COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, May 14, 2008

The Council met at 9:34 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Steeves.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We have our pages this morning, Simone Jaman of Miles MacDonnell Collegiate, resides in Elmwood-East Kildonan ward, welcome.

Welcome of Guests and Announcements. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I actually have two brief announcements. I am sure at this point in time, everyone is aware of the catastrophic earthquake that took place in China, and on behalf of all Winnipeggers our thoughts and prayers go out to the citizens of Chengdu, which is our Sister City, and to neighbouring municipalities and provinces as they cope with the tragedy of such magnitude.

Mr. Speaker no city expects such a great tragedy to take place and it is our hope that during these trying times that the affected communities in China will find strength in each other to face the tragedy as well as to rebuild.

Mr. Speaker as well as it was on this day in 1948, that Israel was proclaimed an independent state, I would like to congratulate the Jewish community on the 60th anniversary of the independent state of Israel.

This milestone anniversary is a joyous occasion that provides the opportunity to celebrate the achievements of the community and family and friends and it's my hope that around the world it will be celebrated and shared in good health and prosperity.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. On May 1st of this year, St. Boniface celebrated its 100th anniversary as a city, and there was a very special ceremony on the stairs of St. Boniface City Hall on Provencher, which Mayor Katz attended. And as we know, 100 years later we are no longer our proper city, we are part of Unicity, part of that great city called Winnipeg. And that's a good thing.

But in commemoration of our anniversary, Joanne Therrien has published a book on the history of St. Boniface, with many beautiful pictures of our outstanding institutions and architecture. So in commemoration of our anniversary I'm very proud and pleased to present a book to every Councillor and the Mayor on St. Boniface, and the CAO, on the St. Boniface.

So I hope you enjoy it. I hope you read it and I would like to thank Joanne Therrien, a long time St. Boniface citizen who now lives in St. Norbert, for putting her efforts forward and publishing this book. Thank you. Merci.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Vandal. Well spoken. We have now next on the agenda a Condolence Motion. Mr. Clerk would you please, would everyone in the gallery and the chambers please rise, for a moment of silence. Read the motion.

Motion
Moved by Councillor Leipsic
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan

That Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Mary Cwik, mother-in-law of Councillor Lazarenko, which occurred on April 26th, 2008.

This Council extends to Councillor Lazarenko, his wife Judy and family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

(Moment of silence).

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillors.

MINUTES

Councillor Browaty moves the Minutes of the meeting held on April 23, 2008 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: We have delegations. The first 10 minutes, Mr. Nick Ternette in opposition to Item 1 of the report of Standing Policy Committee on Protection. Mr. Ternette you have 10 minutes.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz and members of City Council. I am here today on behalf of Cancer Brigade, who as you well know, first appeared at the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services two years ago, to demonstrate the linkage between pesticides and cancer, and urge City Council at that time as a whole to move towards a non-essential pesticides use by-law.

As you know, I was diagnosed with non-Hodgkins lymphatic cancer three years ago and David Nickarz was diagnosed with testicular cancer. Both of those cancers have a direct and indirect link to pesticides. I was in remission for two years and my cancer has returned again, once again. The latest statistics from Cancer Care claim that 44% of all men and 39% of all women will get some form of cancer in their lifetime.

And many of these cancers, especially lymphatic non-Hodgkins cancer which are linked to environmental factors are of significance in this Province, because the latest statistics say that the highest rate of lymphatic cancer is found in the Maritimes and in Manitoba. Those two provinces being unusually high because of the use of pesticides.

As a result of our intervention, two public meetings were held on May the 29th and 30th, 2007, with over 70 delegations both pro and con giving presentations to the Ad-hoc Committee on Pesticides Use. As a result of these hearings the Ad-hoc Committee on Non-essential Pesticide Use made the following observations.

The David Suzuki Foundation said that after reviewing poison control records across Canada it was found that pesticides poison more than 6,000 Canadians every year, and almost half of them are children, younger than the age of six.

The Canadian Cancer Society suggests and has implied that there is a direct link between pesticides and certain types of cancer. It is important to me that there is a recognition of the link between cancers such as non-Hodgkins lymphoma and testicular cancer with the use of pesticides, as well as a link between pesticide use and the 3% of Canadians who suffer from multiple chemical sensitivity or MCS.

Recently in Macleans magazine a question was raised concerning which province had the highest percentage of households using pesticides on their lawns and gardens. Take a guess who came out on top? Manitoba, where 44% of households use pesticides on their lawns and gardens.

Last September I was one of the only environmentalists who supported City Council taking baby steps in restricting the non-essential use of pesticides. But at this time I said that the proof would be in the pudding that is in the actual drafting of the By-law. Unfortunately after the By-law has actually been drafted we've moved one step forward last year and two steps backwards this year. I cannot possibly support the draft By-law that is presently written.

It took eight months to decide that the use of signage by commercial applicators to notify consumers of usage should be on

corrugated signs 8 by 10-inches. There is nothing still stating what should be written on those signages, such as warnings about the impact of the chemicals being used. More importantly, and as I argued last time this By-law will still not apply to residents who choose to use pesticides on their own property which I think ultimately will cause even more harm to individuals and the environment.

The policy of allowing individuals who object to pesticide use to request a buffer zone around their property, which I felt at that time last year was a positive step as it pertained to City as well as commercial companies, has been eliminated from this By-law. Never mind that these buffer zones would not apply and never did to individual property owners. They substituted this part of the By-law that the City of Winnipeg would work with the Province of Manitoba towards a provincial-wide control on the use of non-essential pesticides.

While I recognize that in the long run and no argument there, the Provincial government needs to play a larger role in creating the provincial-wide ban, especially in regards to controlling big box development stores from stocking pesticides. However, in the meantime until we get to that stage, the removing of the buffer zones from the original By-law simply weakens this By-law as it is constituted and makes it basically irrelevant.

Environmentalists as well as commercial applicators of pesticides always have agreed, even from the beginning that the City needs to launch a public education campaign about the use of pesticides. Having said this I looked at the budget for 2008 and found that a mere $10,000 has been allocated for this purpose. Now, what will $10,000 get you? One public meeting? Yup, maybe. God help us, that's education or we gonna let the public know what is the use of pesticides. This is a joke and indicative of the fact that you really aren't serious about this issue.

A major public education program needs to be organized that goes far beyond supporting a series of organic lawn care workshops run by Manitoba Eco-Network. We need to bring in experts on this issue from around the world, and there are no experts in Winnipeg who deal with pesticides but they do in Sweden, they do in Australia and they do in England and those are those people you are going to have to bring in.

You're going to have to hold conferences, seminars, public forums and workshops throughout all of Winnipeg in order to try and I agree it's going to be hard, to engage hundreds of people on this issue. The only way I can see an educational program is the same way as like former Mayor Glen Murray attempted to do with his New Deal Workshop which attracted over 2,000 people and which cost at least a $100,000 dollars, in order to educate the public of Winnipeg about the pros and cons of pesticides. If you're serious about pesticides and the dealing with the pesticides, then put the money where your mouth is.

The purpose of any by-law is to achieve something. The intent of this By-law, as far as I understood in the long run, beginning from the time that we even began the discussion of pesticides, was just like the Smoking By-law which congratulations, Winnipeg has the best anti-smoking by-law, public by-law in any city of Canada because the struggle was there to achieve a ban on smoking in public places.

That is what I thought that this By-law was going to do. That we were going to deal with pesticides on the issue that recognizing that at this stage we are not ready yet to implement a full ban but it would lead, in the long run, towards a total ban on all non-essential pesticides.

As it's been written now, this By-law is good public relations. You can all go home and feel good and tell the public all that, but it will absolutely achieve nothing. If you are serious about trying to achieve a total ban on non-essential pesticide use, then you have got to vote against this By-law and start moving forward to a much stronger by-law that really will in two to three years achieve what that By-law was supposed to do. Otherwise it's

PR and thank you very much. Nobody in the community is going to take this seriously. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Ternette. Some questions. Councillor Smith you have the first question.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Ternette, are you stating that the Canadian Cancer Society has said that pesticides are one of the causes of some cancers?

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, yes. That even the Manitoba Cancer Care people, and the definitions on the causes of cancer, in my case I have a whole file on lymphatic cancer. I go to workshops every year on lymphatic cancer, they outline the cancers in terms of definitions and lymphatic non-Hodgkins cancer is one of the major causes, there are five, there are genetic factors of course included and the environmental factor is primarily pesticides, exposure to pesticides in the long run. Not in one exposure, whatever else.

I deliver newspapers and have been doing that for 17 years. There is an interesting study that have been carried out with mailmen and with paper carriers that we don't have any local studies on but I understand there again, in certain professions depending on how much you get exposure to pesticides, what else, you have a higher rate of cancer and whatever else. And it seems to me that mailmen and carriers or mailwomen carriers, as well as paper people who deliver papers have a higher exposure to cancer than others (inaudible).

But the statistic that is absolutely correct and they've told me that and they've shown it to me, that the highest rate of increase per capita increase is the 5th, lymphatic non-Hodgkins cancer is the 5th largest cancer at the present time. It's after prostate and after lung cancer and what else but it's the 5th and nobody talks about it, it's not glamorous cancer. It's the 5th highest and the highest per capita rate, per capita okay in terms of increase in the last three, four years is the Maritimes and Manitoba.

And I asked them why, they said we don't have an explanation completely but I looked at the situation, and potatoes is the biggest industry and how much pesticides are used on the potatoes and fungus? And I know that farmers are one of the ones who are most affected with this kind of cancer because I know several farmers who have gotten lymphatic cancer as a result of the use of pesticides protecting their crop, and potato crops use more pesticides than anybody else. I've studied enough of that.

And Manitoba, because we use malathion, we use all this stuff, we allow laws to continue that way and there is significantly, they're not going to go public and say absolutely connection but they do list pesticides as the third and the major environmental cause tied into genetic, what else, for lymphatic non-Hodgkins cancer.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz. You have the first question.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate you being here. Nick, in your presentation, I think you stated that obviously the best course of action would be an outright ban at the retail level and obviously you're aware that only the Province can do that. We all know that other provinces have done that. We also know that Councillor Gerbasi is working with the Province and they're monitoring what's going on in other scenarios.

I'm just wondering, in the interim, what actions have you or any other members of the Cancer Brigade taken as far as communicating with the Province?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ternette.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker. We did, in fact there will be a speaker coming afterwards. As part of the Cancer Brigade and I joined last year with various people who are, Glenda Whiteman who will be speaking here next, at a rally at the Legislature last summer in fact it was in July, where we had a petition dealing with the ban of pesticides use and quite bluntly, we got pretty badly harassed

getting into the Legislature with all the new security as a result of 9-11. But that has nothing to do with that. We did present a petition, both to the Premier, the Minister of Health, and I think a couple of other people there, indicating the effect of pesticides on children especially, and the kind of health issues that are and whatever else.

And to be very honest I don't know I haven't heard what the response is. I think maybe Glenda Whiteman who will be next can indicate what the response from the government was, but I didn't get any feedback or response that they were in any way prepared to look into the shape of that.

My impression is, that's my impression, my personal bias I suppose, that I don't see them particularly moving on, I have never found the NDP to be very environmentally conscious to be honest with you.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question? No further questions. Mr. Ternette, thank you.

Nick Ternette: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Next is, on the agenda is as a delegation, Glenda Whiteman. She gets, she will get five minutes.

Glenda Whiteman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning. Good morning, everyone. Mr. Mayor, Councillors, members of the media and members of the ladies and gentlemen in the gallery and down here on the floor. Quite frankly, I can't believe I'm here again. I would have thought you people would have had enough of me by now, but here I am.

So, for those of you who don't know, I'm a concerned former resident of Winnipeg. Probably most of you don't know that I continue to teach in Winnipeg, and I have to be here regularly, especially during the summer months.

Furthermore, I still have family living in Winnipeg and as someone with a disability, known as chemical sensitivities, this issue concerns me greatly, both on a personal level and once again, on behalf of those who are considered by the Federal Standing Committee on Environment to be most vulnerable to pesticides.

You've heard me quote from this book here many times before. I'll repeat my earlier question because I really wasn't being facetious. Why do I have to come here to tell you what a lousy by-law this is? I know you're not dumb, but this is positively the dumbest excuse for a by-law I have ever heard. And you already know it, because you are really quite smart people, or else you wouldn't have made it to where you are. I don't think I should have to tell you these things because I think you already know. You're smart. But I will.

For example, I think you already know that ancestors of some of these pesticides were invented during World War II and tested in the gas chambers. I think you already know that you don't want your kids rolling around in soccer fields in pesticides. I'm sure you know that the EPA has buried its library of pesticide data.

You're smart enough to know that pesticides cause cancer, especially non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. I'm sure you know that pesticides are harming the development of your grandchildren, and you probably know that they could be harming the grandchildren that haven't even ever been imagined yet. They're not even a twinkle in anybody's eye. That's called general toxicity, in case you don't know.

I'm sure you must be smart enough to remember that Mark Lubosch's dog died from exposure to pesticides used on a fruit tree in his yard. I think maybe it was an apple tree. And in fact, you probably are even smart enough to remember that that pesticide was malathion.

I think you're smart enough to know that compost makes a terrific alternative to pesticides and fertilizers on lawns and in gardens. And you know that in this room, a year ago, over 40 people, including doctors and lawyers, and the Cancer, Manitoba Cancer, spoke very strongly in

favour of a cosmetic pesticide by-law that would benefit the health of humans, animals and the environment including Lake Winnipeg.

You are smart enough to know that other municipalities across the country have taken steps to actually protect their citizens from exposure to these toxins. They actually passed by-laws prohibiting the use and sale of pesticides.

And I'm sure you know that these are the groups most vulnerable to pesticides: fetuses, children, seniors, women, aboriginal people, persons suffering from multiple chemical sensitivity or in poor health, and professional users of pesticides. To this end decisions on pesticides should be based on the protection of the most vulnerable groups.

You're probably smart enough to know that somebody is making a lot of money on pesticides. And you are smart enough to know that political will begins in your own conscience. You cannot abdicate your responsibility to protect the people of Winnipeg just because you would rather the Province do it instead. You have a responsibility to protect your citizens now.

And if you think you'll wait till they take away your right to pass this by-law, like the provincial government of Ontario is trying to do, remember what a slippery slope that is. You don't want to start abdicating this Council's right to make by-laws. I'm almost done.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, thank you.

Glenda Whiteman: This weekend I helped bury a friend. He was 33. Your colleagues at the Province are currently mourning a man just 35, a father of two. What's the point? Life is short. Sometimes way too short.

You need to make a difference for the people of Winnipeg now. Send this By-law back to the Committee and have them draft a real by-law. One that's actually going to protect your citizens, not win awards from industry associations. Redraft this By-law.

In closing, I want to honour the gentleman who chaired this committee, the honourable Charles Katcha, who also recently died, and I am very grateful for his political will.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any questions?

Glenda Whiteman: Here is a copy for your records.

Mr. Speaker: We'll get that distributed. Ms. Whiteman I thank you very much for your presentation.

The next delegation is Shirley Thompson in support of Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. She was here? Once again, Shirley Thompson? Not present.

Now we go on with the rest of the agenda. Executive Policy Committee report of April 30th, 2008, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED APRIL 30, 2008**

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

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

Report of May 7th, 2008, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 7, 2008**

Councillor Thomas: Four.

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute. Which one are you on Councillor Thomas, on what we just passed April 30th or on you on the May 7th?

Councillor Thomas: No you said report of May 7th and I said 4.

Mr. Speaker: May 7th. Okay. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, what I would do then is introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 3 and 5 to 6. And then I would very much like to hear comments from Councillor Thomas.

Mr. Speaker: Okay and the motion. All in favour? Contrary?

Item No. 4 has been stood down.

Item 4 - Disraeli Freeway Rehabilitation Project - Constructing, using a Design/ Build/ Finance/ Maintain Model
File SB-3

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, we all know the state of the Disraeli Bridge. I've had personal first hand experience by hanging from a boom and inspecting the underside with some City engineers. We want to move as quickly as possible. Obviously the department is doing their due diligence, and we have a proposal before you to do a P-3. And at this particular point in time, I will wait to hear from Councillor Thomas and then I will respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas you're on.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I have concerns with the style of the business being proposed. I have concerns with the amount of money that's been put aside. And mostly, I have concerns with the method of financing that has been chosen.

The design/build/finance/ and maintain project is just new initial DBFM for 3-P. I call your attention to the Deloitte and Touche report in which they state quite emphatically on page, the bottom of page 9 and the top of page 10, that if the City was to do this under traditional borrowing, the City can finance this at a much lower cost under traditional methods than the proposed DBMF.

The concern that Deloitte and Touche said was that we don't really have enough borrowing capacity. Now, we put that limit on ourselves, and I think we could move that limit in order to do traditional financing. If we saved 1.6 percentage point per year we're talking about millions of dollars of money that's being saved.

I've also contacted the industry, and a construction company and another leader in the industry said they weren't really interested in it from a P-3. The construction company said that why would they do that? Why would they take on debt at a time of expansion in their industry and they've already got a lot of other options. They said they would be willing to take on debt at a time when there was a dearth of projects in the community and they had to take on debt in order to see a project to the fore. But now, to weigh themselves under with debt when there is already many other construction projects big and small happening throughout this community, they knew that they weren't, and this is a very big company, weren't even going to be putting forth a bid on this project.

I talked with one of the leaders in the heavy construction industry who said they weren't interested in getting into this because it's not a new project. If they could do it from the beginning where they could be in control of all the new aspects of it, and they suggested there might be some surprises with the project's estimates that they made and then they get under and find the footings are not as secure as they thought, and so they doubted that there would be a lot of bids put forward. And this individual who is not of the same political perspective as I am, said it would not only cost the City more money, it would cost the industry more money as well. So it was not the type of financing that they were interested in either.

So, it would be more expensive, there would be less competition, and the private sector just doesn't like surprises. So this is not a good candidate for private/public partnership.

Now, I would suggest that the reason that we don't have the capacity to do our self was because even though this bridge is well in need of rehabilitation, it has been put to the bottom of the line and new

projects have gotten their money up front and right away. We're putting $60 million dollars into a new corridor and that's coming ahead of this bridge. Now, this bridge will take, this corridor will take traffic east/west on the Chief Peguis Trail. What we'll need is an alternative for traffic to go north/south.

Now, I also want to suggest that the construction is inadequate. It should be six lanes rather than four. That there should be bikes, a bike lane and dedicated transit lanes, and if we do that, if we do three pedestals at a time, it's going to actually allow us to keep the bridge open. We can do one half with three lanes and the existing bridge can stay open and then when we close the bridge we can put the traffic on the other half. Not only would that get the bridge that we need, it would allow traffic to continue down the bridge until it gets fixed.

And if we don't do this, my ward is going to be very detrimentally affected with traffic bleeding over Hespeler, Louise, the Watt Street underpass between Watt and Archibald, and all the collector streets are going to be affected with over 40,000 vehicles a year, trying to find their way to North Kildonan and East St. Paul. And this is the wrong bridge and the wrong way to go.

Now, I would suggest that there were a number of other mistakes that were made. The widening of Molson should have preceded a couple of years ago and it was a very big disappointment to have that removed out of the Budget. So now we have a two lane where we could have had a four lane road, and there is going to be, it's already got 12,000 vehicles a day traveling down it and there is going to be, I would suggest, twice as many vehicles traveling down it when the Henderson Bridge, the Disraeli Freeway is closed.

So what happens isn't properly planned. Emphasis has been on new rather than existing and expansion of existing infrastructure, and by going this way, not, we're adding bad financing to poor planning. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to put some comments on the record on this issue. First of all, I want to make it clear that I strongly support fixing the Disraeli Bridge. It's a key part of our existing network of infrastructure and it clearly needs to be fixed. Even though it will cost us with the current plan, $120 to $160 million dollars, I believe this Council understands that this is something that has to be done. I just wanted to get that on the record first.

The decision we're making today is really about not whether to build this project or do this project, but whether it should happen through a P-3 process. But I would also, and I will comment a bit further about that in a few minutes but first I wanted to comment about the suggestion being made that the scope of the project be changed to six lanes at a cost estimated, from the motion that came from Community Committee, at $250 to $350 million dollars. I normally, usually am on the same page with Councillor Thomas, but I know this other, I think there are some very important reasons why I need to put my comments on the record in opposition to this.

It's my view that widening is quite unnecessary and far too costly. If we have an extra $150 million dollars, I think we have to look at what would be the priority. It's my understanding that there are three reasons that have been given for needing, saying that we need to widen the bridge to six lanes.

First there's concerns about the inconvenience while the bridge is being built. Well, almost $200 million or $150 million is a heck of an expensive short-term traffic calming measure. It's going to be a short-term problem. We need to find some other kind of solution for the traffic but you don't build a $150 million dollar infrastructure project because people will be inconvenienced for a short time while construction is occurring. That's very shortsighted. Surely Public Works can come up with some other options.

Secondly, expanding car capacity might be another reason that some Councillors are encouraging the six lanes because if

you look at the wording of the motion it talks about the Capital Region and the growth in the City requiring more lanes for cars. Yet Public Works has said that the widening is not needed for at least 20 years. So why would we, with scarce dollars spend that kind of money widening infrastructure that we don't need? This should put, this knowledge which we should listen to, our administration, because they actually are traffic planners and engineers, and they're saying that we don't need this.

But furthermore, we shouldn't be widening and expanding roads simply for the use of the automobile anyway. We should be repairing existing infrastructure which is what the existing project of four lanes is doing. It is repairing the existing bridge. And we should be investing in alternatives to the automobile such as public transit.

And the third reason that's been talked about is public transit and cycling. And perhaps everyone here, although you should be, is not familiar with our transit plan in this area of the City. The eastern transit corridor is identified as a concept in Policy Plate "C" of Plan Winnipeg. And it was also recommended as a high priority in the Rapid Transit Taskforce, and the eastern corridor is currently undergoing a feasibility study right now and it does not require the widening of the Disraeli Bridge and it is not being built using the Disraeli Bridge. It is my understanding that transit is considering building the eastern bus rapid transit way through the Point Douglas area possibly, and with, which we're talking about a separate high-speed exclusive roadway for buses which I assume would have a cycling path as well.

The most effective way to speed up buses in key points of congestion which are identified in our City plan, and the eastern and the southern or the two top priority ones that are identified, is to bypass traffic completely by having a separate roadway for buses. We're not talking about a diamond lane. $200 million dollars or $150 million dollars is a very expensive diamond lane if that is what it is for.

And it's very clear to me from the recommendations of the Taskforce, which were adopted by Council, that we should be building the corridor. And if we were to do that, the diamond lane would be redundant. So to spend that kind of, we're talking long-term transportation planning. You don't spend $200 million dollars for something you need for a year or two or five years.

Diamond lanes have their place in our transit plan and more and more of them are recommended in the Taskforce report but they aren't the best choice for every location. They can't be put everywhere, and the best choice is a separate lane for buses when by the way if we build the BRT lanes they can be upgraded to LRT in the future and they'll be in place for the people who don't think bus rapid transit is good enough. So obviously, it's a direction we need to go.

This area of the City has been identified that this is a high priority, so I just, I am baffled that all of this has not been paid attention to when this motion came forward and this discussion. And as a, you know, I think we have to look at the whole City and our whole City plan not just our own ward when we talk about transportation planning. It's not just about, I mean this is not my ward but you know, strangely enough I still care because this is our City.

And I think that we need to have more public consultation about what our transit plan is and maybe a Council seminar for Councillors too to understand what our transit plan is, because this is nothing new. There is a lot of confusion about it.

And I would also, just one more comment on this, if you ask the public whether they want more lanes, a hundred percent of them are probably going to say yes or if they want their roads fixed, or if they want a new piece of infrastructure. But you also have to ask them do you want it more than you want something else or do you want that instead of rapid transit?

You know, the question has not been asked. The question has been asked in a way to get the response that has been wanted. So I'm sure the people in the area would like it but I think you have to

look at the whole transportation plan and that was a point that I felt was important to make today.

But, back to the P-3 question, I would like to point out that there has been a lot of concern about the transparency around P-3s. And the motion, the report before us today asks us to accept moving ahead with this model, really without the numbers which for various reasons they say they can't give us, or without enough facts or details to really make an informed decision and that's where I come into problems. I can't abstain from a vote on this Council. I have to vote yes or no, and I have trouble voting yes when I don't know what I'm voting for and whether it's the best deal for Winnipeggers.

While it's true that we can back out later if it doesn't work so well, I know, I would like to know the risks we are taking by investing so much money and time in the process of preparing and evaluating private sector bids. And the reason I say this is a report which was mentioned in an earlier Council meeting entitled "Flawed, Failed and Abandoned, 100 P-3s" written in March 2005. If anyone can't find it just Google it, it's easy to find. It refers to the Charleswood Bridge and it states that 10% of the project cost was eaten up by the cost of preparing and evaluating bids. It was also found to cost taxpayers more than if the bridge was built publicly.

Now, the problem is in trying, many people have been trying for years to find out the detailed numbers on the Charleswood Bridge and that still is not public information. There is also, there is a lack of transparency here that I'm finding more and more concerning. Recently, I asked our administration if the P-3 agreement for building the new police station was going to be made public.

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

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: And I was told that the, told that only the award report was made public and I was also told that no agreement or any other information has been made public, nor will it be in the future. How is that for transparency? This is likely what we're going to see if we go to this P-3 model. That the full information cannot be viewed by the public or even by members of Council who have to vote on it.

And if you take a look at that report that I mentioned called "Flawed, Failed and Abandoned", it contains 100 examples of situations where P-3s, where things went wrong or clearly were better done in the public domain. There are many examples of P-3s costing more and that there have been many examples of a lack of accountability.

There is always the chance that this will be different in this case and perhaps we will negotiate an amazing agreement that will save us money and work out perfectly and I certainly hope that's the case. But trust me just isn't quite enough. I'm sorry I can't support this at this stage. I assume we will see what happens because I assume this will go through in the end anyway.

But, the process, as Councillors I think we have a responsibility not to blindly support something without having adequate information to make that decision. And if we can't be trusted with that confidential information, then we, I don't feel that in my conscious I can make a decision to vote for something when I don't have the information to know if it's beneficial to Winnipeggers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I also do not want to support this clause. You know, and basically it's just on one thing basically that I am taking my position. That is the P-3s.

You know, why do we want to pay more money than we have to? It doesn't make sense to me. Councillor Gerbasi mentioned this report and on the Charleswood Bridge, on a contract totaling $11.6 million, the Charleswood Bridge P-3 was found to have cost taxpayers $1.4 million more than if the bridge was built publicly. Over 10% of the

project's cost was eaten up by the costs of preparing and evaluating the bids. You know, I mean I would be voting for this if we had the information on the Charleswood Bridge. If we really knew what the costs were.

You know, how we can go ahead and pass something like this without knowing the added increased costs over the usual bid procedure where the City does it, you know, it just doesn't make sense. So, until we have information that's valid, that show the cost of the Charleswood Bridge actually, I cannot be supportive of this clause.

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

Councillor Leipsic: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address first the issue of P-3s and some of the comments of Councillor Thomas and Smith. I believe they emphasized an issue of money, P-3s and interest rates for government, and private sector.

I would like to point out and Councillor Thomas should continue reading the Deloitte and Touche information, not just the CUPE brochures that she was quoting the last couple of months here, but it's, P-3s buy an outcome not just a service and a structure. In recent years, a number of announcements have been made about infrastructure deficit in Canada. Some say this will be over $300 billion in the next 20 years. This is, this is a new day and new money has to come into the picture. But it's not merely money, Mr. Speaker.

Many jurisdictions explore different ways to deliver capital projects. P-3s are one way to bridge this. And at the end of 2006, B.C. has spent over $4 billion. Quebec and Ontario, over $7 billion. This is also being practiced in U.K., Australia, France and the U.S.A. In Winnipeg, we have our famous Charleswood Bridge and we now have the East Winnipeg Police Station. B.C., Quebec, Ontario, actually have agencies set up to administer their P-3s.

In 2006, Canadian P-3s totaled approximately $20 billion. The intent to leverage private sector resources and expertise to provide these factors for the crumbling infrastructure we're having throughout Canada. One, we want projects on time. Two, we want projects on budget. And three, we want project delivery.

It should be noted, I believe Charleswood Bridge came in, was built in a year. I think Councillor Clement could further that discussion. But it worked. It's being maintained incredibly well. You merely have to go through that Charleswood Freeway? Parkway. Okay.

Lifecycle costs come into this. P-3s are an accepted form of delivery for infrastructure today. I mean, we can't just stay where we were 20 or 30 years ago, Councillor Thomas and Councillor Smith. We are doing things differently.

So, I'm sorry, I didn't interrupt you, Councillor Thomas. I would like to get to the Disraeli Bridge, too. The Deloitte and Touche analysis has shown us a lower burden for taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg will occur if we undertake this project as a P-3 because of transfer of risk. Deloitte and Touche analysis shows a lower burden for Winnipeg's taxpayers and to undertake this project as a P-3, very strongly because of the transfer of risk. Corporate Finances and Public Works in the City of Winnipeg have recommended this course. The outlying business case shows value for money is favoured by a design/build/finance/ maintain.

I also have really been disturbed to recently see the MLA, who only seems to come out occasionally for Councillor Thomas, spending, civic issues exactly, spending our money, our taxpayer money, on full pages in community newspapers. I'm shocked also that this particular MLA, his budget, his expense budget a year ago showed he was at $60,000. He was the only, he was the only MLA who didn't have a constituency office. So where did he spend the money? Well, he had three cell phones. He obviously buys newspaper ads and sends out mailers (inaudible) I don't know, I'm not sure but I have a problem with

that. Obviously, Councillor Thomas doesn't.

So, I think we have to give credit to our engineers and our traffic people who are professionals, unlike myself or some of the Councillors here.

I conclude that this is just one of the, what would I call it? Political grandstanding, Mr. Speaker, shameful, shabby political grandstanding. We need Disraeli Bridge fixed. It's been recommended that it be four lanes, not six. We have to accommodate bikes and transit. They've looked at it. They've come up with a decision. You know, there have been two bridge tragedies in the last few years, Quebec, Minneapolis. Our engineers are saying fix it. No, we have people who are now saying build another addition, then we'll close the four.

And quite frankly, aside from the Provincial representative, I was shocked that three of our Councillors, Thomas, Wyatt and Browaty, would also concur that this was a good idea. It's beyond me if you could help one day, Mr. Speaker, you can let me know. Anyways, I guess that's where I'll leave off and thank you for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to start my comments here today talking about the P-3 process. As Deputy Mayor Leipsic stated, we are buying an outcome. We want to have a bridge and doing the design/build/finance/maintain model I think is the right approach. We say this is the bridge we want, this is how much it is going to cost. There is no surprises.

We have a track record here unfortunately in this City where projects have ended up costing and taking longer and have cost more because companies go bankrupt, whether it's the Nairn overpass, we've had problems with the Main Street overpass, going into Councillor Vandal's ward there was the Esplanade Riel that cost several times what it was originally expected.

The reality is we haven't done a very good job maintaining these costs. Even though we vote for them in Council by the time they end up coming before us, by the time we write the cheque, and that's every taxpayer in Winnipeg that's paying for it, the costs never end up costing what they were originally. The certainty of a P-3 gives you that.

P-3s are being used all across this country now. There is a feature in today's National Post talking about the Confederation Bridge, the Canadian Waterfront Station in downtown Vancouver, B.C.'s Sea to Sky Highway. By taking the ingenuity of private organizations to find the best way of providing that outcome, savings are realized and I think that a P-3 model is in fact where we want to go with the Disraeli overhaul.

My question, my problem, my concern though is, is with the outcome that we're considering. The outcome we're considering is basically a deck rehabilitation and that's all. Northeast Winnipeg continues to grow. The Capital Region continues to grow, East St. Paul and the areas surrounding it. Today we have almost 40,000 vehicles a day going over the Disraeli Bridge and overpass. They're talking about it maybe lasting in terms of capacity for around 20 years.

I have an email yesterday from our director of Public Works and his comments were "with so much of our infrastructure being at or near the end of its existing life we have had to consider the order of rehabilitation of structures such as bridges from a structural needs basis first and an enhancement or capacity perspective second."

The three options presented to the public didn't even consider where we need to go in the future. They didn't consider the fact that we're looking at things like rapid transit. I know there is proposal out there talking about bus rapid transit and using different routes. Why would you not put it through areas where you have the most dense populations. Henderson Highway with all of its large apartment blocks has dense population. I would like to see it

someday perhaps going down the area where, near where the Pioneer's Greenway is but I have concerns that there isn't enough population density along that route, where as you do have along Henderson Highway. And the logical place to put that would be on a sixth lane of the Disraeli Overpass.

When it comes to the inconvenience, yes, we're talking about 16 months of closure the prime route into northeast Winnipeg. Why would you do that? You've got plans on the tables to twin the Louise Bridge to four lanes. We're going to need the additional capacity of six lanes in the future on Henderson Highway. By building a second structure you have that advantage.

Today for example, we have Bishop Grandin where one of the spans is closed, traffic continues to move reasonably well because they did it properly. They built two separate spans.

The Chief Peguis Trail, some of my colleagues here on Council today were around in those days, they made the choice. They had the choice of building one structure where again if you need to do road work you close the entire thing down or they spent more money at the time and they built two separate spans. By having two spans they can work on one, they can cut three lanes of traffic, similar to what we see on Bishop Grandin today and traffic continues to move. By doing the right thing today and doing a six lane structure we have that opportunity and I think that money needs to come from the Premier.

Again when we closed, back in the fall of 2006 there was an incident where the Disraeli had to be closed because of a vehicle hitting the underside support beams of the structure. Traffic was, there was havoc in traffic throughout all of northeast Winnipeg, on Main Street, on Provencher, you name it because of the traffic all moving around. We're talking about 16 months of this going forward and worse because they did open parts of the Disraeli quite quickly.

But the problem is, sorry. The closure for 16 months will affect businesses on Henderson Highway and the bridge that took the biggest increase in traffic was the North Perimeter Bridge. These weren't people from even the City of Winnipeg. These weren't taxpayers of Winnipeg. They were people from the Capital Region and outside the City of Winnipeg. It needs to be pointed out that the only person at the cabinet table from northeast Winnipeg is Premier Gary Doer.

And that's why at the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee meeting on Monday we called on Premier Doer to say, step up to the plate here, do the right thing for this part of the City and make an investment in northeast Winnipeg.

So those are my comments here today. I will be supporting this but again, I like the way we're getting to the outcome, I just don't like the outcome as proposed. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a fascinating report. I went over it several times yesterday, and this morning. I think Councillor Swandel wants to go before me though so I'll sit down.

It's a fascinating report, there is a lot there. And it strikes me that this report is premature. We don't actually know what the final design will be. And we know that the work that's gone, the prep work to actually do the consultations which we're doing now, are, are going to severely restrict the design options.

And the prep work is identified in the report, early in the report, included in that is scheduling and it's quite clear that the schedule is a very important part of the pre-work that was done. And if we approve this report here this morning there is no two ways about it, that the Disraeli Bridge is going to be shut down for 16 months or is it 18 months.

And I think we can do better than that. I think the people of Elmwood, I think the people, the businesses of East Kildonan

deserve better than that. And I think we have to go back and we have to challenge our administration to work with this consortium that they've put together, to simply come up with another alternative that's better. Sixteen months is too long.

I know through the Provencher Bridge which was closed for between half a year and maybe a year, that the businesses suffered tremendously because of that. And if you don't believe me, you can go ask the former owner of Le Beaujolais Restaurant and you can go up and down Provencher Boulevard and talk to the business owners.

And if there is one thing I could do to go back and change the process is challenge the administration to come up with another alternative that's, that's friendlier to the business owners and the residents that live in that area. And I don't think we've done that and let me be very clear. If we approve this report we're telling those residences, those residents, those business owners that your bridge is going to be shut down for 18 months and we can do better than that.

The report is really all about risk. How you estimate risk. How you assess it and what value you put on to the risk and ultimately what premiums you are going to pay the private sector for that risk.

And, the report of course is fairly thorough on how that risk is assessed. The risk assessed public sector comparator is really the key indicator. And each of these risks was subdivided, an estimated value and probability of occurrence for each of these risks was inputted through the Monte Carlo simulation program. I'm not making that up. The Monte Carlo simulation program. Now when I think of Monte Carlo that doesn't give me a heck of a lot of comfort when we're going ahead and spending close to, we don't know how much we're going to spend.

I would put forward to this Council that inflation of course is a risk. But our ability of our public sector, the lack of resources at the highest level, detailed resources to manage a project like that is simply not there. And that is a function of the budgetary process that we, this Council has bought into.

We've cut or frozen taxes for the last 12 years. The Mayor is committed to a complete elimination of the business tax. And quite frankly the resources that we used to have to manage this process are not there. And that is a risk that is assessed and there is a premium paid for that.

And this is not just Councillor Dan Vandal talking. If you read the report "in the current volatile construction market and bearing in mind that Council's, the City's previous experience with budget overruns, along with the Public Works Department lack of resources, it is probable that the final project cost will be more than originally budgeted" and this is our administration writing this and they're telling you this. "This is a significant risk that justifies the premium for using the triple P model."

That's alarming when it comes from the public sector. What that premium is unidentified. I would also suggest to this Council that this is a clear indication this report clearly is a report of ideology over reason.

In verifying the actual recommendations at the back of the Deloitte and Touche report, one of the, recommendation 4 "is implement a fact-based approach to neutralize the opposition." That doesn't sound like engineering jargon to me. A fact-based approach to neutralize the opposition. I'm not sure who that was exactly directed to.

Facts. Let's talk about facts. Page 9 of the report. It says the City borrows money at 6%. The private sector, the consortium that is going to be constructing this project likely will bill us at 7.6%. The City traditionally finances this over 20 years at 6%. The private sector consortium at 7.6% over 30 years. Do the math. That, I'm not making that up. These are facts that are in the report.

Go to the financial statements. The actual financial statement says go to the '08 Budget. Go to the '08 Budget. 2008

estimate, private public partnership there is $38 million dollars in the 2008 estimates. 2009 there is another $2 million. Starting in 2010 there is $13.8 million per year of gas tax money that's going to go into the Disraeli Bridge. To 2013, beyond 2013, we're looking at $360 million, for a grand total of $415 million.

The fact that is missing and I understand the argument of buying an outcome. But the fact that is missing is what is this thing going to cost us? Try to find a number in this report. Try to find a number in the 2008 Capital Budget. Try to find a number that we can explain to our constituents how much this is going to cost. Try to rationalize to those people that this bridge is going to be shut down for 18 months, and you simply can't do it.

Apparently there was a number on the public consultations brochures that have gone out, that have been quoted as $125 to $160. Well that's quite a variance. That's quite a variance. Those are significant numbers that are not in the report before us. That are not in our Capital Budget and when you talk about the whole issue of transparency, Mr. Speaker, it's simply not here for this project.

And that could be that this project is here early. We need to send it back, do some more due diligence with our administration to mitigate those negative effects on businesses and the residences…

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

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Vandal: Work with the area Councillor, work with the Provincial government and actually bring forward a number so that we can explain to constituents this is what the Disraeli Bridge is going to cost and we can't do that at this point.

And, Mr. Speaker that's where I'm at. Believe it or not, I read the report with an open mind. I am not, believe me, I voted for the triple P on the police station on the east side of St. Boniface. I've got an open mind towards this but the facts simply are not there. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the report before us today. Benjamin Disraeli, Disraeli Bridge, one of the famous quotes from Benjamin Disraeli of course "there are three kinds of lies, lies, damn lies and statistics" and I think we're hearing a lot of statistics being thrown around today.

The reality is Mr. Speaker, if you look at the report before us, it's very clear. What's being asked here is we're giving direction to the Winnipeg public service to proceed with a P-3 model, a 3-P model with regards to design/build/finance and maintain the new Disraeli Bridge. If you vote against this report you're basically voting against us moving forward on the Disraeli project. Let's be very clear about that. I think that would be a very, very negative thing for the City to do.

The reality is, the options being presented to the public are anywhere from $120 million to $160 million dollars based on what is finally chosen at the end of the day. But, Mr. Speaker this Council as all of us know, with all the competing Capital Budget considerations, does not have $120 to $160 million dollars just sitting there that we can take and put into the bridge reconstruction project. Therefore, we're looking at a 3-P model to reconstruct this bridge.

And this is not something that Mr. Speaker that's radical or revolutionary. Maybe for Winnipeg it is, but the fact of the matter is that this method of building infrastructure is being used across North America and across western Europe, and being used successfully. And it's a way to control costs. It's a way to manage risk, and ensure that risk instead of being managed by the public sector and being borne out by the public, is being managed by the private sector and that risk is being borne out by the private sector.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's, you know, I think it's an extremely important project. I would encourage every member of

Council no matter what comments have been made here today, to support this report because if we do not support this report it basically grinds the project to a halt.

And the reality is Mr. Speaker, we do not have, we do not have that luxury. We know that we have less than five years to fix this bridge. If we do not fix this bridge within five years Mr. Speaker, we're going to be shutting this bridge more than 16 months. This bridge will be shut down completely because of the fact that it will be unsafe.

And we know what's happened to bridges across North America and other parts of the world but the reality is that's not going to happen in Winnipeg. We're not going to let that happen in Winnipeg Mr. Speaker, and that's why this has to go forward. We're not in the position where we can affect the economy of this Province and the economy of the City by shutting down a major artery permanently. If we, and that's where we're, what we're basically at.

The engineers are the ones who give us the best advice. They have indicated to us that the worst case scenario we're looking at a 16 month closure. Of course we would all prefer to see that it be less but that is the reality that we have to deal with. It is a single span bridge and unfortunately to do the work and to do it as efficiently as possible and cost effectively as possible it means a complete closure for 16 months and hopefully less but that is the minimum that they've come forward.

I am not in a position and I don't think any Councillor here or anybody who is not qualified, as far as that goes, to turn around and tell the engineers that sorry, you're going to reduce the amount of time that this is going to be closed because it's politically unpopular.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we're not going to cut corners here. We're not going to shortchange a major engineering project that if done right will last more than one generation and hopefully two or three generations. You know, we can't take that risk, Mr. Speaker. We just can't take, we can't gamble with the public money and just dictate based on public opinion that it should be less.

Of course it would be wonderful. My neighbourhood is going to be directly impacted. The traffic volumes are going to be directly impacted. It's going to spill out onto the Louise Bridge. It's going to spill out onto Provencher. It's going to spill out onto the Redwood. All of northeast Winnipeg and a good part of east Winnipeg is going to be directly impacted by this project and in a negative way based on the traffic flows and the congestion and the importance of the Disraeli to the economy of Winnipeg.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to proceed with this. This is a positive report. It clearly details the consultant's report which is attached. The information is there. It clearly details what steps have to be taken next. So Council is being kept completely informed of what the process is.

I just want to comment, Mr. Speaker, on the motion that came out of Community Committee the other night. It was moved by Councillor Browaty, unanimously endorsed by Community Committee. My comments at Community Committee, I'll make the same comments here. If you read the motion and I'll read it, "therefore be it resolved that the EK-T Community Committee calls on Premier Doer to immediately make the rehabilitation of the Disraeli Bridge and overpass a priority and contribute the necessary funding to facilitate a twin six lane bridge system."

The motion does not say cancel the Disraeli project and don't proceed. The motion is very clear. The motion says that if the Premier makes this a priority and comes forward with funding to facilitate a better bridge why would we look a gift horse in the mouth. So I supported the motion because I thought it made sense.

Mr. Speaker, it's a, in the event we can build a six lane bridge, which in my view would automatically include diamond lanes for rapid transit, or the Rapid Transit Taskforce report which was referred to earlier, the fact of the matter is we recommended diamond lanes on

Henderson Highway. But what good are diamond lanes on Henderson Highway Mr. Speaker, if they dead end at the Disraeli Bridge? There is no diamond lanes.

So you're going up and down Henderson Highway and maybe you might want to do that, you know visit the Dairy Queen at one end and go down to the book shop at the other, but you know, Mr. Speaker, the reality is that you want to get downtown, the majority of people. And Henderson Highway is, you ask the administration, bus number 11 is one of the busiest routes in the City. We have huge densities in northeast Winnipeg. It's one of the busiest routes in the City Mr. Speaker and used extensively.

Would it make sense? Absolutely. Is it a priority? Should it be a priority of the Province? Absolutely. But as we know, we today do not receive a majority, we do not receive the kind of funding we need for our regional infrastructure from the Province.

When it comes to the gas taxes and fuel taxes paid by the citizens of Winnipeg, the reality is Mr. Speaker that the Province is keeping a ton of that cash to do what they like to do, rather than transferring it back to invested infrastructure. We're still waiting for the Premier to address the fiscal imbalance that exists, not just in Winnipeg but across this Province between municipalities and the provincial government.

This issue along with other issues as rapid transit was referred to is part of that and so we've now seen a member of the government caucus stand up publicly and run ads saying that this should be a priority, a twin, six lane structure. Well he should go and talk to his boss and say, instead of running these ads, say look at, let's make this a priority.

It's nice to see Mr. Maloway speaking out. We've now heard him twice in the last year, first on Kelvin, now on this. It might have something to do with the fact that it's rumoured that he is running for the nomination in that riding but Mr. Speaker, good for him, he is finally making some noise after 30 years of being there, and you know it's good to hear it. And you know, maybe hopefully he will be able to be successful and convince his…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding moves extension of two minutes

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: He may be able to be successful and convince Emperor Doer to release the funds and make it flow into the City.

So you know, I think Mr. Speaker, and so we as the Community Committee want to support our local MLA. You know, we want to see him succeed, and we're on the same team fighting for northeast Winnipeg and that's Mr. Speaker, the reality. If the Premier comes along and supports this, wonderful, great. But that's the reality.

We can't, the citizens of Winnipeg are financing this project already to the level that we can afford, $120 to $160 million dollars from the taxpayers of Winnipeg for this project. For us to do anything further, for us to add extra lanes, the Province has to step to the plate and make that happen. So I'm saying to Mr. Maloway, and to all his colleagues on Broadway, talk is cheap. Put your money where your mouth is. Make it happen and that's what that motion says.

So Mr., it's interesting you know, one of the Disraeli quotes also you are familiar with is quoted as saying "damn your principles, stick to your party". So clearly, Mr. Maloway is doing the right thing. But he also said "power has only one duty to secure the social welfare of the people" and I think that's what we're attempting to do today with this motion before us, this report before us.

This secures the economy of the City. This has to be supported wholeheartedly by Council and I think I've given a fairly clear explanation of the motion that's come out of the EK-T Community Committee which I'm assuming the good Councillor who moved it has sent a copy off to the Premier and encouraged him to

act upon it as quickly as possible. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak on the Disraeli request for proposal that we're putting out, or rather expression of interest. And in my opinion really what this debate boils down to is providing those core services for our citizens in the most efficient manner possible.

I'm very supportive of the process because of P-3s, I think it provides some very important things to the citizens here of Winnipeg. The P-3 model provides cost savings and cost certainty that reduces financial risk and the possibility of extensive delays within our system.

I was really hoping today we could come here and have a consensus on this. After all what we are talking about is an expression of interest to find ways for us to save money as our citizens. And no matter what your political stripe, you know I don't think anyone would say that they're going to support a P-3 if it comes in and it's decided that this is going to cost substantially more or cause more risks for the citizens of Winnipeg, but at this point we don't know that. That's why we're asking for this expression of interest to find exactly that out.

And I think no matter, as I mentioned, if you want to focus on efficiencies here at City Hall or a variety of other topics, it's inherent and I think it's a responsibility as your representatives at City Hall, to always look amongst ourselves and how we can deliver the system more efficient and I think this is something that needs to be looked at. In my opinion, really our citizens have nothing to lose in this process.

The best case scenario is that we find a more efficient way to deliver a core service, a bridge, a road like the Disraeli to our citizens. The very worst case scenario is that we find out that the existing traditional way in which we usually finance and build these types of structures is the best way but at least we can come to our citizens and tell them, you know what we're looking for all that we can in terms of making our systems more efficient.

And that money that we will be able to save on the P-3s if it is the case, that we are able to save a vast amount of money, will go to putting more police on the streets, will go to putting more infrastructure or more programming or more about cutting business taxes or property taxes. So but I am confident that a P-3 model will be effective in these means.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons why I'm supporting the project is the cost savings. If you look at what the report, the analysis has shown is that the process could save Winnipeg taxpayers close to 16% over the traditional approaches.

We know that P-3s, as Councillor Wyatt had talked about earlier, are vastly used throughout Canada, throughout the United States, throughout the world and it's proven to save governments and their citizens hundreds of millions of dollars. One of the major reasons why they save money is because it introduces a lot more competition into the marketplace and allows to find the best bidder for these projects.

Taxpayers deserve to make us a more efficient government and spending our tax dollars more wisely, especially when you are looking at big ticket items like the Disraeli or other items that we're looking at to spend, those are where we can save the most amount of money. As I mentioned saving these types of monies can go to more vast, more community projects or different initiatives that are there so I think we need to take a look at this.

Mr. Speaker, another reason to support this initiative with P-3s, it really offers taxpayers more certainty in the marketplace. This includes design, structure, construction costs, the maintenance and repair of the structures for the life of the agreement.

Everyone in this chamber is very familiar with the cost overrun, not cost overruns but the rate of inflation, the construction inflation that's plagued a lot of our projects over the last year whether it's 20% or 30% increases in overruns in the construction projects over the last year. I think the Mayor and Council deserves a lot of credit for looking for different bold ideas on how we can address this and we're going to address a number of these items over the next number of years.

And I think the P-3 model that we're debating here and waiting to hear back at some point, is another bold step in reducing the risk for taxpayers by transferring the ongoing risks away from the City to the private partner. The private sector will be responsible for all cost overruns, the increased costs of materials, maintenance, it must be completed the project on time or there will be financial penalties for it. P-3s are a safer choice for the long term viability of the City, the financial viability of the City.

Another major advantage of P-3s is the short construction timeframes and the implementation periods compared to some traditional ways of financing and constructing these projects. Over the last number of years, the majority of our major projects whether it be bridge or street work, has been done or has not hit the timeframes and have been run over budget.

P-3s have a track record of completion of time, completing these projects on time because there is a financial incentive for them to do such. The terms and conditions for the projects are looking, projects are locked in and thus the private partner will do everything in their ability to get the jobs done on time on budget.

There has been talk Mr. Speaker, from some of the critics of some of the P-3s in some terms of some of the financing that's associated with it. And you know yes, to the point that the City can finance some of these projects at a lower level, whether it be 6% and I think the private sector number is somewhere around 7.6%. But if you do look over the entire project which extends whether it be 20 or 30 years the efficiencies found in building and operating far outweigh the initial financing charges.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Businesses have taken a look at, even just the labour costs that are associated with it and the City overall has got a 20% difference in terms of what the private sector can provide these services for. So there will be some initial savings in terms of that.

The private sector also has a vested interest in completing the project on time and on budget and thus the risk transfer really far exceeds any financial benefit that you can have in terms of the financing for it.

The Charleswood Bridge is another example. Pointed out by probably proponents and critics of the process of something that needs to be looked at. And I think that the Charleswood Bridge, if you look at the example of this, the financing was locked in place whether it be the design or the construction that has taken place.

So, my point with this is you've got to make the right deal for the right equation. There's not a cookie cutter approach to this and you need to ensure, and I think our experience as a City is because of the Charleswood Bridge and whether you look at the new police station that are being used, were closer and we've moved the ball in terms of that. So there isn't as much risk to the taxpayers in terms of being set back in terms of this.

The final issue, I think that critics have talked about is the loss of control. Well you know the same protocols, the same standards will be applied for this. We're not losing control of the bridge. There is going to be no tolls that are associated with this that are associated, so we'll have complete control of the process for it.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker I'm very much supportive of the P-3 model. I think it offers some cost savings to our taxpayers. It reduces the risk as taxpayers and it can get the jobs done ensuring that delays aren't happening

here. So I will be supporting this proposal and this initiative and am waiting to see when the expression of interest comes back the next stage of the project. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll start by talking about some of the ideas that have come forward about what we should be doing instead of what it looks like we will be doing. You know it's all fine and dandy for us to sit around the chamber and start imagining and dreaming what this bridge could look like or might look like and we could certainly go a lot further than that.

We could talk about perhaps an overall redevelopment of the south Point Douglas area and start thinking about what if we were to extend Waterfront Drive all the way down to where the Disraeli Bridge is.

What if we were eliminate the CP yards and sweep it out to the airport vicinity and get rid of the need and loop the CP main line around the north or south of the City and eliminate this railroad track that bisects this area.

What if we were to build a brand new domed stadium with a convention centre and a hotel connected to it. And what if we were it use that abandoned rail line as a monorail system to connect to the Human Rights Museum and into the hotel district in downtown? What a wonderful vision for our City.

What if when doing all of that you were able to turn the Louise Bridge into an active transportation corridor to connect into this wonderful neighbourhood.

And at the same time you were able to go on the other side of the Disraeli Bridge from Henderson Highway through to the Nairn Overpass and another Waterfront Drive in this magnificent natural feature called the Red River that we have in our City. You know those are certainly wonderful thoughts and great ideas and a great exercise in visioning.

The reality today is that the people of Elmwood and East Kildonan deserve a safe bridge. That's what we're here to talk about. We're here to talk about the fact that our engineers have come to us and said today, we need to do something about this bridge.

So we can stand here and we can say well you need to build another four lane structure or six lane structure. You know certainly we can do that down the road. You can build another parallel structure sometime down the road and you could expand this out to a twinned eight laned piece of infrastructure that meets the needs.

One of the things that we may be throwing away in the world of infrastructure here today is we may not in the future need to be grade separated over Higgins Avenue and the CPR rail line, you know, when you look at the overall development for the area. But today we know we need to do something for the safe transport of people from Elmwood and East K and Transcona into our downtown district.

Somebody referred to the P-3 process and you know I'm just going to go through some of the realities. And referred to a document called "Failed, Flawed and Abandoned P-3s" and in that document they suggest that they've found the Charleswood Bridge in there.

I could tell you if you found the Charleswood Bridge in a document called "Failed, Flawed and Abandoned P-3s" that document is fiction. It is fiction. Those of us that have done our homework, looked at it, saw what happened, how it was done, how it was delivered on time and on budget, know that that would be fiction.

Now, there was also mention of whether or not there was industry capacity. Well right in the report it says "a market sounding was carried out to obtain an indication of the market's receptiveness of this project and to obtain some input relative to the rehabilitation aspect of the project procurement process. Seven companies comprising of local, national

and international firms from both the construction and finance sector of the market were surveyed.

From this exercise it was identified that even considering that this is a rehabilitation project, the project scope, size and full procurement process would attract interest of organizations in the market globally." So we know that there is industry desire to take on this project.

And we can look at other projects in our City whether it's the Provencher Bridge, the Main/Norwood Bridges, the Charleswood Bridge. The Charleswood Bridge will tell us that P-3s actually have gotten things done on time. I don't believe that the other examples have been done on time and on budget. Where we went out and did the work ourselves and borrowed the money, huge escalations. And that's part of the risk analysis that is done.

You know if you want to talk about risk, you know, Councillor Vandal mentioned that this report talks a great deal about risk. What he failed to mention was what it really talks about is value for money.

And there is no better example in our City or in our Province of value for money with P-3s than just looking to the south Perimeter Bridge. This is something that was funded by the taxpayers and done through a normal tendering process. On that bridge that we're now going to have closed for another year or two while the deal with the debacle that's happened out there of improper concrete or improperly spaced concrete and everyone pointing fingers at each other, they didn't deal with risk.

If they would have bought an outcome at the front end, applied a value for money equation and done the Monte Carlo risk simulation process to find out that perhaps a design/build/maintain and you know, a P-3 option, we wouldn't be in this situation. The contractor, the person who came forward with the P-3 would be obligated to deliver the outcome. But that's not the situation that we're in with the south Perimeter Bridge. You don't have to look any further than that.

You know, further on, on the item of risk, I'll just read another chunk out of this report here, "to reinforce the outside business case for the preferred option a preliminary value for money analysis was carried out using the information collected and Deloitte's experience on similar value projects. To do so a risk adjusted public sector comparator is calculated. What this entails is taking the anticipated discounted cash loads associated with the traditional construction model including estimates of the cost of risk associated with this method.

For this particular case, the public sector comparator was derived from the estimated cost developed by the City's engineering consultant during the conceptual design. It was then adjusted for the risk retained under this model based on the current project estimated probable cost plus an addition for risk-related to policy, design, construction and life cycle. Each of these risks was subdivided and an estimated value and probability of occurrence for each of the subdivided risks was put into a Monte Carlo simulation program."

You know Monte Carlo simulations are something that financiers use all the time when you have variables at work. You run the simulation so that you can drill down to the numbers so you can do a proper value for money equation.

You know the fact that many of our colleagues sitting around this table don't understand that and we're sitting here having these lovely political discussions is troubling. We've got a bridge that work needs to get done. The people of Elmwood and East Kildonan need to be able to commute in a safe and effective manner.

Finally I want to make one comment about diamond lanes and yes it would be lovely if we could have a little bit wider bridge here and have diamond lanes on the bridge. Diamond lanes are one tool we use in helping the buses move efficiently.

I would suggest to you that the use of transit traffic signals, bus prioritization

signals, on either end of this bridge at both of those controlled intersections would allow the buses to flow just as quickly on the bridge as if there were added diamond lanes and probably at about 10% of the cost if not less.

So you know, let's not sit here and bandy about the safety of the people of Elmwood and East Kildonan. Let's get to work here, get this job done and let's start looking to the future. You know how do we accommodate building some extra capacity here and perhaps a redesign in the area for…

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

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Swandel: for the general flow of traffic. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to start by saying that I'm happy to know that MLA Maloway is alive and well. Other than his penchant for putting up signs in front of every house in his ward during election campaigns it's the first time I've heard his name in 22 years about any project. So he doesn't do much work outside of Elmwood. But anyway I'm glad he's around.

But you know, before anybody gets drawn into this idea of unencumbered money such as this motion that's coming from East Kildonan I guess suggests. I can tell you that the Provincial government doesn't have any unencumbered money. Every time we go near there we don't get very much as I'm sure you're well aware, particularly at election time.

And if they had a hundred million dollars of unencumbered money I would suggest to you that it would be better spent on some of their sewer projects that they have forced on us and try and keep our sewer and water rates a little lower than having an extra two lanes on the Disraeli Freeway.

We've talked about a lot of things here today or people have, and it's amazing to me how we jump from one thing to the other. First of all, people are saying they don't know what this is going to cost. Well that's natural. If you read it, it says "that the Winnipeg public service be authorized to proceed with the Disraeli Bridge, as a rehabilitation project based on the design/build/finance/maintain delivery model." Well, until you go through that process the numbers don't fall out. So how can you know up front before you go through that process what it's going to cost you?

You have a pretty good idea and our staff does. In fact they're pretty accurate and they believe that their numbers are going to fall somewhere between $120, or pardon me actually $110, $125 to $130 million. We don't really know. We're hoping it is a little lower but nobody is going to know until you go through this process.

So if you can read all these things, and then this issue of the Charleswood Bridge and nobody understanding what it costs. It's in your Budget. It states what we spend every year on that project. The interesting thing about that project and what's never been included in any of the numbers that ever came out of Finance, who didn't agree in the first place with a P-3 model, was the fact that it was going to be maintained for 30 years.

I get phone calls all the time people are saying to me Bill what are they doing on the Charleswood Bridge. They're doing work again. You know like what's going on and there is nothing wrong with it. Well we aren't working on it. The company that owns the bridge is working on it and when I explain that to people, they go oh, well I didn't understand we didn't own the bridge. Well we don't own it and we won't own it until 2025.

And when we get it back in 30 years, guess what? We're going to get it back in year one condition and that's why they're spending their money every year and every second year maintaining the bridge deck and other things.

Heck they even go out and clean the salt off the concrete pathway, whatever you want to call it along the edges, in the spring before we've even started our spring cleanup because they don't want the salt to attack the concrete. Interesting concept but they do this kind of stuff.

So we know what the costs on the Charleswood Bridge are. We also know that they were cheaper than us doing it because the maintenance costs were never ever figured in and I can tell you that they're substantial.

Now how do we operate? We have a Capital Budget that's cash financed. That's how we operate. We don't borrow money. We use cash. We transfer cash from the Current Budget to the Capital Budget and we pay cash for everything. That's how we're operating. That's not a big surprise or shouldn't be around here.

So then you get into a situation where you've only got so much money, even though the Federal government has been pretty generous and the Provincial government has too frankly, with their $25 million. I mean we currently have $65 million dollars, or we will have next year, that we didn't have five years ago. And while it's not as much as we would like to have it's still pretty nice. When you couple that with the roughly $45 million we were spending that's a lot of money to be spending on infrastructure.

But the reality is that it still only goes so far, and then when you get a project like this thrown at you, and it virtually came out of nowhere a couple of years ago, that we had to deal with this. We don't have the capacity within our Capital Budget to deal with this project in a normal fashion.

However, if you look at taking a percentage of the cash we have and use it to cash finance P-3s, we could make it work. And so that's what was recommended to you over a year ago in our Capital Budget, and that's why we went to the P-3 models and went back to them.

Because the only way we could afford to do this project without completely bastardizing our entire capital project, our capital planning document and throwing out three quarters of the initiatives that are in there, we couldn't afford to do this project. Except guess what, we have to. It's one of the key transportation routes in our City.

But you know, this issue, this terrible thing about having it closed for 16 months, the last time I checked, the Redwood Bridge is open and operating fine. So is the Chief Peguis Bridge. So is the Perimeter Bridge. So is the Louise Bridge and Lagimodiere Boulevard for anybody who has to get to south Winnipeg down to Bishop Grandin or something like that is wide open too.

What's the big problem? There's all kinds of accesses in and out of East Kildonan and Elmwood during that 16 month timeframe. At least four or five and most communities don't have that opportunity. This one happens to and that's a good thing. That's not a bad thing. But I don't think that there is any issue there.

As far as this 6% verses 7.2%, what you have to, 7.6%, sorry. What you have to remember in those numbers, once again, is it's not just about cash financing the original project. Inside those numbers is the maintenance of those P-3s for the lifetime of the payout of the P-3. That's built into those numbers. Can I tell you exactly how much that's worth? I can't but I can tell you it's in there and that's what the difference is.

I can also tell you that as far as the Charleswood Bridge went, it was in our Capital Budget for a period of time, three years, three years, three years. Guess what? It got built in one. The private sector can do those kinds of things.

This is all about cash financing. It's all about doing a P-3. That's what this discussion is all about. If you don't agree with P-3s then vote against it. But if you think that we're going to get this bridge rehabilitated without doing it as a P-3, as opposed to wiping out our Capital Budget, you're dreaming in Technicolor. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Clement. No further speakers. Mr. Mayor, do you want to close?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe it's pretty much all been said and I thank Councillor Swandel and Councillor Clement. They covered pretty much almost anything that I may have said so I'll just put a few facts on the table, Mr. Speaker.

The Disraeli Bridge and overpass are both in need of major repair. That's number 1. And by using a P-3 we can avoid the risk of cost overruns, delays, and also make sure that we have the best possible maintenance that you can possibly imagine.

I think the most important thing to remember is that the public service has conducted extensive studies into various options that are available to accomplish this goal, and they find that a P-3 provides the opportunity for savings to the taxpayer of up to 16%. You know you heard all sorts of comments and that was mentioned I believe at least once, but the realities are, savings of up to 16%. As was mentioned earlier, we own and we control the bridge and our risks are eliminated.

But here is the interesting part I find. I mean Mr. Speaker I'm not a pro or a con of P-3s. I am pro the City of Winnipeg. I'm pro of fixing our crumbling infrastructure no matter what part of the City it's in. We need to address that issue.

We all know it's been neglected for over 20 years. This didn't happen overnight. We're trying to fix the problem. Councillor Clement told you how we do it. It's really simple. It's not rocket science and sometimes when I hear people talking about I guess it's the procrastination syndrome. Procrastination is suicide on the installment plan.

I would really like to see Councillor Thomas support this. It's her ward. I believe she wants to see the bridge repaired. Whether that will happen in the end only time will tell. This is something that has to be done.

But here is what I really find amazing sometimes, Mr. Speaker. Is the public service has come up with a recommendation and they recommend we explore P-3s and I think Councillor Clement very nicely told everybody you don't know the price until you put it out there and then you get the price. If Councillor Vandal knows how to get a price without getting the professionals to give it to you, I would very much appreciate him sharing that with me. I don't know how you could do it.

So the public service comes forward, they have a great deal of expertise there, engineers, et cetera. We have accounting firms, consultants giving us reports and so I look around the floor of Council because I hear a lot of criticism and I'm trying to count up all the engineers and all the CA's sitting on the floor of Council. So far, Mr. Speaker, I haven't got past zero. But man is it easy to criticize if you don't like something for whatever the reason may be.

This is something positive, okay. We're not creating something for the sake of doing it. The CAO has consulted with CUPE. The process involved the Stakeholders' Advisory Committee. This was comprised of citizens from the area, business people, all the stakeholders.

I know there are many Councillors on this floor who like us to make sure we get the input from the stakeholders. We did that. They're aware of what's taking place here. Mr. Speaker, this is a good thing. This should be supported unanimously and unfortunately it probably won't be.

But I would be remiss if I did not address one thing, comments from the MLA for the area. I wish that he were here making a presentation because then we would have the opportunity to ask some questions. But you know what, mother taught me if you don't have anything nice to say then don't say anything at all. So I'll try not to say anything at all but I didn't always listen to my mother which I probably should have.

Sometimes I find it very discouraging to hear a MLA and as was mentioned this is

not the first time this is the second time. On the Kelvin Community Club this MLA spent $10,000 on advertising coincidentally tied into an election basically saying call the Mayor, call your Councillors, etc., wanted to save that community club. Do you know how much money this MLA raised for that? Not a penny. Not a penny.

Here is another situation where that certain MLA comes forward and talks about spending between, don't even know, $250, $350 million dollars for a six lane bridge. You can argue the merits of six lanes. I think Councillor Gerbasi explained when it comes to transit and active transportation, there may not be that need there. But I can tell you if you have six lanes that bottleneck into four at both ends of the bridge, you are still going to have problems. There is a bigger picture you have to look at.

But the realities are this MLA has been there forever, a career politician, why they're not in the cabinet you can address yourself, and I believe that the biggest problem we have out there is poor representation from the MLA. Hopefully that will change in the future. One day, maybe, that MLA will have the courage to come before the floor of Council and address an issue that he is making.

I could assure you, Mr. Speaker, if I asked the question of all citizens would you like every sidewalk new, every street new, every bridge new, and active transportation 200 kilometres, I guarantee you I should get a 100% answer yes. Where all that money is going to come from, only God knows because we don't have it. And I don't believe for a moment that the Premier is going to find that money without taking it back from the City of Winnipeg.

So let's not fool ourselves. For once, let's address an issue. Let's do something good. We fixed up the Redwood Bridge and we did it right. Now we're going to do this. Let's do it right.

Forget about what your ideology is. You know I come here saying thank God I don't have an ideology. I've never been a member of any political party. I don't consider myself beholden to anybody. Just want to do the right thing. End of story. If it means union, terrific. If it means private sector, terrific. If it means what Dan Vandal thinks is best, terrific. If it means what Brenda Leipsic thinks is best, terrific. I don't care. Let's just do the right thing.

This is the right thing. We've done it the right way. It will save us up to 16%. It will eliminate all the risk and we can get it done in the period of time for the safety of all the citizens of Winnipeg, of course, including Elmwood and East Kildonan. I have nothing further to say Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. On vote, the vote on Item 4, 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, Clement, Fielding, Leipsic, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas, Vandal.

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

Mr. Speaker: The Item is Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: EPC motions there is one motion. Motion No. 1 by Councillor Swandel and seconded by Fielding. Would you like to address it Councillor Swandel.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Swandel
Seconded by Councillor Fielding

WHEREAS on November 21, 2007, Council adopted Item 2 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 31, 2007, with respect to the subdivision and rezoning of property on the west side of McPhillips Street, north of Templeton Avenue;

AND WHEREAS through clerical error a recommendation was omitted regarding the approval of the plan of subdivision;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council reconsider Item 2 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 31, 2007, as adopted by Council on November 21, 2007, and adopt the following recommendations:

1. That a new recommendation No. 1 be added as follows:

"1. That the plan of subdivision under File DASZ 28/2007 be approved for preparation as a plan of subdivision by a Manitoba Land Surveyor in accordance with Schedule "A" for File DASZ 28/2007 dated September 1, 2007, for registration in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office, subject to the following:

That the Developer be required to enter into a Servicing Agreement with the City containing all the conditions outlined in the report of the Administrative Coordinating Group dated August 28, 2007."

and the balance of the recommendations be renumbered accordingly.

2. That renumbered recommendation No. 2. B. be deleted in its entirety.

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

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker we just, a little bit of housekeeping to be done here. There was apparently a bit of survey information left out of one of our property, or one of the EPC matters regarding property. Everybody has the motion in front of them. I'll move it.

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

EPC Consideration of By-laws Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 65/2008, 95/2008, 96/2008, 97/2008, 100/2008 and 102/2008.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 65/2008, 95/2008, 96/2008, 97/2008, 100/2008 and 102/2008.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that By-laws No. 65/2008, 95/2008 to 97/2008, both inclusive, and 100/2008 and 102/2008, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 65/2008, 95/2008, 96/2008, 97/2008, 100/2008 and 102/2008.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 65/2008, 95/2008 to 97/2008, both inclusive, 100/2008 and 102/2008, 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: Question Period. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Yes Mr. Speaker, my question is with regard to an accessibility issue. A couple of weeks ago I was at the Pavilion in Kildonan Park. I had the misfortune of being on crutches at that time, and I had to use the facilities there, and that necessitated my going outside and down an external ramp to go to the washrooms rather than going inside. There was no ramp inside. There was no elevator. No way to get inside except going outside onto the ramp and this when it was quite slippery.

And talking to the staff there they said that it is actually very dangerous in the wintertime. I had come just after a rain but they said that when it was icy that people on crutches or people in wheelchairs were actually slipping when they had to go outside.

And my question with regard to this is there was $9 million dollars that had been put aside for redevelopment of the Kildonan Park and $3.5 million dollars were supposed to be addressing accessibility issues in the Pavilion and now that $7 million has been moved out of the Kildonan Park rehabilitation what are we going to do to see that …

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, Councillor your question.

Councillor Thomas: That's my question. Now that $7 million dollars has been moved out of the $9 million dollars that were scheduled to go to Kildonan Park, $3.5 was specifically supposed to be for accessibility issues at the Pavilion, what are we going to do to see these accessibility issues are dealt with in a timely manner?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I could say that I will refer that to the chair of the Access Advisory Committee but I would never do that, but I certainly would rely on some input down the road.

Number one, Mr. Speaker, that $7 million dollars was taken away from water features and swimming pools. If there was $3.5 million dollars, and that would have to be verified and I certainly will commit to getting back to Councillor Thomas, it should still be there. My understanding is the $7 million came from other water features we were going to do there. We decided to move it somewhere else and do a major indoor water park facility.

And as far as the access scenario, I certainly will bring it up with the public service and of course I will also talk to Councillor Gerbasi but we can certainly address the issue. I do not believe that the two are tied together whatsoever but we will confirm that and get back to the Councillor.

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

Councillor Thomas: My second question is also with regard to inaccessibility. We're now charging people who have to use the accessibility parking areas on the streets. We never charged people before in the past.

And I had a phone call from a constituent who is going to the St. Boniface Hospital and has to go there for radiation treatments, sometimes as often as three times a day and it's now costing him $6 dollars to park in accessible parking spots that now have meters at it. And he had to go on a disability pension so his income is much reduced and now he's having to pay this. I know we have an independent Parking Authority and I'd really like to know…

Mr. Speaker: Your question Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: what we can do to make sure that people who have legitimate parking signs that they put up that they don't have to pay these exorbitant rates what...

Mr. Speaker: Are you? Councillor Thomas are you talking, are you speaking about the St. Boniface Hospital?

Councillor Thomas: Not just the St. Boniface Hospital but with all the hospitals. The example is with regard to St. Boniface Hospital but if they're having to go for treatments or some kind, what can we do to ensure that these people who are suffering from cancer and other diseases that they need treatment, that they're not gouged by our Parking Authority where, what…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas that, that is…

Councillor Thomas: where they didn't used to be.

Mr. Speaker: If the Mayor wants to answer he can, but this is not within our jurisdiction dealing with the public hospitals. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I will try and address the question. I think first of all I think I need more information from Councillor Thomas. What she may be referring to might be private property that belongs to the hospital and as you know they can charge whatever rate they want to.

So the first thing I would need to know is the specific location and find out whether it's a City lot or it's a lot controlled by the hospital and only then could I give the answer. If it's private property we obviously have no say whatsoever.

So if the Councillor would get me that specific information then I'd be happy to look into it.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sure the Councillor will. You're okay? No further questions? That's it for Question Period. The Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development report of May 2nd, 2008, Councillor Wyatt.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED MAY 2, 2008**

Councillor Wyatt: I'll move Consent of Items 1 and 2, Mr. Speaker.

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

Motions, none. By-laws, none. Question Period. None.

Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development report of April 29th, 2008, Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED APRIL 29, 2008**

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I will move the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 13.

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

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS**

Mr. Speaker: Motions. There is one Motion, Councillor Swandel Motion No. 2, moved by yourself. Councillor Swandel and seconded by Councillor Fielding. Is that pretty well the same thing as what there were?

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Swandel
Seconded by Councillor Fielding

WHEREAS on December 19, 2007, Council adopted Item 4 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated November 27, 2007, with respect to the subdivision and rezoning of property located at 2202 Gallagher Avenue;

AND WHEREAS a recommendation regarding the approval of the plan of subdivision was omitted in error;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council reconsider Item 4 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated November 27, 2007, as adopted by Council on December 19, 2007, and adopt the following recommendation:

1. That a new recommendation No. 1 be added as follows:

"1. That the plan of subdivision under File DASZ 30/2007 be approved for preparation as a plan of subdivision by a Manitoba Land Surveyor in accordance with Schedule "A" for File DASZ 30/2007 dated November 1, 2007, for registration in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office."

and the balance of the recommendations be renumbered accordingly.

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

Councillor Swandel: Yes, Mr. Speaker it's just a clause regarding land surveying was left out of this item as well and I'll move the Motion.

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

Consideration of By-laws Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I will move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 94/2008, 98/2008 and 101/2008.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 94/2008, 98/2008 and 101/2008.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I will move that By-laws No. 94/2008, 98/2008 and 101/2008, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 94/2008, 98/2008 and 101/2008.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I will move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 94/2008, 98/2008 and 101/2008, be read a third time that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions. No questions. We shall continue to the Standing Policy Committee Protection and Community Services report of April 28 of 2008. Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED APRIL 28, 2008

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, regarding the report of April 28, 2008, I'll introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Items No. 1 and 2.

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

Report of May 5th, 2008.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MAY 5, 2008

Councillor Steeves: I would move Item No. 1, the Pesticide Management By-law.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? No. Councillor Smith on number, on Item 1. Councillor Steeves could you just elaborate a little bit before Councillor Smith takes the…

Councillor Steeves: Sure, I'll make my comments now, Mr. Speaker.

Item 1 – Pesticide Management By-law File E

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Okay, thanks. Actually I'm not completely disappointed this item is pulled. I think it bears a little discussion by Council but I'm still confident we can fire our way through this and probably be out by the noon break.

First of all, with respect to the delegations, I think it probably behooves all of to us have just a word about health and medical research. I'll preface my comments Mr. Speaker by disclosing that while the Mayor is quite correct I am not a CA or engineer, nor, I'm actually not a doctor or medical researcher either, despite the fact that my Council colleagues will often seek out my wisdom when it comes to matters (inaudible) I feel obliged to disclose that the medical degree on my wall was actually done by my six year old daughter and the medicine I've been giving you is nothing more than Pepto Bismol and cheap Irish whiskey, really.

Although it also should be said that nobody else here, that's appeared in delegation is a medical expert either. And we have been looking at the issue of pesticides and human health for quite a few years here at the City of Winnipeg and to the best of my layperson's ability of looking at the research Mr. Speaker, I feel obliged to inform this Council directly and dispassionately that right now, in the country of Canada, there does not appear to be any direct link, medically proven between normal and responsible application of pesticides and human health.

It is correct to say that if somebody ingests a pesticide directly there are doubtless going to be medical ramifications negative to that person. But there is no credible body that has stepped forward and said that use of pesticides in the community will result in this ailment and cause these effects to human health. That doesn't exist.

I should also say that this research was not done by the City of Winnipeg. This research is never done by the City of Winnipeg. We don't have this type of a capacity on staff. We of course rely on research that's done by the Federal government of Canada and to a lesser extent the Provincial government of Manitoba.

The Federal government as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, has left in place a regime wherein the use of the pesticides that are mentioned in our By-law are in fact legal within the country of Canada and are in fact as everyone around this Council table knows, sold widely in retail outlets across this country.

It is, I think, incorrect to compare the medical evidence with respect to something like smoking with respect to the medical evidence with respect to something like pesticides. Candidly, Mr. Speaker, the medical evidence suggesting that there is proven, human harm based on people smoking is much more direct, and much more proven than in the realm of pesticides. I don't think anybody would argue that.

Having said all of that, Mr. Speaker and as I said at Executive Policy Committee I think it probably does behoove this Council and makes some sense for this Council to adopt a precautionary type principle in the use of pesticides. Even though we haven't, or the medical establishment hasn't established that direct link as of yet, there are, it's true, some unexplained increases in certain ailments in our population. Things like asthma rates, allergy rates and the like.

They have not been, despite comments to the contrary, directly linked to certain illnesses. But, they are unexplained. And it's true to suggest that pesticides are under suspicion with respect to some of these things. That is an objective and again, dispassionate lay of the land when it comes to pesticides, Mr. Speaker. That's where we're at in terms of the medical research.

The ban experiment that has been done in certain cities, I have to tell you, in places like Halifax, Hudson Quebec and to a lesser degree in other cities, really

has come into question. It was suggested at Committee, and there is reason to believe that it's true although it's very, very hard to prove these things one way or another, that banning the use of pesticides within a community while they are still on sale in retail outlets throughout that City, actually has virtually no effect on the use of those pesticides in that City.

And in fact, merely drives the use of those pesticides away from professional applicators into the hands of private citizens who I would respectfully submit Mr. Speaker, know less about proper application than people who apply them every day.

The By-law although criticized by the delegation as doing nothing, actually does something. It requires that professional applicators when they do so have to put up a sign that's lists the application of whatever of the five chemicals that are being applied to that lawn or that garden in those circumstances. That way people in the community will be aware of what's being applied and it will be there for a 24 hour period post application.

In my opinion what that will accomplish is that will raise the awareness in the community of these chemicals and that they are being applied and people who are not comfortable can take whatever measures that they deem appropriate but at least they will know that they have been applied.

A fair comment that was made by the delegation is what do we do in the case of private applicators and that's challenging because I can tell you it is very, very difficult for the City to insert itself into the relationship that a private citizen has with a retail outlet.

Unlike the malathion bans and the buffer zones it's not a case where somebody will contact the City and the City is the organization that is actually doing the application. If we're doing the application it's frankly very easy for us to enforce the buffer zone, isn't it. It is quite another matter entirely if what has to happen here is that someone has to contact us about a buffer zone and that we have to somehow suss out the surrounding area, talk to those people and say well now you can't go to the store and make an application yourself. Very, very difficult to do, arguably illegal, and at the end of the day, how successful would it really be? Enforcement I would argue, impossible. Absolutely impossible.

That's why we're doing what we're doing with respect to this By-law here. It's not an attempt to evade any responsibility. It's an attempt to do what we think we can do responsibly and properly as a City and we can follow up on it. That's all it is.

The education component and I'm not sure what type of public meeting my friend Nick Ternette was talking about but if you can only hold one public meeting for $10,000 I would submit that you have to review your food budget for that meeting. You can actually do a lot for $10,000. You can have a lot of public meetings. I've never seen a public meeting, unless you take into account, really grandiose advertising schemes, cost more than a couple of hundred dollars. It doesn't cost that much at all.

This By-law is worth supporting for all the reasons that I have laid out. Contrary to what was said it does a lot more than nothing. This will be a real step in the process of educating our public, raising awareness and putting in place a cautious regime of trying to deal with these chemicals that we have concerns about in our community.

We're not laying ourselves out to some by-law that everyone around this table knows we could never enforce. We can do this. And this will help. And for people around this table who in their heart of hearts may wish to have a ban of those chemicals, then this is not that. And as my colleague Councillor Clement stated in the previous debate, if that is what you are looking for through this By-law then I'm not going to try to trick you. It's not that.

I want to thank my colleague Councillor Gerbasi. I know this has been difficult for her. Some of her traditional allies have abandoned her and left her to stand alone

with some untraditional, perhaps friends, in terms of policy. But I can tell you that I support what she has done with respect to this report and this By-law. I think what she has done is, contrary to some things that I sometimes see my good friend from Fort Rouge doing, she has attempted to truly build a consensus on this item. And I'm fairly confident that when the time comes to stand up yea or nay on this issue that her methods will have proven true and that consensus will in fact have been built.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, it was interesting, I was talking with Councillor Leipsic about this clause and she gave me an ad that she had torn out of the newspaper. Let me quote the ad. "Last week the City Council approved", we didn't approve it, it was the EPC, "approved the new Pesticide By-law and there is no watering required. The By-law is already watered down." And that's very, very true.

You know, the clause lists five chemicals. Let me tell you, Halifax has a by-law and it reads "any substances intended, sold or represented for use in preventing, destroying, repelling or mitigating directly or indirectly any pest." That's a lot clearer. They have exceptions. But that's a lot better than what we're putting forward. They also say "commencing on April 2003 no person shall carry out or permit or suffer to be carried out a pesticide application within the Halifax regional municipality." Very clear-cut.

Now, I should point out that, like we you know, Councillor Steeves said that these bans by cities are not effective. But you have to ask why is Toronto, why is Halifax, why are other centres having bans? And that's because they are concerned about the health of their citizens.

Barbara, "Dr. Barbara Yaffe, the acting Medical Director of Health, told Toronto Councillors she believes pesticides pose a significant health risk by increasing rates of cancer, causing birth defects and contributing to learning and reproductive problems. She went on to say at this point, I believe the evidence is similar to what we had for smoking years ago. In 1964 the United States Surgeon General presented his report on tobacco. It took 30 more years before we could definitely say there was a causative effect but the evidence today is looking that way for pesticides, Dr. Yaffe said."

But you know, there are so many things wrong with this By-law. For example, even the signage. You know. In Halifax they insist it be on bright yellow paper. They insisted that it bear the words in letters black in colour of at least a 24 point type. They made it very clear. They also have, I don't have it here, but they also have a symbol, we have, our clause is a symbol encouraging caution. Halifax says warning pesticides in use and the symbol of a skull and cross bone at least 4 and a half inches in diameter. So even the signage in their By-law is clearer for anyone who sees the sign.

Now the whole idea of the education campaign and obviously we have to have an education campaign. But $10,000 is very, very little. Quoting the report, "there are many options for public education campaigns. As an example, the City of Toronto launched a large campaign which included bill boards, posters, advertising in the local media, point of purchase information in retail locations and both a dedicated website and a telephone information line. Other cities have chosen to do smaller campaigns."

And then it goes on to say "recognizing the City's fiscal capacity the public service recommends working with community organizations with proven capacity in delivering environmental education. At the present time this would be most economically effective means of increasing public awareness".

Let me tell you this you know, they have budgets, too. They have a tough time having adequate funds and we have no indication how great a campaign they would have. You know, $10,000 is very, very little. If you, if you took what Councillor Steeves had to say that we should have a campaign, why don't we do a decent campaign? Why don't we

allocate sufficient funds to wage a campaign? Relying on community organizations is not going to do the trick with $10,000, whatever, however you spend it.

So this, you know, we pass this clause, it looks like we're doing something but we're doing very little. In fact, it would be far better for us to go ahead and tackle this issue and present to Council a by-law that had some teeth and then, that did something. You know, it's embarrassing. You noticed there was no opposition from the insecticide companies. No one is opposed because they are in agreement. And this agreement is based on doing very little. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Mr. Speaker, when the chair rose to speak on this matter he lost my vote. How many times will a man turn his head and pretend that he just doesn't see? I'll tell you. DDT, Agent Orange, Ally, pesticides, herbicides, defoliants, that have been banned and why were they banned? Because they killed people. And there have been tests that have been done if you are in any doctor's office and have to wait for a bit, I'll tell you, I've had the opportunity to read trade magazines and there are plenty of research that says that pesticides are a problem. There are plenty of doctors speaking out who say that this is a problem.

And I thought well the first thing we could do is warn people and that would be great. But when I heard the comments of the chair of this Committee, I realized that this step was as far as the chair was willing to go and that we would have to have many deaths before this Committee would do more, this Council would do more. And I don't think we can go that slow.

I'm just amazed at tiptoeing along through the tulips here, and you really do have to tiptoe because you could step on something that's a contaminant and your children and your grandchildren could and this is not good.

I couldn't believe the comments that were coming out of the chair's mouth on this report and it scared me. It scared me good and made me say to myself why am I supporting an advertising campaign when there are so many cities that are supporting so much more and I said, no, I'm off of it. I thought this was going to be a good first step and I realize that there is not going to be any more done and I have to say, stop. This is stupid. We can't do this little and wash our hands. This is not right and I won't have anything to do with this. I'm done. I'm not voting for this.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, you know, when I took on the Standing Policy Committee I raised the issue, we had a Sub-committee on Pesticides that had been in place and nothing actually happened from that before. I took on the issue and decided that I would try to do something, and I realize everyone isn't happy with it and in fact I'm not thrilled with it myself, because I believe that we should be reducing pesticides. That's why I took on the work of this Sub-committee. So, and I respect my colleagues who aren't happy with it. I too was a bit taken aback by the chair's words and I find them somewhat discouraging because he is indicating that he isn't convinced himself of how serious of a health issue this is and I think that's unfortunate.

But, I do believe that pesticide use is a serious health risk. I come from a public health background and that's what drove me to do this work on this issue. That's the only thing that drove me to do work on this issue, is that I believe, and I have a buffer zone when we fog for mosquitoes, I myself have a buffer zone. I don't believe in using these pesticides personally and I don't believe in it professionally in terms of what we should be doing as a City. So I just want to make that clear in case anybody thinks otherwise from some of the comments you're hearing.

One of the, I'd like to take you back to when we brought in the ban on smoking in enclosed public places. We did take a first step before it was banned in bars as

many of you remember and there wasn't support on Council for it, to do anything at first when Councillor Lubosch first brought it forward. There wasn't support from the Province and it seemed very difficult, politically, to try to get anything done. There was an initial by-law that came forward, banning smoking and they ended up banning it to where kids weren't allowed in and it sort of backfired and it was kind of silly and it didn't really work.

But what happened was is the discussion happened. There was two days of public hearings. There was a lot of discussion, there was increased awareness from the public and from members of Council and eventually, we made the by-law stronger and eventually, the Province brought in a Province-wide ban. And now you don't even think about being around smoke in a bar, there's no problem and yet it seemed impossible politically.

So if anybody wonders what I'm up to here, is I'm trying to get a ban on pesticides but we have to start with some steps, and we have to have nine votes at least, and we have to have public buy-in and we have to have political buy-in from preferably both levels of government. So I just want people to understand what my motivation is here today.

In terms of the research, it's unfortunate that Councillor Steeves wasn't able to attend the two days of public hearings because we heard from a lot of people with a lot of expertise. We heard from people on both sides of the issue and there was no doubt, there is no doubt and I don't think there would be any doubt in anybody's mind if they spent those two days listening to that evidence. And I think that's unfortunate that not everyone was able to see that information or wasn't able to take the time.

The problem is that pesticides, it's not even just, yes we have a regulator, Health Canada and they regulate things. But the problem is that they don't go into the research in terms of how they interact with each other. How they build up and how these chemicals build up in the human body.

And so, Councillor Steeves referred to the precautionary principle, which is a very important principle, which has driven many of the provincial and municipal by-laws across the country, is that we don't know these products are safe and we have a pretty darned good reason to think they are not. Why are we allowing them? Are we going to wait, you know, and count the bodies later or are we going to prevent this? Because we know it's a problem. And so, the precautionary principle means we don't, you know, really means a ban on pesticides.

I would like to point out that the Province of Quebec has a ban on pesticides and they have a significantly lower level of pesticide use than anyone else, any other province in Canada, it's something like 17% compared to 48% or something in Manitoba. And the reason they do is because they've taken it off the store shelves, as well as banning it. Halifax, for your information, actually there was a show on Marketplace two days ago, and they are saying that because it's still available on store shelves in Halifax it is not as effective.

So one of the things that I hope to do here, I hope we will see here, and the Mayor has asked me to work with the Province on this, which I appreciate being asked. And you know, I don't have a magic wand and none of us do, but sometimes policies that you think may never happen, can in fact happen if you just keep working away at it. Just like we will see rapid transit in Winnipeg, I believe we will also see a ban on pesticides in the Province of Manitoba. But if you don't try, you certainly won't see it.

So, this By-law today, yes, it's not banning pesticides, I'm aware of that but it is expanding our public education campaign and there is also, I also took the liberty of talking to the Province about adding more funding to the public education component, which my understanding will mostly be organic lawn care workshops and education and that sort of thing, as opposed to public consultation about whether pesticides are bad because we know they're bad and we've had that information and I think we

know smoking is bad too and we've had those consultations. What we need to do is get people to look at alternatives to using pesticides and what we need to do is get them off the shelves.

And I know Councillor Leipsic is very supportive. I know Councillor Smith is supportive and Councillor Thomas and others are convinced that we should be getting these pesticides out of our community and we're all trying to find a way to effectively do that. So, I hope that we can accomplish that.

So, I would, I would like to, I think a lot of the questions have already been discussed, answered about you know, the buffer zone issue. It's not really effective. I think that that was discussed with some of the activists who in the drafting of the by-law I thought they understood that. The real thing is a ban and that's what we all want and we're not getting that yet.

So, in closing, I guess voting against a public education ban for pesticides I guess you are making a statement that it doesn't go far enough. You're entitled to make that statement. I would like it see more organic lawn care workshops, I'd like to see more awareness, and we do have to start there. Winnipeg does kind of have a culture of being addicted to the use of chemicals for mosquitoes, for lawns, for all these things. And I think we have to start changing that and I think that changes when the leaders stand up and talk about it and take it out of the closet and look at the evidence.

And that's what this process, and I would also like to acknowledge Councillor Pagtakhan who was on the sub-committee with me and attended the two days of meetings, listening to the community people, the experts. And you know we came out of there quite convinced that action needs to be taken and obviously, this By-law, it is baby steps but I think the whole exercise is important in itself. I mean, I've had people come up to me in suits who you wouldn't even think, live in the suburbs, coming up saying you know I don't want it use pesticides anymore. What can I do? Pets, that's another issue.

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

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: We had the Humane Society came forward and I think a lot of people heard that, you know it's pretty shocking how many pets have died. We all know, I don't know, I certainly know of many pets that have died personally and families I know. And you know, I have a little grandchild crawling around in the grass.

I think we all need to be concerned about this as a public health issue. It's really not, in my mind, a political issue it's really a public health issue. And I think the Province has the power to really do something significant because Quebec has done it and they've got their pesticide use rate down to 17%. That's incredible compared to 48%. Ontario is talking about a province-wide ban.

So since we talked about this a year ago even, the world is starting to change or Canada is starting to change. And so I think there is more hope that the Province will come on board. But unless we take that step and ask for that and really try to go for the best possible by-law which means taking it off the store shelves, I would like to try to go for that and if we can get that I think it will really make a difference to the health of Winnipeggers.

So, I thank you and I hope you spend some time learning more about this issue as it evolves and watch what's happening on the Canadian scene and in the news because it's a real evolving issue and I think we can do something really important here. And I'm willing to do some work on that and if anyone else wants to join me in talking to their Provincial representative and coming up with solutions and ideas to help with this, any of my colleagues here, I'd truly appreciate your help. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors it's 12:00 o'clock and we have two more speakers plus the chair will close. We have one

item on the Public Works and also a sort of a band-aid thing we did with the Secretariat Committee.

Councillor Swandel: I move we continue.

Mr. Speaker: We continue? All in favour? Okay, we continue. Councillor Leipsic, you are next.

Councillor Leipsic: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll begin by just saying I'm certainly not an environmental expert or a medical expert, and I haven't done the surveying and research that has to be done in this area. I know this though and it's something you can't avoid. There is a dramatic increase today in pediatric cancers, birth defects, adult cancers, asthma, which I now have, you know, there is no history of asthma in my family. Why are so many people suffering from the allergies and asthma now? I believe Councillor Swandel also is joining that select group of people with asthma problems. So, where is this all coming from? Well I stopped smoking a long time ago, Councillor.

The situation with animals is something that you just can't avoid. I personally also had to put a dog down a year ago that I had had for many years, suffering from, I'd never heard of this, nose cancer, and why? The vet said there is dramatic increases everywhere in cancers in dogs, particularly nose, because of the fact that they're out and that's what they do when they're out walking. They're sniffing constantly. But they also pick this up on their paws and their bodies because they lick themselves clean.

The vet at the Humane Society will tell you, there is something happening, if there isn't recorded absolute proof, something is going on. Pesticide residue lasts. Scientists have found it in dog urine 7 to 10 days after dogs being near an area that was sprayed. Walls can be scraped 10 days later and have pesticide on them still.

I understand Councillor Gerbasi starting the process and Councillor Pagtakhan, and I commend them for hearing at least over 50 delegations. But I ask her now to seek further action working with the Province, the City can't do this alone and we can't, this is a, this is the beginning. I will support this because it's a beginning but we need so much more done. And I just would like to be recorded as someone who is seeking that.

So I think we all have to remember too, that as elected representatives we are supposed to be leading and have the courage to lead for the betterment of all Winnipeg, and some things might not be popular with certain pockets of people, but we're supposed to be here for the betterment of the citizens of Winnipeg.

And I wish Councillor Gerbasi good luck and if I could help in any way get the Province involved, we have to have that. It can't happen just within the City boundaries. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I won't be supporting this clause today, for a number of reasons. Let me start by just saying I look at it as a bit of a waste of taxpayer's money. It's very difficult to enforce and probably impossible to gain a conviction. If somebody were to put a sign up and the sign was to disappear, you know who is to say who took the sign away or even if one existed in the beginning.

So I don't, there is no effectiveness in this. So you know, we're going to create a situation where you know, we have a by-law that says people have to do something but there is no way, really no way for us to police or enforce this. You know, so I don't see the By-law as having any impact.

I want to say that, you know, I want to give a little bit of support to my good colleague from St. Vital here, I saw the wind get knocked out of his sails when Councillor Thomas suggested that she wasn't going to support this motion and that troubled me greatly to see him knocked down so.

But, I did listen to the logic of his argument and the statements that he put

forward and I think I understand what he was trying to say and from an overall perspective, there is a difference between where the medical community stands today on smoking and the information that it has, and where it stands on pesticides and the information that it has and the level that it's willing to go to make that a solid statement, is what I heard out of all of that.

But I will say that you know there is enough anecdotal information out there and I know I have a friend who loved using a chemical called Par 3 on his vast open spaces of yard that he had to keep the dandelions off of it and other weeds and I know that his dog did not live a very long time after the multiple applications of that chemical. And it was some form of cancer that took the dog. So that's just one simple example and I'm sure there is others, and somebody mentioned Councillor Lubosch's dog earlier on.

So you know, I think what we need to be doing is moving towards elimination. I don't like to use the term ban. We might, some of us might recall Councillor Eadie in this chamber years ago, the last time this item came up saying "from my cold dead hands they'll pry my Weed-Ex." We've certainly moved a long way as a society from that type of representation to the anecdotal information today telling us that we need to be doing more.

What I would strongly advocate and I know Councillor Gerbasi you're going to be going forward and dealing with the Province, as a starting point, some level of taxation. You know, an enviro tax, a levy that can be used with the aluminum cans and other disposable containers for liquids. You know, a substantial one not your 2% or whatever, but perhaps 25% that would go towards funding education and perhaps subsidizing alternative methods.

So you know, one of the places you know you look, somebody mentioned composting, I don't know whether it was Glenda Whiteman or Nick when they spoke, mentioned composting. Every year in the City of Winnipeg we do a little bit of subsidizing, getting composters out there to people and we get some out into the marketplace and get the costs down to $25. There is more things like that that we could be doing.

I guess just in closing, you know, the comments that Councillor Gerbasi made about pets and children. These products whether you're applying directly in the ground or spraying them in the air, the particles ultimately end on the ground and those around us that are closest to the ground are our pets and our children. And I think when you take that perspective we know we need to be doing more. I don't think is this effective and I don't think it's an effective use of taxpayer dollars. I agree with the tone and intent and the logic of why it came to this but I won't be supporting it because I don't think we can really effectively apply and enforce what is in front of us here today.

Mr. Speaker: The chair will you please close, Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I will. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you everybody for your comments. As chair of the Committee, I feel that my responsibility here is to try to rely on the truth and what is actually available in terms of good science for the Committee. That's been my goal and for better or for worse that's what I've tried to achieve, both as chair of the Committee, as a Councillor and as an individual.

I will distance myself from the comments of my colleagues, Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Thomas. For someone to say there is no doubt that these chemicals used in our society are harming people, or for somebody to say that these chemicals are causing quote unquote, "many deaths", are statements that simply are not borne out in fact or in medical research.

And I think as citizens of this great nation, one of the most developed nations in the world, what are we really saying here? That we as a Council know that these chemicals are causing, as my colleagues have said every year, many deaths, but yet the government of Canada is still sanctioning the use of these chemicals. Is

that really what we're saying? Do we really believe that? I hope we don't believe that. I don't think any medical body of any credibility really believes that.

There is a toxic soup out there I suppose, it has been termed of chemicals and its aspartame, there's hair spray, there's margarine, diesel fuel, perfume, different forms of plastics. All of these chemical have had the finger pointed at them and said this is the cause. Allergy rates coming up in kids, this is why. Asthma rates rising, this is why. Nobody has ever said this chemical is causing this affliction. And I have looked exhaustively to try to find that evidence.

Now, Health Canada in the past, Mr. Speaker has banned certain chemicals. We all recall as citizens, the horrible tragedy that was something like for example, thalidomide, the horrible things that caused in our society, obviously that's been banned for use, et cetera, because of what was proven to be the case. These chemicals that we are, and a good point no one wants to go through that. But it has to be said, and I have a tough time making this point without sounding like someone from a lobby group for Pfizer or something like that.

But the truth is these chemicals that have been used for decades now in our society, have something of a track record. If in fact many deaths were occurring as a result of the use of these chemicals, I would think that by now that link would have exhaustively been proven. Now again, I make perfect room for the possibility that new information might come forward which is why we as a Council have to act in a precautionary stance. We have to take some steps. But, I do not think that the medical evidence exists for us to say this is causing this, right now, today. And that is the reason that this report, By-law, is not calling for a ban.

But what this Council is saying by endorsing this report and this By-law is that although we can't make that conclusive link, we have concerns. And it makes sense that the step we would take would not be all the way to a complete ban, but it would be a step somewhere up to there. That makes sense I think for this Council.

The comparison for smoking bothers me. We think back. Smoking. Yes, absolutely. I guess the authorities in Canada dickered back and forth with this and at some point came up with the realization that now we know conclusively that this is bad for you and it does cause lung cancer. And it does cause lung cancer, we know that.

So what has the Federal government done? Obviously they banned smoking, right? They made it illegal to smoke, correct Mr. Speaker? Because we know it causes lung cancer, they made it illegal to smoke, right? No. Nor has Health Canada banned sugar or alcohol and we know darn well those two components cause trouble in our society as well.

The point is Mr. Speaker, in this country we know that we have concerns about a bunch of different things that we voluntarily allow people to use. We know that today, x-number of people are going to start smoking in Canada, and we know that because we as a nation allow them to start smoking, that they may well die of lung cancer. But yet, for some reason, as a free society we allow people to make these types of choices. What is the reason for allowing smoking? Could someone make that argument for me, Mr. Speaker? Some delegation come down and make an argument that people should be allowed to smoke. Cause I can tell you, cause and effect, smoking will cause x-number of deaths this year, tomorrow, this week, this month.

It's difficult. It's difficult, and it's challenging. But these are things that we do in a free and democratic society. As strange as they might be or strange as they might seem to people who don't live in a free and democratic society.

I am hoping that people who are inclined to not support this today will look past some of these issues that they have, and they'll look past some of these walls that have been built here on Council, they'll look past some of the reactionary things that are said and they will come to the

objective and clear acknowledgment that this, in fact, is a lot better than doing nothing, if you are indeed a person who is concerned about the use of pesticides in our community.

People in Elmwood, St. James, St. Vital, St. Boniface, Charleswood, Fort Rouge, will be walking down the street in their communities they will now see a varia of signs that are up telling them that certain chemicals are being applied. It will get them thinking about what is going on in their neighbourhood and it will help advance this debate.

If you don't vote for this report, and if you don't vote for this By-law, and if you do care about this issue, which I know you all do especially the folks who have registered some concern, then you're cutting off your nose, Mr. Speaker, to spite your face.

Mr. Speaker: Fine speech, Councillor Steeves, as the chair you have convinced me.

On the vote on Item 1. Recorded vote has been called for.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Smith, Swandel, Thomas.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 3.

Mr. Speaker: The clause is Carried.

Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Steeves.

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

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I move that By-law No. 99/2008 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2008.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-law No. 99/2008 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2008.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move the rules be suspended and By-law No. 99/2008 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions. None. Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, Councillor Clement, report of May 1 of 2008.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED MAY 1, 2008**

Councillor Clement: I'll move the agenda of May 1st, 2008 and move Item 1 as Consent.

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

Motions, none. Consideration of By-laws, none. Question Period, none.

We will now go into the Committee on Finance. There is no report. No Motions. No By-laws and I believe no questions.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 21, 2008

Mr. Speaker: The final one, Councillors, before we adjourn, this is a report from the Secretariat Committee and I'll ask Councillor Browaty to do that on my behalf.

This we dealt with at the Secretariat Committee and it was fine tuning. Also we dealt with the, with the report as was presented and we're asking for the, some of the minor changes that have been made for acceptance. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I would like to move the report of April 21st and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour?

Councillor Wyatt: Point of Order Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Wyatt: I'm assuming that you're talking here with regards to the By-laws that you're amending is that correct? That are attached to this Procedure By-law?

Mr. Speaker: This is the introduction to the report. There is a report. A report and then we will be dealing with the Consideration of By-laws. The report itself is explanatory.

Councillor Wyatt: It would, if I could Mr. Speaker it would be helpful if there could be an explanation given of what some of these changes being made, what the logic is or reasoning.

Mr. Speaker: I'll just cut some corners here. I'll ask the City Clerk to give us a brief on this so you'll have a better understanding as to what is in the report. Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk: Mr. Speaker, it is as presented, the majority of these changes are practices that we employ already. We began with Decorum, making sure that the By-law reflected our audio/visual requirements within the chamber.

In terms of Person's Permitted to the Chamber, while the CAO is invited to attend meetings, we ensure that he shall attend meetings.

In terms of Question Period, we corrected some of the wording within the Question Period sections to ensure that questions could be asked that are germane to the specific Standing Policy Committee.

With regards to the Motion to Refer, there was wording that existed prior there was misleading and some Councillors questioned whether a motion to be referred to a member of the administration, so we clarified that.

With regards to Committee of the Whole, there is some clarification, introducing that it would require a two-thirds majority to go into Committee of the Whole.

And with regards to Suspension of the rules to hear delegations, we implemented a rule that allowed for delegations to speak for five minutes with no questions by Council, which is currently the practice.

Mr. Speaker: Okay?

Councillor Wyatt: I would like to have the item stand. I would like speak to the item.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead you're first. Speak.

Councillor Wyatt: I don't know if Councillor Browaty is finished?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, well, Councillor Browaty… Look, Councillors, we were dealing with this issue at length, it's not the first time we had to, you know some issues were raised. And I asked Councillor Browaty and I know you have a concern so let's hear your concern Councillor Wyatt and…

Councilor Wyatt: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Councillor Wyatt: Well my main concern and some of the items are very

straightforward. Audio/visual equipment in the gallery that makes sense. Requiring the CAO to be present at a Council meeting makes sense.

I guess my concerns Mr. Speaker relate to, and I think there has to be a clear understanding to all the Councillors of what we're voting on here today and what they are actually approving is with regards to the first concern is in Question Period with regards to what does it really imply by eliminating the word "not" and being specific to questions relating to Standing Committees verses Sub-committees and commissions and wards of Council?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like, you know I'm a little hesitant to introduce and start changing what traditionally has been part of Roberts Rules of Order but the system where we're looking at here with regards to going to a two-thirds majority to go into Council of the Whole. Council or Committee of the Whole is something which I think a simple vote of a majority should be sufficient. To require two-thirds I question that move. I don't understand the necessity of it. And so I'm concerned with the direction that we're going with regards to these changes.

So that's, those are my comments. I would prefer to have the matter, I've spoken to it now so I can't refer it back but I would prefer if it could be referred back for more discussion amongst Councillors because I don't think Councillors really have had a chance to really look at this to be quite honest with you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty, Councillor Wyatt, each and every member of the Secretariat Committee is a representative and you have your Councillor who is representing you, you should have asked him before. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll just speak for a minute. I would like to move referral back. There is no rush on this. If any Councillor still has questions. Not everyone attends Secretariat Committee. I would like to refer it back and then it can just come back if our questions can be answered satisfactorily. Thank you. I move referral.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi moves referral to the next meeting of Council. All in, I'll make it to the Secretariat.

Councillor Steeves: Can I ask one question? Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Councillor Steeves: Can I just get verification that is there no harm done if we refer back in terms of timing.

Mr. Speaker: No. None whatsoever. It's fine tuning the process that's in place right now. Okay, it's been moved to refer back to the Secretariat Committee.

And Councillors, may I suggest that some of you attend the Secretariat meeting when this will be brought on our agenda. Then you'll have, Councillor Wyatt you in particular will have a full understanding as to what we're trying to do.

So this has been asked to be referred.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 12:25 p.m.