of Upper Fort Garry, the actual site. And it was obvious to me that when the request for $4.5 million dollars was made and the answer was $1.5, I think everybody knew exactly what that meant. If there's anybody on the floor of Council who did not understand what that message was, okay, you have to give your head a shake. And it was also reported in the media, and you know, that there are those who thought the project was too grandiose or maybe they should focus on other things.

The realities are quite simple. If you ask for $4.5 and you get $1.5, you can read between the lines and understand what it is. You don't have to be told specifically in black and white. And those are the conversations that I have had with the Province and with the Federal government.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Good.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel your first question.

Councillor Swandel: No it's okay, my question was answered.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions?

Let's get on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Councillor Steeves report of March 3rd, 2008.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MARCH 3, 2008

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Regarding the report of March 3rd, 2008 I'll introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 4.

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

Motions. Mr. Clerk, none. By-laws, none. Question Period. No questions.

Standing Policy Committee Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works report of March the 4th of 2008, Councillor Clement would you please introduce the report.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED MARCH 4, 2008

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move the report of March 4th and I'll move Items 1 to 7 as Consent.

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

Motions, none. Consideration of By-laws.

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

Councillor Clement: Yes I'll move that By-law No. 47/2008, 48/2008, 49/2008 and 50/2008 be moved forward, be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law Nos. 47/2008, 48/2008, 49/2008 and 50/2008.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the By-laws Nos. 47/2008 to 50/2008, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law Nos. 47/2008 to 50/2008 both inclusive.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws Nos. 47/2008 to 50/2008, both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question Period. None.

Standing Policy Committee on Finance, no report. Finance Motions, not any. Consideration of By-laws, none. Question Period of Finance. No questions.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development report of March 4th of 2008**.** Who's going to introduce that? Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED MARCH 4, 2008

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, thank you. In Councillor Wyatt's absence I'm pleased to introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item No. 2.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Councillor Vandal, you want it stood down?

Councillor Vandal: No, no. Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: Well we're not there yet. On Item 2.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor.

Item 1 – Proposed Development of the Upper Fort Garry Site File FI-2.4(32)

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce Item No. 1 and ask that it be considered. I'll wait and speak in closing after hearing what other members have to say.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think first of all this Council should congratulate itself because throughout this torturous process, which has led us to this day, this is actually the very first time that we as City Council as a collective, all 16 of us, well 15 of us, can have a discussion and a debate about the merits of this very, very important site. And I think that fact alone is noteworthy.

This has been decided in the backrooms of City Hall. It's been decided in the backrooms of the Downtown Committee. There has been tie votes. There has been, regardless of what Mayor Katz says, Mayor Katz did intervene in

December and cast the deciding vote which put some onerous conditions on the Friends of Upper Fort Garry.

And one thing is very clear at this point. Several things are very clear, that the Friends of Upper Fort Garry are not going to meet those onerous conditions that were imposed by the Downtown Committee. They're not going to be able to raise 80% of $12.5 million dollars in three months and a few days, because when you throw Christmas in there, it's almost, it's almost impossible to raise that sort of money in that short of time.

I'm not sure what's happened with the curling club. I don't know where they are in terms of obtaining title, but that was another condition which they were supposed to do in a few months, and it's very clear that they are not going to succeed.

It's also becoming abundantly clear that Mayor Katz's Executive Committee and the votes around this table are going to kill the motion which I introduced last month, essentially to rescind the decision of the Downtown Committee.

What we are left with then Mr. Speaker, is the reality that we will as a City, sell a parcel, parcel "B" of Upper Fort Garry to the developer that was here this morning, so that they the developers, can construct a 20 storey condominium tower which is going to be at minimum 230 feet high, with a lot line of one metre from the actual wall, the west wall of Upper Fort Garry. That is the concrete reality of our vote here this afternoon.

And if you look at the lot line and you measure it to the most westerly bastion wall, which is essentially the foundation of the Fort, it's not even a metre. It's 27 inches, and that's going to be the lot line. 27 inches is approximately this long Mr. Speaker. And at this lot line, probably a few feet behind, there's going to be a building that's 20 stories next to a national historic site.

Now, I'm asking you, through you Mr. Speaker, to each and every member of this Council, is that the best that this Council can do to honour, to celebrate, the birthplace of the Province of Manitoba? Is that really the best we could do?

And obviously the Mayor thinks it is. I've asked him three times. Three times he's evaded the question. He's talked about the Province, he's talked about the Federal government, he's talked about, he's talked about a whole bunch of other things, but he has never answered the question. So through you Mr. Speaker I need to ask that question to the remaining 14 City Councillors that are here. Is that the best that this City could do to honour the birthplace of Manitoba?

I've mentioned the 27 inch buffer between the property line and the bastion line. Now, when the building actually gets constructed, they're going to need from the Provincial government a historical resources impact assessment. If they dig further than 50 centimetres into the ground, and they're going to have to because there's one storey of underground parking, they're going to need an archaeologist on site at all times to basically monitor what is going on.

So I dare say that the construction of this building and the site where they may have chosen is not a given and that this whole project, the actual construction of the 230 foot building is not a given. Things are going to change. And it may very well be that we're going to have that 230 foot wall one metre from the fort, the westerly walls of Upper Fort Garry. And I ask you again, is that the best that this City Council can do?

Mr. Speaker, how did we get here? I want to talk for two minutes about procedure. This was not a land sale when it went to the Downtown Committee. This was not a quick and dirty land sale. This was not a call for proposals. This was an expression of interest. There were nine submissions to the expression of interest. There were three short listed, and from there, we went to a land sale. Highly unheard of. Highly unlikely. Shouldn't have happened.

The results of that should have been kicked up to Executive Committee, the

Property Committee, to this Council for discussion to talk about the concepts, to talk about the plans, the potential of this site. That didn't happen. That was a mistake. It should have happened.

The legal issues. Mr. Speaker, the Procedure By-law clearly states that notwithstanding the delegation of any authority or power under this By-law to EPC, a Standing Committee, this Council may at its discretion review or deal with any matter which falls under the Executive Policy Committee or a Standing Committee. Council is supreme. If we feel that the public interest is not being served by a decision of a Standing Committee, we have the authority to override that Standing Committee.

And let me say this. This Council is concerned with the public benefit, the public good. A private developer is concerned with his private good. And anyone who thinks that this can't be negotiated, we can't negotiate our way out of this, is not being realistic. That's all I'm going to say about the legal issues.

Mr. Speaker, my motion has two therefore be it resolves: That, number one, we rescind the December 13th decision of the Downtown Development Committee. Number two, that the City of Winnipeg meet with the Province, the Federal government, and the Friends of Upper Fort Garry to develop and to implement a world-class historical destination for Upper Fort Garry. There's that "implement" word again. We've talked about it in the ring road report. We're talking about it now. It's an important word.

Nowhere in my motion have I tied our endorsement and our implementation of this to the business plan of Upper Fort Garry because frankly, I'm not married to that business plan 100%, but I think we all understand that there is enough there to develop this site in to a world-class site that we can all be proud of. There's actually three therefore be it resolves, also we should actually involve the public in the development of this very important piece of land. What a novel idea that is.

Today Mr. Speaker in conclusion, through you to the Council, I want to say the future of Upper Fort Garry is in the hands of this City Council. For the first time in this incredibly important issue…

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Move extension.

Councillor Vandal: for the first time in this very important issue we get a chance...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy moves extension of time of two minutes.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Vandal: we actually get a chance to vote on the future of Upper Fort Garry.

And we have a choice to make. We can choose to show the leadership, the political leadership necessary to embrace this project, to embrace the potential of this project and work with the Friends of Upper Fort Garry. Go bang on the doors of the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, the Federal government, the Manitoba Metis Federation, the private sector.

We can choose if you support my motion, to embrace the potential and make this ours, make this history ours because you know what, we cannot replicate this history anywhere else in the world. The history of Upper Fort Garry, the potential of Upper Fort Garry is uniquely Winnipeg and we as leaders of the City have a choice. We can embrace, we can embrace that notion, we can harness it, and we can be proud of its future together. That's one road to take.

The alternative road is selling parcel "B" to Crystal Developers. We could retain the remaining fort for the Friends. Parcel "B" will go to Crystal Developer. They will construct a 20 storey condominium tower with a lot line of 27 inches from the bastion, the westerly bastion of Upper Fort Garry and let them do that and work with the rest.

That is clearly our choice here today. It's in our hands. Let's be bold. Let's be leaders and let's do the right thing. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is a complex issue to talk about because in fact some of the things in it are still in-camera. So, I, and we're delicately trying to talk about things, so the whole history of who decided what and all that is not always going to be completely clear.

But I wanted to talk about what's going on from a big picture view at first. A group of citizens and philanthropists are trying to save an historic piece of land, to enact a vision. This historic piece of land is the birthplace of our City. The building that was put on there at 100 Main Street has been declared surplus. That created the opportunity to reclaim the site as a heritage destination.

The group, the Friends and others spent many years planning for this. However, until the City put the land up for sale and until they knew they could actually have the land, they couldn't start a serious capital campaign. So when people are saying they've been doing this for 10 years and haven't raised the money, they couldn't raise it till they were given the chance, okay?

The requirements that were put on the Friends of the Upper Fort Garry Gate by the Downtown Standing Committee are not reasonable requirements. It is ridiculous to expect a non-profit group no matter how capable to raise $10 million dollars in three months, particularly from levels of government. The Human Rights Museum has been raising funds for years and are still raising funds. The reality is that other levels of government don't take orders from City Hall. They also don't move quickly to allocate funds and they don't ask how high when the City tells them to jump.

It's remarkable that this group has raised $6-1/2 million dollars in only three months, but the terms put on the group mean that that $6-1/2 million dollars may not count for a whole lot. The terms put on the Friends were unfair and unreasonable, which is why I never supported putting on those terms. It's not reasonable to add on things such as purchasing curling clubs that aren't in their business plan in a three month timeframe.

I think it's appalling how this group of volunteers to be frank, I think it's appalling how this group of volunteers and philanthropists have been treated in this process. It's not as if there was an opportunity to sit down together with the City and decide on a plan of how we can work together to make this happen. The Friends were simply given terms with no choice but to take them or walk away. So they took the terms. They did an incredible job by raising $6-1/2 million dollars, but it probably won't be good enough for this Council.

What Councillor Vandal's motion, which I was proud to second, has done, is to bring this issue into the public eye for debate. That is where an issue of this level of importance really should be. Not in a backroom, not solely as a business discussion in a competitive marketplace. You have to look at the public good and the bigger vision of what our City can be.

The Friends have that vision and they've tried to make their vision real, but they have been given impossible terms. They had to try and they did a heck of a job, but we all knew it was too short of a timeframe to succeed. That's why Councillor Wyatt and myself could not support the terms of the Downtown Standing Committee. And that's why I support Councillor Vandal's motion to give the group more time.

I was quite amazed to see the discussion on the motion when it came to EPC. Councillors were throwing out other suggestions that are either not doable in the timeframe given or would even ruin the project. It was suggested they should buy a privately-owned gas station. Why not throw that in two weeks before the deadline? Are the Friends of Upper Fort Garry Gate supposed to turn water into wine as well?

And then there was the talk of scaling down the project and plunking an interpretative centre in the middle of the heritage footprint. The private donors that bought into the scale of a project that is a world-class attraction and it just simply, those suggestions just simply don't work for the fundraising efforts that have taken place. We heard that this morning. There's no assurance that scaling the project down would not result in a betrayal of what the donors were buying in to.

The reality is, if you step back and you look at the big picture, if you support the project that the Friends of the Upper Fort Garry Gate then do what it takes to give them a real opportunity to raise money. The motion, this motion takes off the absurd conditions that make the project impossible.

Surely with all the business acumen of the Mayor and this EPC, they could come up with another way to work with the developer, and I just want to say obviously I have, this has nothing to do with the developer or anything, any aspersions on them. This has to do with the big picture that we as a Council should be looking at.

Downtown is loaded with surface parking lots. Surely this problem could be resolved by finding another location or another piece of land or some kind of a deal to make this possible. Where there's a will, there's a way, but unfortunately, the will has gone to the wayside. Unless this motion passes today, it's pretty clear that the will is not there to make this project work on this Council. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting Councillor Vandal's motion but I won't be supporting the Executive Policy recommendation and I will explain why.

First with regard to the location of the interpretative centre. I've been to Citadel Hill. I've been to Fort Walsh. As a matter of fact, my family is very proud of their Canadian roots and we have traveled across the whole of the country from east to west, from Newfoundland to British Columbia, and one of the things that we do is explore heritage sites. And in so doing, whether it be Fort Walsh or Citadel Hill, the interpretative centre is never on the heritage site itself. It's adjacent to it.

And as a matter of fact, you don't have to look at Nova Scotia or British Columbia to come to that conclusion. Look closer to home. Look at Lower Fort Garry. Look at Dalnavert. The interpretative centres are not in the site, they're adjacent to the site so that they don't interfere with the historical footprint of the site.

I can say that I believe that previous City Councillors made a bad decision when they chose to knock down Upper Fort Garry and blow a road through the site. Other City Councillors made mistakes when they decided that they were going to put buildings in the middle of that site and not do the proper research that they needed to do with regard to the history that lie beneath.

We do not need to add to those mistakes. We have an opportunity to go back and revisit it and make some positive changes because we have something that a lot of communities don't have. We have a dedicated group of interested citizens who have been working on this for a long time, and I remember how long they've been working on this. They were working on getting that site together before the City had declared the building surplus and was considering moving out of 100 Main Street.

There were people down here from the Friends of the Hotel Fort Garry; I remember my conversations with former Lieutenant Governor Peter Liba and former Mayor Bill Norrie and a number of other people asking us to think about this site as a preservation site. I am sure that I am not the only person that they talked to with regard to this. So people who say that they didn't know about it have chosen to be ignorant Mr. Speaker.

Now, the second thing that I want to say with regard to that is when the opportunity came out, what possessed certain people to decide to put it up for sale when they

knew there was a group there, they knew they were raising money, they knew that they were looking for an interpretative centre? What possessed them to even think about putting this on the open market when there were people that made it abundantly clear, and I have thick documents in my office about all the plans that they have. They've come with a few things, but this is not all that they've given us. This is what they gave us today. This is not the first or even the second time that they've talked to us about this. We cannot say that we did not know that they were interested in this piece of land and that they were not working hard to get things together.

I was impressed by former Councillor Savoie's representation to us because as he made it clear while there are other Councillors, former Councillors who have come back on many occasions to make their opinions known, this is the first one that he's come to and this is how important that he feels it is to him.

This is the cradle of the City, this is the cradle of the Province, and I cannot believe that it's being dealt with such disregard. And one of the questions that I asked the group for the preservation and the restoration of the Upper Fort Garry site is why didn't you, when you got that $1.5 million dollars from the Province, why didn't you buy the property and then work on getting everything done after that? And they said we couldn't buy the property it wasn't for sale.

Are you kidding? This was within our hands! It could all have been solved, and it wouldn't have been on our plate here today if all we had done was say, okay, for that amount of money, you can have the land, and then you can take all the time you want to raise the rest of the money. But nobody did that! Raise it all, raise it all now, raise the money to build the centre, raise the money to restore the fort, raise everything beforehand and do it in less than three months! Not even let them buy the land so that they could start from the beginning.

I think that that wasn't a very wise move, and I'm not about to add to the lack of very wise moves that is happening around this Council today. I will not be supporting Executive Policy Committee to rescind the motion.

We have to start preserving our history for our children and for our grandchildren. Across this country, people are making great efforts. In Halifax, I've seen them bought up huge scales of land in order to preserve their heritage site and get back what other people have done, and we have this opportunity because it's within our purview right now.

If someone two years down the road says oops, we made a mistake, it's not going to be the City's land anymore. And to suggest that they go off and buy a Petro-Canada station when they should be buying this land right here, right now. There's plenty of other land within the City for apartment blocks. They don't need this land. Come on. Get it together. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support Councillor Vandal's motion. There was a moment in time where I thought this might be my Jim Walding or Chuck Cadman moment. May they rest in peace. I hope the same fate doesn't befall me.

The reason I stand before you today in support of the motion, it is largely many of the things that Councillor Vandal and Councillor Gerbasi have already stated. But from my perspective, in the 17 months that I've been on City Council, no single issue or event has rung my phones in my office or my email quite like the sale of Upper Fort Garry.

Albeit St. Charles ward is where the sun sets on Winnipeg and may be in some respects the most distant from the fort itself. The people of St. Charles ward have come to me in droves and said this is the right thing to do, support the fort, no development.

So you know, as I have gone through this process of evaluating it, some of you may remember several months ago, I was the

one who stood up and tried to ask a question of the chairman of the Downtown Development Committee at which point Councillor Swandel, Mr. Speaker, not only jumped out of his chair, he just about jumped out of his suit, which I sold him, screaming "in-camera, in-camera, in-camera."

And to some, in some respects as Councillor Gerbasi has said, the bogeyman here is in-camera. So much of this has not been discussed before today's date. You know, months and months of you know backroom dialogue, but not enough in the public forum and I'm thankful at least that we've had the opportunity to do that.

I've heard it said when is a deal a deal? Also in some respects that developers are going to flee from the City of Winnipeg. I don't think for a moment that Shindico or Shelter or Ladco or Qualico or Greentree are not going to continue to do business with the City of Winnipeg because of this one particular bit.

I realize there are probably legal ramifications to extending this, extending this opportunity for the Friends of the Fort to continue to raise money, but I really think it's important to do the right thing and it's never too late to do the right thing.

So I leave that with you, and my directive comes from the citizens and the constituents that I have in St. Charles ward, and they've advised me to support this today.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor, you're on.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, "a lie gets half way around the world before the truth has a chance to put its pants on", Sir Winston Churchill. That's exactly what's happened here.

For months, Mr. Speaker, we were all told how the gate was coming down, how they were building on the site of Upper Fort Garry. Thank God we all know the truth today. None of that was true or accurate. Although it was represented that way, whether it was intentional or not, I cannot say.

But I can tell you this, I heard today about casting the deciding vote. For Mr., for Councillor Vandal's information, I cast the deciding vote to make sure Friends of Upper Fort Garry got a chance to do what they wanted to do, because otherwise it was all over that day in December.

And to be very frank with you Mr. Speaker, I would never go in that direction unless I had dialogue with Friends of Upper Fort Garry. I spent an hour on the phone with former Mayor Bill Norrie who basically called me up and asked me if there's anything we could do. I shared with him what I thought we could do. Every single detail that's in that motion, and it was approved, I shared with former Mayor Bill Norrie. And you know what he said? "Thank you, we can do that."

Not only that, contrary to what you hear today, whether they've been working on this for 10 years, or 10 months, or three and a half months, that day in December, former Mayor Bill Norrie told me they've already raised, I repeat for Councillor Gerbasi, raised over half a million dollars. Excuse me? They weren't raising monies prior to, absolute nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great project And the reality is, this Mayor and this Council for the first time ever, are preserving the site of Upper Fort Garry. Not only that, on the day, on the day that the Committee for Downtown Development made their decision, the public service was instructed to work with the Friends of Upper Fort Garry to make sure that that site was there. Those are the realities Mr. Speaker. Those are the truth.

Mr. Speaker I want to read something from the Winnipeg Free Press, all right, dated February the 7th. "The Friends of Upper Fort Garry are preparing to scale back their plans for a heritage park on the site of the City's birthplace after the Province…

Councillor Thomas: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

Mayor Katz: made it clear…

Councillor Thomas: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

Mayor Katz: the group's $12.5 million design is too ambitious."

Councillor Thomas: Point of order Mr. Speaker, we are not allowed to quote from a …

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor, Mr. Mayor. Point of order.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Yes you are.
Councillor Thomas: We are not allowed to quote from the paper.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Yes you are. You just can't read a newspaper in the chambers.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas please stop…

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I won't read from it. That's fine.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor, Mr. Mayor hold it. Councillor Thomas and others please, enough of this Point of order, Point of order. Because it's coming to the point that it's ridiculous. I mean he's not reading a newspaper, this is really what he is not allowed to do, any member of Council to do, to take… reading of something that's in the paper has been done so many times each and every time. So let's get on with the business. Slow down these Point of orders.

Mayor Katz: I'd like just to quote Jerry Gray. "The Province, they conveyed the fact we need to take another look at the development, and that's what we're going to do." That was on February the 7th, Mr. Speaker.

I've met with Friends, and we sat down and had a heart to heart. And they agreed the only reason we're having any problem whatsoever is because we asked the other two levels of government for $4.5 million dollars each. And Mr. Speaker they both said no.

I'm wondering why some of the Councillors here, Councillor Vandal, Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Thomas, Councillor Smith, aren't lobbying the Province to give them more money. Asking $4.5 million dollars from the Province would be like me asking Councillor Vandal for 50 cents. I guarantee you he'd give it to me. He knows that. What's the issue here? The Province has made their statement. It's loud and clear. We wouldn't have to have this torturous debate if the other levels of government had come to the party.

And how can everybody forget the City? The City who's fighting to balance its books, okay. The City is doing everything possible to freeze our property taxes. We're contributing $5.5 million dollars. Where's the round of applause for the City? Where's the thank you for the City?

Not one person here is saying you know what we've come to the table. Where's everybody else? We knew the private sector would come to the table. Where is the rest of the parties in this $18 million dollar deal? I don't know. One day, maybe I'll get the answer to the question.

The bottom line is they're $6 million dollars short, $3 million each, and that is a problem Friends of Upper Fort Garry are facing, period. And they still have time, and every Councillor on this floor has time, to lobby the levels of government to come up with the $4.5.

Mr. Spletzer was here today. He said "I'm from the old school. I make a deal, I live up to it." He'll still walk away. What more can anybody here ask from a private citizen? Whatever amount of money he's expended to date, and he has, he'll walk away, and three and a half months wasn't enough time?

They got the answer from both Federal and Provincial governments. The answer was no. Nobody here wants to acknowledge that. I don't understand it. Are you living in a cave? What part of the syllable no do you not understand? They said no. It's too grandiose.

But for anybody to say and to try and intimidate Councillors that we are basically forgetting about our history, this Council is basically saving it. We made that decision a long time ago.

And if anybody thinks it's wrong to go after other properties that sit on that site such as Petro-Can, such as the curling club, well guess what, you're wrong too. We should go after every single piece of property to restore the fort so we have as much of the footprint as possible. Obviously there are some parts of it Mr. Speaker we can't get back. We're not going to dig up Main Street. We know that. But let's do everything we can and work together.

And let's once and for all face the reality we would all stand united and give three cheers if the other levels of governments had said yes to the ask and it would be all over. The Friends would be happy. The developer said he agreed there's no problem.

In the meantime, what do we do? We just beat each other up. And I'm not going to question the integrity or the sincerity of some Councillors, whether their emotion is genuine, whether they really care, okay. I've seen what's happened in the past, and sometimes people take an opportunity to gain a pat on the back.

And I happen to know personally Mr. Speaker, what it's like to stand up to ridicule and criticism from some members of the media to do the right thing. That is courage. That is integrity. And I commend every Councillor on this floor who's doing that because one, we are preserving our integrity, and two, we are saving the fort. The fort is not going anywhere.

As was pointed out in the paper on Sunday, in a fantastic article with a picture, and I won't quote from this article Mr. Speaker, the fort's gone. We have the gate. It's not going anywhere. We can't restore the fort, but we can save the land that exists there.

And if anybody thinks there's something wrong with more housing in downtown, every single Councillor here has pushed for more housing in downtown. You can have the best of both worlds. Councillor Steeves that's for you from Miley Cyrus. You can have the best of both worlds Mr. Speaker. Hannah Montana for those who don't know. Move extension. Mr. Speaker we have an opportunity…

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

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Katz: We have the opportunity to do the right thing and make sure that.. I'll just wait for Councillor Gerbasi to finish and then I'll continue. Please do not clock me on this. Finished?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker we have the opportunity to do the right thing here. We are saving the fort as has been pointed out by the objective media. We can have housing. And we can continue to broaden the size of the footprint and regain as much that was lost many years ago because you know what, there were mistakes made years ago. We can basically solve some of them, not all of them. But let's not forget it takes the City, the Province, the Federal government, and the public to do this together. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Clement: Thanks Mr. Speaker. Much of what I was going to say just got said, so I'm going to take a little different tack.

I guess, I heard about this deciding vote thing earlier today. The Mayor's explained that but my understanding of that meeting, because the first time I was in a meeting that this issue came up was last Wednesday. That particular meeting back when the development group was meeting, my understanding was that the Mayor is ex-officio and only went to the meeting because the vote was going to be tied and it was going to be all over that day. The Mayor's vote actually bought the Friends three and a half months. So you

can deal with that any way you want. Thank you.

This other issue about who knew. I don't know who the movers and shakers are. I know who the movers are they have motions here every Council meeting. Not sure who the shakers have become. But the bottom line is that while Councillor Thomas may have known something some time ago because somebody called her, the first that I got called about this at all was right after I read something in the paper I talked to Harold Buchwald. Actually I had a meeting with him. He gave me a cd. It was pretty interesting.

And he explained to me at the time that they had a couple hundred thousand dollars, was the way that he put it, and that he was pretty sure that they had and that they were going to continue on. But he told me how much they needed and it wasn't a lot of money. He told me they'd been talking about this for several years but it had only just heated up kind of thing. So that's when I knew and that would have been, I'm guessing September or October last year.

So I don't know how fast these things move along, but my understanding is is that this land was made surplus to our needs which we would have voted on. It was surplus to our needs over a year ago, I think, more than a year ago because I think the initial request for proposals went out in May, I think, of '07. So we all knew that this was all going on so, at the time.

The curling club is a moot point by the way. It certainly was one of the conditions and obviously would have to be because it sits on part of the site, but the curling club is owned by the Grain Exchange, and two-thirds of that Grain Exchange ownership as I understand it is the Richardson family, and I believe that that's all under control if it ever push came to shove, that would be done in a phone call within an hour probably. So that wasn't an issue.

But I have to I guess deal with an issue that's been bothering me. I keep reading about this, and you know it's unfortunate we can't quote people. You know we can quote Shakespeare and we can quote others, but we're not allowed to quote Gordon Sinclair. And I don't know why. He's not a bad guy. He's sitting up here. I don't think he's a bad guy anyway. I hit a home run off him when we were in an all-star game one time. He doesn't remember that as well as I do, but you know he was the big kahuna in those days, so that was a good deal. Anyway, he's had less stress than me, he's kept his hair.

But anyway, you know, he's written some articles, and I don't mind telling everybody I think that this is a wonderful idea. Love to see it happen. But we have obligations, and there are some in-camera issues that I can't talk about, so I can't go there. Notwithstanding, I know what they are.

And so the issue though that I wanted to raise and the thing that I haven't read in any of those articles, is the fact that the City of Winnipeg came to bat, and they put the money on the table. I mean, we have a gift, call it what you want, it's land, it's real, it's tangible. It's worth $5-1/2 to $6 million dollars. The Mayor rounded it off today so that the number would be $18, but we really think it's worth $6 million, and we're prepared to gift it and we've openly said so all along. But it's never made the project $18 million dollars somehow it's still $12-1/2. As a matter of fact I asked Jerry Gray last Wednesday, was he planning on buying the land with the $12-1/2, and then he said well no, we were expecting the City to provide that. Well we are. But that doesn't make it $12-1/2 that now makes it $18. Somehow that's escaped everybody.

And it wasn't all that onerous Councillor Vandal for them to go out and raise this because they were only supposed to raise $3-1/2. Guess what, they did. They raised $3-1/2 million in their three months. They did their job. Okay?

The people that didn't do their job are your friends over on Broadway. Yeah, they're your buddies. I know who they talk to. They were asked for $4.5 million dollars and it wasn't a number picked out of the sky. They've done their homework. They knew what they needed.

And what was interesting was watching the Federal government because the $1-1/2 million dollars has been on the table for a month and the Feds didn't come running. They waited and they waited and they waited because they had told Jerry Gray and others that they would match the Province, but they knew $1-1/2 wasn't going to cut it and they were prepared to put more. But the spotlight's never been shone on Broadway. I don't know why. Maybe Gordon can tell us in tomorrow's column, I don't know.

But bottom line is that the spotlight shouldn't be here and it's been shone here by those articles over and over and over and nobody says anything to the Premier. There was an article today that well he agrees to a scaled down model. Well, why is that? Because the interpretative centre is $9 million of the $12-1/2, and Doer said I got that figured out.

And by the way, I don't know whether it was going to be one metre away, but it looks pretty close. And guess what because Councillor O'Shaughnessy asked a question you know, you've depicted everything in the fort that you're building in replica of those times, 1850, 1860-ish, that type of time. Why are you looking at a brand new interpretative centre that doesn't match anything with a glass wall yet at that part of the fort? That was his question.

Oh, well, you know, the interpretative centre has to be modern. It's got to be this and that. It doesn't have to be modern. If you go out to Lower Fort Garry everything is the way it was, and they've still got an interpretative centre and it looks, and it's in a building that was there years ago and it could be the same this way.

And the suggestion wasn't that they, well there were a lot of things thrown up about where it would go, but the one thing that was raised was, you know we could pursue the Petro-Canada site. And I can tell you with the $6-1/2 million dollars they've got, if they don't build a $9 million interpretative centre right off the bat and they build the fort, they've probably got enough money to buy Petro-Canada, frankly.

Whether they want to be there I don't know, but everything is for sale at the right price. So it would be a good idea to do that and there wouldn't be anything wrong with that. It's the same thing. It's kitty-corner, it's kitty-corner. What's the difference? So I don't see the problem.

But the real problem here is that the Provincial government only put $1-1/2 million dollars on the table. Had they put $4-1/2 million dollars on the table, the Feds would have matched because that's what they told these people they would do, and they told them that long ago.

So there's only one group that hasn't come to bat for this project. It's the Provincial government. And what part of that the two or three of you don't get, I don't understand. I know you don't like saying things about people that you are close to…

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

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Clement: but every once in a while you've got to do that. You might recall that I took a few shots at Mr. Filmon when I was standing in this chamber a few times. He didn't like them but I did it anyway because I thought it was the right thing to do. But that's not what I'm hearing from some of Mr. Doer's friends in this chamber today, and I don't know why. It's so black and white. It doesn't make any sense to me.

You talk about the right thing to do. I know what the in-camera issues are so I know what the right thing to do is. I can't support your motion Dan. I can't vote for something that's going to put the City in what I believe to be a situation of significant litigation. That makes no sense.

And we've provided enough time for the Province to make up their mind and if they got off the fence, we'd have a deal here. And it's too bad that the Provincial government won't do the right thing because they're the ones that are wrong here not us.

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

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I guess Mr. Speaker it needs to be said that we probably in this circumstance and this Council are not in a position to recreate the past as it exists for the Upper Fort Garry. I mean, obviously I think as everyone knows looking at the site plans, a goodly portion of the Fort is beneath our Main Street. And as has been said already, I don't think anybody here on Council is proposing that we could do anything to change that. At least I take it that that is not being suggested.

And what I take from that Mr. Speaker is that we all have I guess some duty to adapt this site, right. It's not going to be the exact same site as it was originally. And as much as that may or may not hurt the people, it looks like a reality that we're stuck with, and if we don't want to live with that reality then we have to talk about what we're going to do with Main Street. And again, I don't believe anybody wants to talk about that today or at any point, at any reasonable point in the future.

The interesting thing about I guess the building that's being proposed as outlined by Councillor Vandal is that, if the proposed building that we're talking about that's immediately I guess adjacent to the site, the people who live on the east part of that building eventually I suppose, will be probably the closest people who will be living closest to the site.

Interestingly, the people on the other side of the building I would submit won't even be the second group of people who will be closest to the site. That will likely be the people who will be living in Fort Garry Place across the, across the road from the northwest corner of the fort. There's that much, there's that much proximity.

I mean, my point is is that this is a historical site in a downtown setting. That's what it is. And I think every member of this Council wants to recreate that site to the best of our ability, taking into account the competing and I would say laudable interest that exists in the context of a downtown setting.

Unfortunately, I don't think we have the luxury of looking at this site in isolation. We have to take into account the existing pressures that surround it. That's a reality. That is just a reality and it is not easy and it's not very comfortable but it's something that we have to do.

Not much has been said about it, and I don't know if I'm really even supposed to say this Mr. Speaker, but I'm probably not the only Councillor who is sitting here or standing here wondering what would happen legally if we passed this motion today.

Would we wind up in years of litigation over this site? Would it be locked up forever, or if not forever, at least for a very long time, while we got this very, very complicated situation resolved? There are competing interests here again and they are not made up and if we change these unilaterally, which we have the power to do, we also had better acknowledge what the realities of that decision might be.

More important than that though, because this isn't really about legalese. Regardless of how anyone feels about this, the truth is, and I hope everybody acknowledges this, is that there was an agreement that was made in December and there may be people who differ on this, but I do agree lockstep with the Mayor on this point, and it's very, very important Mr. Speaker. People who are interested in this were not forced into anything.

This was an agreement between informed adults and people who understand, understood the import of that agreement. I categorically reject the insinuation that anybody was forced into any deal on this at all. And I would further say Mr. Speaker that it is bad practice to enter into a deal and then post-entering into that deal say I was forced into that deal. We do not have the power to force anybody into any deal. Period, full stop, end of story.

The Provincial government. I think everybody understands exactly what the position of the Provincial government is on this issue, and if you do not understand it you are being willfully blind

Mr. Speaker. You are deliberately ignoring the facts.

I commend my colleague Councillor Thomas for jumping up with her objection when the Mayor rose to read that article. In the court of public opinion, there is no way you want this going into evidence. You do not want this going into evidence if your job here today is to protect the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, because what it says is crystal clear.

And I commend the writer of this article. I mean I haven't always agreed on everything that's been written by this particular author throughout the course of this discussion, but this article I think is bang on. This article I think, is very fair. It lays out categorically, unambiguously and clearly the position of the Premier of the Province of Manitoba on this issue. There is no, pardon the pun, gray area here with respect to this issue.

The amount is $1.5 million dollars, and that is it. Councillor Clement is exactly correct when he says the Federal government has committed to matching whatever the Province will deliver. I think everybody around this Council table today understands that to be the facts.

There's no time issue here. There is no issue of any other level of government not understanding the problem. I think one thing we can all agree on this thing, this issue has received its share of publicity. I don't think anybody could claim ignorance. This is what's available. This is what we have to work with. We have to make a decision.

What about the Petro-Canada? My friend Councillor Gerbasi said "impossible". How could Petro-Canada be impossible and this site of Crystal Properties be so easy? That part I don't understand. I don't know anything about the legalities surrounding the Petro-Canada site yet, but I can tell you the Crystal Properties site, very complicated, not easy.

I would submit that if as Councillor Vandal alluded to we can negotiate our way through the Crystal Properties issue. I would counter that directly Mr. Speaker with we can negotiate our way through the Petro-Canada issue.

And I will say this, without knowing what is or is not possible, as a Winnipegger, as a citizen, that site makes imminently more sense than the site that we are talking about for the interpretative centre today. It is not even comparable. If we can move the mountain that is the Crystal Properties site, then can we not move the mountain that is the Petro-Canada site if that is our will?

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

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Steeves: I'm going to say one more thing I guess or a couple of more things. The position of some members of this Council, and I respect their right to take whatever position they want, but as other Councillors have alluded to, it sometimes does feel like Councillors on, some Councillors on this Council are turning inward to do battle with fellow Councillors when they should be teaming up and siding with us to fight the battles that we need to fight as a matter of course with other levels of government to get what we need to get as a City. We need these people. And their absence in these discussions and their absence in these debates is not only noted, but it is hurting this City. Their first allegiance should be to the Council of the City of Winnipeg and the citizens that we represent.

What is possible here is exciting, Mr. Speaker. What could be done with this site even given the challenges is very exciting. This could look spectacular at the end of the day. I, perhaps unlike other members of Council, am excited at the prospect of the downtown housing component on this site. If I'm wrong, then I'll wear that, but we all know how hard it is to develop downtown housing. That's not a walk in the park. Every single time, we seem to leave skin on the floor when we get in to those types of battles. Downtown housing is never easy.

It's time to bury the hatchet on this one and move ahead. We have an exciting opportunity here. We have a citizenry that is engaged and interested, and something very positive could be done. But again, we have to stick together and realize what's possible.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak to Councillor Vandal's motion before us today. I'd first like to say that I think it is extremely important that we as a City do preserve heritage. And heritage sites really give us our identity as a community and tell us a little bit of history about ourselves. So I think it's very important.

Winnipeg, of course is rich in that history right now, whether it be the Forks, Fort Gibraltar, these types of places, Lower Fort Garry just on the outskirts of town as well, and all sites add to the rich heritage of our community.

Really Mr. Speaker, I think with this debate there has been a lot of confusion of the public. I think probably everyone as they speak to their constituents or anyone else has encountered this. I think there's a perception out there that if this deal does go ahead, that the fort and the gate per se will be torn down, and we'll be bulldozing this and putting this up, which is completely, completely not true, whether we make this decision here or the 31st if the Province does come in.

I'd also first like to recognize the Friends group for what they've accomplished. Councillor Clement spoke a little bit about it, but I know they obtained their goal. They had set a goal, a fundraising goal of $3.5 million dollars that are there and I think they deserve some credit for this. It really represents a big part of the fundraising goal which they had. There is still a way to go with the $6 million dollars I think that's allocated, that needs to be raised as well through the Feds and through the Province.

And there's a lot of passion from this issue. I've read a number of media articles as everyone else has. You know I've heard from callers, I've heard from email from my constituents as well as people from all over. I've heard from media that passionately talked about the need to invest in historical properties and support what it means and possibly what it could mean to politicians.

I'd also have to admit Mr. Speaker that I was very disappointed in what the Provincial government, what their role has been so far in terms of the leadership on this issue. And I did find it very interesting what their commitment to the project was the $1.5 million dollars that was contributed to the fund.

And as Mayor Katz and a few others have mentioned, I think this was put forward almost as a set criteria almost for the project to fail. What is being said, there is time for Premier Doer to step up to the plate for a leadership role. I think there has been some developments in the papers. I'd like to see how that plays out over the next number of months.

Leadership Mr. Speaker is something also that we've talked about, whether it be City Council, I think Councillor Clement spoke eloquently about this, and I think the City deserves, has gotten a rough ride whether it be through the media or through the public in terms of our role for this.

The City to date has invested the most out of any province, most of any government that is there with the valuation of the land being $5.5 or $6 million dollars. Even if both other levels of government come in at $4.5, the City has contributed more than any other level of government. So I believe that the City has done their due diligence on this and do essentially want to see the project succeed.

The City's also given the Friends group an opportunity to raise the necessary money that has been contributed and they revisited this project. The deadline was extended for the agreement of the Friends group to come back to us to find the necessary money for the project.

One concern that I do have with the motion before us today with the message that it does send, and I know other people have talked about it, to the business community, business and investment community. If we go back on this pre-agreed agreement, what message does it send to the people that are looking to invest in our area?

I think everyone would agree we that need more housing, we need more condominiums, more people living downtown and I think this is something that is a step in the right direction. So I don't think anyone would suggest that it would be a bad thing for more development to happen downtown.

Another issue that has been talked a lot about is the legal responsibilities and ramifications of what this could mean to us. The developer has suggested, and I don't think he denied it when he came up here, that there could be some ramifications, whether it be you know, us getting sued or we have to settle out of court. But at the end of the day, this means more money that the taxpayers will have to shell out if this agreement isn't touched upon.

Well Mr. Speaker my opinion of what really this debate boils down to is extending the deadline. While the reality is that everyone knows what the deadline is right now. The two stakeholder groups that are there, that are the deciding factor, which really are the Federal government and the Provincial government, everyone knows the deadline is March 31st. So if they're going to commit the money they're going to commit it before March 31st. Extending the deadline in my opinion really will not make any difference at all because the money will be there or it won't. They've had four or five months to contribute and establish that they are going to contribute this or not.

Before we vote on this issue, I think we should ask the question to the Province. Do you need more time to establish if you're going to be putting more money towards this project? They're the ones that we're waiting for in terms of this approach. And after both levels of government, the Friends who have been waiting for, they're the decision makers that we've been waiting for on this project.

The idea of compromise has also come up. I know Dr. Gray was here last week to talk about this. Dr. Gray also had said last week that there would be no compromises, that it wouldn't look to refurnish this deal, or if they weren't able to raise the amount of money to change the deal so that they could have a portion of what they were looking for.

And I relate this back to my own household. You know if you're interested you know we'd like to drive a Mercedes Benz in our household. The fact of the matter is we can't afford to. So we choose to purchase and drive other cars that are less affordable, and I think that's the same thing that needs to be done with the Friends group, right? If you can't afford this not with the money that's there, you need to compromise, come up with a solution that's going to make sense and you're going to get the majority of your project.

An area that was talked about in terms of reducing the size and scope of the project is of course the interpretative centre. And one point that I think is missed with all this, the interpretative centre is not the historical site. It's the fort. It's the gate that's the historical site as opposed to the interpretative centre. So if you need to scale down, that's an area that you need to look at.

Another item, my last item I'd like to talk about is in terms of the funding. Let's be perfectly clear here. I mean this, as the Mayor had mentioned this project whether its $18 million dollars, whether the City gives $5 to $6 million dollars, and the other level of governments give $9 million dollars, that's close to $15, $16 million dollars of public money that will be there. At the end of the day there's going find, there's the certain amount of money that's going to be dedicated towards our priorities.

So that $15 million dollars, that's public money that's going into, that's $15 million dollars that we won't be able to spend in

terms of roads, money that we won't be able to spend in terms of public safety, clean and green initiatives that are there. So let's be perfectly clear about this.

And you know I think when I talk to the residents, my constituents, they say, yes, absolutely, let's try and support the Friends group and ensure our history is there, but you've also got to stick to our priorities. The money that is there, it should be spent on our priority areas. So I think you can do both.

Mr. Speaker in conclusion, I will not be supporting Councillor Vandal's motion, but I hope that a compromise really can be reached by the end of the time period, whether it be March 31st. If the money is not committed by the Province and the Feds, then I hope that the Friends group will agree to reduce the size and scope of the project to allow them to restore the historical nature at the site. Maybe it won't be exactly what they want but rarely in life do you get something 100% what you want. A lot of times you need to settle on 70%, 80% of the project. And with that I'd like to conclude. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Fielding. Councillor Leipsic, you're on.

Councillor Leipsic: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel I have to stand and voice my opinion here also today. It's a difficult time, difficult decision making, but that's what we were elected to do.

And so I want to start by saying I congratulate the Friends for, the Friends of Upper Fort Garry for the work, the fundraising, and the passion they have. Indeed, I have many friends that are on the board. I have actually a family member on the board, and the first founding chair, the Honourable Peter Liba, was one of my closest friends. So this wasn't easy for me.

I'll start by saying though, I believe an agreement was made in good faith between the City of Winnipeg, Friends of Upper Fort Garry and Crystal Development and the involvement since, the extension and modifications made to agreements. I have at this time huge concerns regarding the City of Winnipeg credibility, honour, our word, our principles of doing business with people.

I've had many calls regarding that. Certainly I've had the emails and letters also from people supporting the Friends, but I also have had many others saying, what's the point of trying to do business with the City? You can change things here and there. What is it all about?

So let's look at some of the things in the agreement I haven't had answered. The Grain Exchange Curling Club. I have no idea where that's at. Dr. Gray didn't address that this morning. I assume that nothing has happened.

The goal of reaching the monies for fundraising, obviously he addressed that. It's not quite there yet but it may occur and if it does, God bless them, I wish them well. And I also congratulate Crystal Developments for taking such a liberal attitude to the possibility and being cooperative.

However, money. I also with many of my colleagues am extremely disillusioned beyond disappointment with both levels of government. I do have friends on Broadway. Actually, I think some people in government are my friends. I have many friends in opposition too of course, so it shocks me that they haven't come to the table.

It's been a sham. It's a drama to say, oh, we're going to give you $1.5 million, and they know very well the Feds don't have to go higher than that if that's all they're giving. Where are they? Why aren't they here with the money? Talk is cheap. Political grandstanding is an art. Certainly I'm learning that I will be seeing more of that I suppose, but it's a fact. So the point is, you know, the Jerry Maguire rule, where's the money? I don't see it.

Regarding the terms, I remember clearly discussing with Mayor Katz when the agreement was being altered with the Friends of Upper Fort Garry, the enthusiasm that the chair I believe, and few of the members of the executive had, he was on the phone for hours. I spoke to

some of them. I saw it on the same day, the next day, they were thrilled. They were saying it's going to happen, and I wished them all well, of course.

But to go back to EPC last week. What shocked me was the intransigency of Dr. Gray and the Friends. He said he several times when he was directed questions he would not consider changing anything, not one item on the sketch.

Well, you know, life is compromise, Mr. Speaker. An interpretative centre is so imperative to the plans? I heard many people, and many of the big donors say to me directly, they would have given even more money. They didn't think the interpretative centre was a critical part. So I throw that out. Dr. Gray also said no plan "B". That shocked me. That's sort of one of the cardinal rules in business I believe.

Concerning the location, Crystal Development is building the, their proposed building outside the historical footprint. I remember that clearly from the first meeting where this ever came up at City Hall and it's still the fact. Even with the extension of the wall. Other lands privately-owned in the vicinity would have to be acquired.

And you know, all of a sudden this morning, the media, Premier Doer's on the radio saying, "oh, look at the Petro-Canada spot". Well, you know, this is something that should have been considered a long time ago, but fine, consider it. I agree with Councillor Steeves. If that can happen, go for it.

I have huge concerns which nobody's mentioned regarding a business plan for the Friends. I don't see in any of the material, and I also have a cd as Councillor Clement has, I haven't seen any long-term economic viability of a solely heritage proposal for capital cost and ongoing operations. It's just not there. I don't see it.

Regarding historical sites, everybody here seems to want to say today that they've been to historical sites so, I'll join in. I also have seen many historical sites. I've been to Israel a couple of times Mr. Speaker and it's quite fascinating. They can excavate a site and show you centuries of civilization at a site, and right alongside, miracle of miracles, you have people living, working, playing. Anytime anything is found at a historical site, you stop, you evaluate, you save the site, the important parts. Same thing can be seen in England, in various parts of Europe and also in the United States. So history can be preserved.

And I just, I have to say, I'm sorry I cannot support my colleague Councillor Vandal and thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to start by thanking the Friends of Upper Fort Garry for igniting the debate on one of the most historic sites in our City. I discovered the small Upper Fort Garry gate mostly by accident when I was in junior high school.

No, what's there isn't grand or very impressive, but it serves as a landmark to remember the significance of what was there. Today it desperately needs an overhaul and should be enhanced to recognize its significance in our City's history. But that's key. What was there?

The Friends of Upper Fort Garry and Councillors around this table here today have talked about saving the fort. The reality is that's recreating history. One blogger had suggested that's as authentic as Cinderella's castle at Disney World or the Eiffel Tower on the Las Vegas strip. It's not about recreating history in my opinion but I think it needs to be tasteful and it needs to recognize the significance of our City's past.

Over time the grounds of the fort have been used for new development. Main Street was straightened out and now covers a big chunk of the original site. Our civic building at 100 Main Street covers another part. So does the Grain Exchange Curling Club and the Petro-Canada gas station.

The proposal before us is for a condominium complex at the northeast corner of Fort and Assiniboine and won't be on any of the original site of Upper Fort Garry. Whether it's a metre or 27 inches, five inches, its' not on the original site. They've made those concessions. That's how it was negotiated at Downtown Development.

Everyone talks about who's friends with who on Broadway here today. Here's a shocker for you. I like the Premier's suggestion that we develop the green space and a greenway from the park at the river through to Broadway. Removing the City of Winnipeg building at 100 Main Street which is on the grounds of the original fort is part of this. Perhaps moving the curling club and the gas bar should be part of this too.

In northeast Winnipeg, we named our new Active Transportation trail, the Northeast Pioneers Greenway, with the intent to build commemorative markers and displays which remembers the founders of our area. I believe a type of outdoor interpretive centre at Upper Fort Garry is most appropriate.

Alternatively, perhaps the Friends could work with the developers of the condominium project to build an interpretative centre on the main floor of the complex. We do have to look at compromises. $3 million dollars is not the $9 million dollars that the other levels of government were supposed to contribute.

I truly believe we need to capture the public's interest in Upper Fort Garry that has been ignited by Friends of Upper Fort Garry in this exercise here. I sincerely believe that allowing the proposed development to proceed as part of a plan to redevelop the entire block is a prudent and reasonable approach to recognize our past. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, I've heard a lot on both sides of the issue today, and there is a lot of valid arguments on both sides. You know, I'm supporting Councillor Vandal's motion because first of all, we shouldn't have sold, we shouldn't have even brought up the idea of selling the land in the first place.

And secondly, the conditions that were set forth, three months to go ahead and raise these funds and make a deal with the curling club, were impossible when I heard them. I said look it that will not happen. And so that's an injustice. Those conditions were unwarranted, unfair, and that's why basically why I'm supporting the Councillor Vandal's motion.

Now I'm also, let me tell you this, much of what Councillor Clement said is accurate too. I think the Provincial government should be come on board. You know, I'm critical of them too. I mean this is an historical site. This is the founding of the City and the Province of Manitoba. I think the Province should be in for a lot more than $1.5 million. So I'm critical of them too.

I'm not, I'm not just on one side and battling everybody. I believe that this is an historical area, and we should preserve it to the utmost. And you know, if something is out of the actual area of the fort, the, you know, that whole area as Councillor Browaty just mentioned it's in effect historical.

So I do think that we can do something here, and I'm really very unpleased, I'm embarrassed by the Provincial government not coming on with a greater contribution. And I think the group; the Friends of Upper Fort Garry should in effect pressure the Provincial government. And I think all of us, I think Councillor Vandal, Gerbasi and myself and Lillian, should all be saying to the Provincial government, you can do better. And I think we should do that at this point with the little time we have left.

But I'm supporting this motion because we've been very unfair setting those ludicrous conditions that could not possibly be met. So I'm supporting the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. There is no further Speakers. So

Councillor Swandel will close debate. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to start by saying that I believe Dr. Jerry Gray is a good man, and what he presented here today was truthful and he did so in an honourable fashion. I think it's been inferred a couple of times perhaps he was crossing a bit of a line there and just wanted for the record to say that I believe him to be a good and decent man and I believe what he said here was done so in an honourable fashion.

I want to correct another piece that's been coming up over and over again. We keep referring to this building as condos. What we actually have going on this site is an apartment complex providing much needed rental housing in the downtown. So I just want to get that off my plate.

And I want to tell you Mr. Speaker, that I do not support a building going on that site. Whether it's an apartment block or an interpretative centre, I don't support it Mr. Speaker.

As a matter of fact Mr. Speaker, when Councillor Gerbasi moved the motion to sell the land to Crystal Developers, I voted against it Mr. Speaker. That's correct. When Councillor Gerbasi moved the motion to sell the land to Crystal Developers, I voted against it. When I moved the motion to take the...

Councillor Gerbasi: That's in-camera Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: No the substance of the matter is in-camera. Who moved what motion is already public, it's not in-camera.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, Councillors. Councillor Gerbasi let the Speaker continue.

Councillor Swandel: When I moved the motion to have the entire site sent to the Planning, Property and Development department to be dealt with, the heritage nature of the site to be dealt with under the Historic Buildings procedures that we have, my motion was defeated by the rest of the members at that Committee. So I do not support a building going on that site. That's the history Mr. Speaker. That is the real history.

But I'll tell you what I do support. I do support conducting yourself in an ethical fashion. And if you look in this gallery Mr. Speaker, you'll see that many of the prominent and principled businessmen and women that have their name on that list of the Friends of the Fort Garry, they're not in this chamber today because they too as several of them have made it clear when they called my office and speak to me about this, believe that once we've made that contract, that we must honour that contract. It's principle. It's ethical.

So why are we here? You know, I've got the word "hypocrisy" written down in front of me. It's easy to say this was done behind closed doors Mr. Speaker. You may as well throw our entire Procedures By-law out the window, if you believe that there are not matters that should be done behind closed doors at City Hall. Where was Councillor Vandal when this item was brought forward to the Committee? He was certainly front and centre when the item was getting a great deal of press in the front page of the newspaper.

I think several of my colleagues have made it very clear, very clear, that time is not the issue here. The Friends agreed to the timeline of March 31st because they knew they could get a response from the Federal and the Provincial governments. They knew they could raise their money. They raised their money. They were let down by the Provincial and Federal governments. That's where this thing has fallen off the rail.

I'm going to close by making a comment about respect for that site and why I voted not to sell that site to Crystal Developers. That site Mr. Speaker, that site Mr. Speaker is the birthplace of Manitoba. And when I sit and I look at that site and I wonder, I wonder to myself, those leaders of that day as we are the leaders here today in this community must have had principles. And when they sat at that site and they made decisions Mr. Speaker,

those decisions were done in a principled fashion.

And if you actually respect that site and you respect those leaders then let your principles guide you here today. You should not and never should, support a motion like what Councillor Vandal has put in front of us here today. Stand by your principles, understand the ethics of what you are doing here today, and move forward with the decision that we entered into in good faith. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We're ready for the, we'll be voting on the recommendation of Executive Policy Committee that the Council Motion of February the 20th of 2008 be, just a minute, that the Motion, that the Motion be filed. This is what we're voting on.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: That the motion be filed, period.

Mr. Speaker: The motion be filed, period and that's it. No, no, I'm saying that Council Motion of February 20th is to be filed, is what we're dealing with, to be filed. Okay, so ready for the vote? Has someone called a recorded vote?

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Yeah.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes.

Councillor Swandel: Oh yeah, I'd love this one recorded, please.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Councillor Swandel wants a recorded vote.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Smith, Thomas, Vandal.

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

Mr. Speaker: It's Carried.

Now we're into Property and Development. Motions, none. Consideration of By-laws, none. Question Period. Question Period of Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development. No questions.

Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Councillor Swandel, report of February 26th, 2008.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED FEBRUARY 26, 2008

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce the report of February 26th, 2008 as Consent Agenda Items 1 through 4 and 6 through 8.

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

Item 5 - Transcona West Area Structure Plan File SP 1/2006

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, there is some new information has come forward on this item. I've been asked that it be referred back to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development to a date to be set at the call of the chair.

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

Motions, none. Reading of the By-laws Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: The By-law No. 215/2006 related to the matter that we sent back, so I will move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 35/2008, 36/2008, 37/2008, 38/2008, 39/2008, 40/2008, 41/2008, 42/2008, 44/2008 and 45/2008.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 35/2008, 36/2008, 37/2008, 38/2008, 39/2008, 40/2008, 41/2008, 42/2008, 44/2008 and 45/2008.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I will move that By-laws No. 35/2008 to 42/2008, both inclusive, and 44/2008 and 45/2008, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 35/2008 to 42/2008, both inclusive, and 44/2008 and 45/2008.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I will move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 35/2008 to 42/2008, both inclusive, and 44/2008 and 45/2008, 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.

Question Period.

Secretariat Committee, Councillor Browaty would you move that on my behalf please? The addendum report of March 17th, 2008

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE DATED MARCH 17, 2008

Councillor Browaty: I move Item No. 1 of the meeting of March 17th, 2008.

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

Someone wants to move adjournment?

Councillor Swandel 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, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas and Vandal.

Council adjourned at 3:31 p.m.