COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday October 22, 2008

The Council met at 9:36 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Wyatt.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Pages – we have Rory Mitchell of Kelvin High School resides in Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward. Would you make yourself visible? Thank you. Welcome. Welcome of Guests and Announcements. We have Duncan McMonagle and Stephen Vogelsang, Journalism Instructors, Red River College, and the class of journalism students. I believe they're all here. Welcome.

A leave of absence motion, Madam Clerk.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Steeves
Seconded by Councillor Swandel

That Councillor Leipsic be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to a personal family matter.

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

We have a second leave of absence motion.

Moved by Councillor Vandal
Seconded by Councillor Browaty

That Councillor Thomas be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to illness.

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

MINUTES

Councillor Nordman moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on September 24, 2008 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: Delegations. We have a number of delegations. Some will be getting 10 minutes. I'm sorry. Councillor Steeves, I believe you want to address (inaudible).

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. On a point of order, there is a motion…a notice of motion…that's been brought by one of my colleagues, Councillor Gerbasi. I'll call it the Ethics Motion for want of a better term. I'm not sure what the term is. I've spoken to Councillor Gerbasi and others on Council. There's another motion which is similar under the same vein if you would Mr. Speaker. It's Motion No. 2, numbered No. 2 under the Executive Policy Committee. I don't know if the motion will, at the end of the day, receive the support of Council but I do believe that there is consent generally on Council that the rules be suspended and this motion be heard today alongside the Ethics Motion as it is of a similar vein. I might ask, given there's delegations perhaps to speak on it, that it be accepted now so that delegations can address both motions if that pleases the Council.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves are you moving a motion to suspend the rules? For that motion to be put on the table to be heard? Councillors you've heard that. All in favour of Councillor Steeves motion? A recorded vote has been called for. The motion is No. 2. Councillor Steeves and Councillor Fielding.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Steeves,
Seconded by Councillor Fielding,

WHEREAS all Members of Council under the "The City of Winnipeg Charter" must sign a "Declaration of Office" that indicates they will truly, faithfully, and impartially, to the best of their knowledge and ability, execute the office to which they have been elected and not have received, and will not receive any payment or reward, or the promise of payment or reward, for the exercise of partiality, corruption or other improper execution of the office;

AND WHEREAS "The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act" requires that when members of a municipal council or their dependents have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in a matter that comes before Council or a Council committee, they must disclose it, withdraw from the meeting and refrain from attempting to influence the matter;

AND WHEREAS "The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act" takes considerable effort to set out what constitutes a direct or indirect pecuniary interest and a violation of the Act can result in forfeiture of the councillor's seat;

AND WHEREAS all Members of Council are obligated to provide a "Statement of Assets and Interests" under "The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act";

AND WHEREAS a member of the electorate or, upon instructions from Council, the City Clerk may apply to the Court of Queen's Bench for a declaration that the member of council has violated this Act;

AND WHEREAS "The City of Winnipeg Charter", declares the City Auditor responsible for determining whether "operations of the city are carried on, and money is expended, with due regard for economy and efficiency" and whether "satisfactory procedures have been established to measure, and report to council on the achievement of, economy and efficiency in the conduct of operations of the city and each affiliated body";

AND WHEREAS the Provincial Ombudsman has authority to investigate "any decision or recommendation made, including any recommendation made to a council, or any act done or omitted, relating to a matter of administration in or by any municipality or by any officer or employee of a municipality, whereby any person is or may be aggrieved";

AND WHEREAS the "Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act" deals with what government information is required to be released to the public and the protection of personal information from being publicly released;

AND WHEREAS City Council adopted a Code of Conduct in September of 1994 that established Principle Guidelines that required:

- *Members shall not engage in any activity, financial or otherwise, which is incompatible with the proper discharge of his/her official duties in the public interest;*
- *Members must disclose any business or interest which may give rise to a reasonable apprehension of conflict. A Member shall not accept a fee, gift, personal benefit, except compensation authorized by law, that is connected directly or indirectly with the performance of his or her duties of office. This does not apply to a gift of personal benefit that is received as an incident of the protocol or social obligation that normally accompany the responsibilities of office;*
- *Members shall not use or disclose any information gained in the execution of his/her office that is not available to the general public for any purpose other than his/her official duties;*
- *Members shall not use influence of office for any purpose other than his/her official duties;*
- *Members shall not use the services or resources of civic employees in any private or personal business or for his/her re-election during hours in which these employees are in the paid employment of the City;*
- *and Members shall respect the legislative and administrative*

regulations governing the decision-making mechanisms of the City.

AND WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba through the Premier has indicated in the media that "the bottom line is there is a Municipal Conflict of Interest law in Manitoba. It applies to the City of Winnipeg. It is a law that provides for disclosure for any elected official and the provision for withdrawing from any decision making. If anybody feels that law has been offended in any way, there are the remedies in the law. There is a public debate going on at City Hall and that's where it belongs. The bottom line is there is a law. And the law applies to every councillor in Manitoba, it applies to every Mayor in Manitoba, and it doesn't depend upon the debate of the day. It depends upon an issue where people fail to disclose or fail to withdraw from the decision making";

AND WHEREAS the Secretariat Committee's functions have been established in the Organizational By-law to include among its purposes:

- *To resolve non political issues between Councillors.*
- *To resolve difficulties between Councillors and administration.*
- *To consider and resolve all other issues as referred to it by Council, Committees or member(s) of Council;*

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

(1) Secretariat Committee review all existing measures in place to ensure accountability, transparency, and integrity including all existing legislation and further investigate opportunities to strengthen accountability at City Hall by:

(i) Establishing an Accountability Commissioner that oversees all city employees not just elected officials;

(ii) Creating an enhanced expense account monitoring reporting system for elected officials.

(iii) Enact whistle blower protection that could include a dedicated hotline that would include protection to city staff who report unethical or illegal activity;

(iv) Strengthen consequences and accountability measures for not meeting any of the criteria and terms established in all of the existing legislation.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker could you clarify what we're voting on because…..

Mr. Speaker: You have it. You have it. You have that on your desk.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, are we voting on whether delegations can speak to it or are we voting on whether it's going to be…..

Mr. Speaker: Councillor. First we're voting on the suspension of rules Councillor Steeves has made, and once, if that is accepted by Council, then this will be part on the agenda which a delegation will get a copy of and they can speak to that also. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I'm…first of all Mr. Speaker, the first time I saw this was a couple of minutes ago and I'm trying to read it. That's the first thing. The second thing is the...it's most unusual to ask for a suspension of the rules until you're ready to deal with motions. This is putting this piece of business in front of everything else that's in front of us today and doesn't have anything to do with the delegations.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Councillor Clement: Yes there is.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor. Councillor Clement, the motion that is before us…

Councillor Clement: The reason I'm saying that Mr. Speaker, if this was put

forward before a speech, we'd call notice on it. And you can't…and the way this is being handled, you can't, and that's not the way the Council operates.

Mr. Speaker: The motion on the floor is Councillor Steeves has moved a motion that the rule be suspended to place Motion No. 2 to the floor of Council to deal with, and ready for the vote? A recorded vote has been called for. Those in favour of Councillor Steeves motion, please rise.

(inaudible voice in background)

Mr. Speaker: On the motion – suspension of rules.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Clement, Gerbasi, Smith, and Vandal.

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 5. The motion is lost.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is lost. What was the count again? Two-thirds is required. And 4 voted against those 10. Four members of Council voted in opposition.

Deputy City Clerk: My apologies Mr. Speaker. The Yeas were 9, Nays 4. The motion is carried.

Mr. Speaker. The motion is carried. Thank you.

We have a delegation on Motion No. 2 that was presented by Councillor Steeves and Fielding. We'll go on for a debate when that time comes, and we're getting now into the delegations.

DELEGATIONS

The first one is Robert Chemomas, Council of Canadians, in opposition to Item 3 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 3, 2008, to file the September 24, 2008 motion relative to Ceasing the Selling of Bottled Water in Civic Facilities. And you are present, and you have 10 minutes sir.

Robert Chemomas: Thank you. Thank you for my ten minutes. I would like to take my few minutes to discuss four issues with respect to bottled water. First one is health and safety. In order to persuade people to spend 2 to 3,000 times what they would spend on tap water, bottled water companies advertise their product as a safer and healthier alternative. Nothing could be further from the truth. Bottled water is regulated as a food product of the Canada Food Inspection Agency. As such, according to the Polaris Institute, water bottling plants are inspected, on average, once every three years. Regulation of tap water, on the other hand, is far more stringent. In general municipal tap water is tested continuously during and after treatment. One just has to casually watch CNN where they talk about the science that tells us of the contaminants in bottled water. Bottled water is not healthier or more safe.

The environmental impact is the second issue I would like to talk about. Earth Policy Institute estimates that the U.S. demand for bottled water requires more than 17 million barrels of oil annually to produce the bottles themselves. The production of the bottles contributes to global warming, acid rain, when carbon dioxide, sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides are emitted. It is estimated that it takes twice as much water to produce bottled water than when it is sold, than what is sold in the bottle. Once the bottled water product is ready, it can travel many miles to where it is consumed which burns massive amounts of fossil fuels emitting CO2 and other pollution. The Pacific Institute estimates the total amount of energy embedded in one use of bottled water can be as high as the equivalent of filling a plastic bottle one

quarter filled with oil. When you're drinking water, bottled water, you're also drinking oil and a lot of it.

What about individual choice? The usual question that comes up. Other beverages sold that…plastic beverage containers, have similar environmental impacts as bottled water. One of the differences, however, is that these beverages are not available out of the tap as water is. Passing a policy to promote tap water and phase out bottled water sets a precedent that challenges well-marketed notions that bottled water is healthier and safer than tap water. In helping to expose the environmental health, social and economic impact of bottled water the choice in supporting public water services and consuming tap water becomes clear. Opting to drink tap water is about making a commitment to the environment and public water services. The ecological footprint of tap water consumption is significantly higher than for bottled water.

In universities where I work, I'm a prof in the Economics Department, we discovered public water fountains are often behind for-profit beverage machines, actually covering the public access for water. Enron, Lysteria, trillion-dollar bail-outs of the banking system suggests that the (inaudible) what is good for the Nestle Corporation is good for our citizens would appear to have run its course. The responsibility of the public sector is to regulate the market in the public interest.

And finally water is a human right. Canada has one of the best public drinking water systems in the world. The bottled water industry has worked hard to undermine our faith in public water. Council of Canadians has focused its efforts on fighting for a national water policy that would improve the public system and ensure clean drinking water standards for all communities across the country, because we believe water is a human right and should be guaranteed to all people regardless of their ability to pay. This morning, Maude Barlow, National Chairperson of the Council of Canadians and founder of the Blue Planet Project, has been appointed as first senior advisor on water issues by Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann, President of the 63rd session of the United Nations. The Canadian (inaudible) environmental crusader, Maude Barlow, has been appointed senior water advisor to the United Nations. The United Nations estimates that 42,000 people die every week from diseases related to bad water and poor sanitation. "This has been a growing momentum in the international community for water justice", adds Barlow. I also plan to take this opportunity to get the Canadian government to change its shameful position and to finally join the international community in recognizing water as a human right."

Water, according to the President of the United Nations, is not a commodity to be bought and sold on the open market, he said in his inaugural address to the 63rd general assembly. Those who seek to derive economic advantage, even from the worst of human tragedies, are pursuing the privatization of water thereby denying people a human right as basic as the air we breathe.

In conclusion, as members of the Winnipeg City Council, you have a responsibility to this community to do better than drowning this motion. Doing so may be in the interests of the for-profit corporations but not in the public interest. Instead you can allow your staff to open up the files so that you can begin a dialogue with the people of Winnipeg on the subject of water.

I would add to the students that this afternoon at one o'clock David Suzuki and Maude Barlow will be at the University of Manitoba to talk about water and other environmental issues. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Are you aware of… that you can share with us, of other jurisdictions in Canada, City Councils that are taking action on the issue of limiting the use of bottled water in their facilities?

Robert Chemomas: It's a list I should have brought with me but didn't. I sort of did this at the last minute, but there are

cities in Ontario that have now public…have banned bottled water in their jurisdictions, often led by the Council of Canadians or the Polaris Institute because of the environmental impact of bottled water. We would not be the first City in the country to do it.

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

Councillor Nordman: You said jurisdictions or in their facilities?

Robert Chemomas: They have.

Councillor Nordman: This is about facilities.

Robert Chemomas: I believe they have banned it in their facilities. They didn't ban it in the City.

Mr. Speaker: That's it? No further Questions? Thank you, sir. The next delegation to speak on the same subject is Geoff Brown, on behalf of the Canadian Federation of Students. Mr. Brown you have five minutes.

Geoff Brown: Thank you. I would like to thank you for this opportunity to address Winnipeg City Council on the matter of calling the motion for a ban on bottled water.

I'm pleased to offer my comments on behalf of the University of Winnipeg Students' Association of which I am the Vice-President Internal as well as the Canadian Federation of Students, which represents over 42,000 students in Manitoba. I speak emphatically today in opposition to the motion to file Councillor Smith's motion for a ban on bottled water in City Operations. Last year at one of the twice annual general meetings of the Canadian Federation of Students, we voted in favour of a Students for Sustainability campaign with three major planks - stopping climate change, protecting natural water systems and better managing waste. As my…the gentleman who just presented here mentioned, today at the University of Manitoba, the Students for Sustainability campaign is taking place with Maude Barlow and David Suzuki, who will be joining us via video feed from Ottawa. They will be informing students on the latest threats to public water and urging them to make actions such as calling for bans on bottled water in public institutions like universities and different levels of government.

Media coverage in Winnipeg on the issue of banning bottled water, although welcome in its exposure of the basic concerns, has been narrowly focused. The most important aspect of the debate is not only the health, waste and consumer implications of overpriced, often impure and creatively labelled portions of bottled water, but the larger threat posed to an increased reliance on for-profit water. For-profit bottled water supplies have been found to be worse managed, more polluted and less sustainable than public water. While it is true that other bottled beverages may have high mark-ups and create waste, as well as pose greater threats to consumer health, the fact remains that companies producing pop, for example, do not begin pushing for the privatization of water sources until they entered into the bottled water game.

The concerns about bottled water of the Canadian Federation of Students are related to the quality, quality of management, and of managing our natural resources. A study by the Federal Perspective on Water Quality stated that Canadians generally use a lot of water, the second most per capita in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, and twice that of any average European country. This is partly due to unrepresentative flat rate pricing which produces no incentive to limit the use of water in Canada. Water use decreases as price rise, but the low water prices in Canada have hampered any significant conservation efforts. These issues are urgent for Winnipeg because of our dry climate and problem -- any problem with the water supply could quickly become severe. The more water that is diverted for bottled water, the more problems we will face.

The biggest bottled water companies, namely, Pepsi, Coca Cola and Nestle, are manoeuvring to have greater influence over how water supplies are managed and to ensure the free flow of water goes to their bottling plants. I know that over the years, Federal funding cutbacks, in particular, have strained public resources, leading to the scaling back of public facilities. Public fountains and washrooms in Winnipeg can be hard to find. Banning bottled water would be a great opportunity to make public water more readily available in public places and to put more pressure on the Federal Government to do the right thing. Public support for a made-in-Winnipeg initiative to protect and improve public water could be effective in pressing the Federal Government to increase funding to Canadian municipalities.

I hope you will see in my intervention today in opposition to the motion to file for what it is - a vote of confidence in this City Council to do what makes sense for the future of the City of Winnipeg and to protect the public interest. A vote today in support of the motion to ban bottled water in City facilities will create no real inconveniences while at the same time creating an amazing opportunity to promote consumer awareness of bottled water mark-ups and the alternative - public, healthy, clean tap water for all.

Other municipal governments around the world are taking steps to end the use of bottled water in public facilities. London is one of the most recent additions to the list. True that this city has run into some criticism for those with vested interests such as bottled water producers and their lobby organizations, but it was ultimately a decision that made sense. In Manitoba we have a wonderful water supply that is fundamentally worth protecting, even more so because it is one of the best water sources in North America.

I hope this Council will choose to take action now before it's too late or more complicated to take the important basic initial step of making City Hall operations bottled-water free. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. There will be some questions. Councillor Swandel you have your first question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you for coming out today to speak on this issue. One of the things that are always challenging when you want to do something like banning something, whether it's bottled water or plastic bags, is there is a lot of people that are already closely connected to the issue. One of the easiest places to make change is with young people, and at the universities. I'm wondering if you can tell us what…through your organization, not just at the University of Winnipeg but the organization throughout Canada…if you've been successful in getting bottled water eliminated from any of our universities?

Geoff Brown: I believe that…well, I can speak on behalf of the University of Winnipeg specifically, that in our Student Union owned and operated café, we do not sell any bottled water products, however, we are under the umbrella of the University of Winnipeg exclusivity contract with Pepsi, so we do have to have Pepsi products, however, the café does not sell any bottled water products. And I can also mention that at all of the gatherings of the Canadian Federation of Students, there is no bottled water to be brought into any of the meetings, and we always issue reusable containers for people to bring water and drink water in, and we always encourage that at any meetings.

A lot of universities right now are looking at getting rid of bottled water. The problem is that they are all in the middle of…I'm not sure how long, four, five or six year exclusivity contracts with companies like Coca Cola, Pepsi and Nestle that they're bound to have these products on the campus for the time being. So while we have this time to consider the impacts and the effects of the quantification of water, I would…while a lot of universities are running out of the last few years of their contracts, I would encourage them to consider not renewing them. I mean the amount of money that they're making off these contracts in comparison to their

operating budget is really nothing and it wouldn't…I mean, it would be…it's the obvious choice. They have to do this. The commodification of water has to stop.

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

Councillor Smith: Did you see the item in the newspaper on the weekend that Health Canada has added Bisphenol to the list of toxic substances, and this leaches into the water? Can you talk about the leaching of the water by the plastic bottle itself?

Geoff Brown: Right. So that the chemicals that are in plastic bottles that are leaching into the water themselves. Well one of the main problems with that is that bottled water will be bottled at a plant and it will sit in these bottles for we don't know how long, in a warehouse somewhere being transported and sitting in a drinking machine, sitting in someone's fridge, sitting in someone's basement. So these chemicals, the longer they are in the water they just keep leaching out, leaching out, leaching out, leaching out. And the bottled water companies have done a great job trying to convince us all that bottled water is cleaner and better than tap water. Well tap water is managed and regulated by government and also tap water, water coming out of the taps is constantly moving so there is no chance for any of these chemicals to settle in there. There are no chemicals whatsoever in them, whereas these bottled waters, they will sit there and these bottles will break down at a molecular level…I mean if someone has them in their basement for six years, I mean the water that they're drinking is toxic by the time they get around to opening it up.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Thank you Mr. Brown. Next delegation is Nick Ternette in opposition to Item 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal. Mr. Ternette, you have 10 minutes.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz and Members of City Council. I'm here today to oppose the proposed increased bus fare for 2009. At the same time, I work as a volunteer at Winnipeg Harvest and am a member of the Public Education Team there. So I've also been asked to speak on behalf of Harvest today.

Quite bluntly we are tired of being nickel and dimed to death, and while we were promised a two-year moratorium on bus fare increases in 2006 when the bus fares went from $2 to $2.25, we find it unconscionable that Winnipeg is facing a massive recession and have been asked to pay another five-cent increase in bus fares.

In reviewing the administrative report concerning bus fare increases for 2009, we've noticed an implication that diesel fuel costs have risen 54% since 2006; that is Transit is paying $1.07 per litre from paying 69 cents per litre. This costs an additional $1.5 million on the current usage. While I can appreciate this may have been a factor in 2007, when a barrel of oil cost $140, and gas prices were over $4 per gallon in the U.S., today's recession has brought the oil prices down to between $75 and $79 per barrel, close to a 40% decrease. This has also been reflected in a significant decrease in the rise of diesel fuel cost. In fact, it doesn't quite equal 40% but there's been a significant decrease in it.

Furthermore, the Transit report indicates that after years of declining ridership, 2008 will represent the sixth straight year of ridership increases. This has produced an additional $1 million in additional revenues in 2007, making it approximately 6…between 5 to $6 million in additional revenues in the past six years. Furthermore, the Transit system was supplemented by Provincial Government grants to the tune of .09 million this year, and all of which combined indicate no need for bus fare increases in 2009.

Now on behalf of Winnipeg Harvest, I have been asked to include these specific remarks and these were written by people who work at Harvest. Winnipeg Harvest clients live with hunger and poverty every day. They need the bus to get to a job. Look for it to get a job, look for a job,

go to a doctor's appointment, further their education or some other useful purpose. Many of our volunteers are clients of Winnipeg Harvest. We couldn't operate without them. They need to get to our warehouse to help sort and distribute food to others in need. Whether Winnipeg Harvest clients are working poor or on employment income assistance, every nickel spent taking a bus comes out of their food budget. You are taking this money out of their mouths.

One of the major issues that Winnipeg Harvest would like me to point out is the difference between the cash fare increase of 5 cents and seniors and reduced ticket increase of only 3 cents. This is discriminatory. Most poor people pay by cash when they use the bus because they cannot afford bus tickets. Now furthermore, City Council, a year and a half ago or so, approved $142 million for Transit improvements over five years in 2007. Now if all of these improvements had been implemented by now, then an increase in bus fares might be justified. The fact is, and I've said this over and over again, service has deteriorated, not improved over the past year, especially. The reality is, that the new buses are smaller and with wheelchair and baby carriage spaces removed from 10 to 15 seats for use, never mind that the bus drivers don't know who gets priority, whether it's wheelchair or baby carriages. These smaller buses have forced people to stand, not only during rush hours but at other times of the day as well. What has happened to the so-called additional 20 articulated buses? They have been removed from the budget due to the fact that they jack-knife on snow and ice making them unsuitable for Winnipeg roads. Never mind that an additional $10 million is being removed from the Transit budget which were originally scheduled for new buses and have been transferred into the BRT Southwest Transit corridor. There were to be about 50 new heated bus shelters built between 2007 and 2012. Now I agree, it's a five year period, not one. I have yet to find one, even though Mayor Katz has said there are heated bus shelters, at least he says there's one downtown. I haven't found it yet. I've been looking. Instead I have found a number of bus shelters torn down and not replaced. While I have noticed that some of the 56 bus stops have been upgraded, quite often I found them vandalized and smashed to the point where they don't function.

Real time electronic displays of bus arrivals and departures are still not in place, although I have been told that these will be in place by 2010, and electronic fare collection boxes, which we were promised, apparently are to be installed in approximately 2009. Now, I noticed that there is an amendment to this motion coming up. That is actually being moved by Councillor Pagtakhan and his Worship Mayor Katz which indicates fairly interesting philosophically that yes, it is fair and reasonable that Transit riders bear a share of the cost of increases. Now, the suggestion is, and I don't have a complete disagreement of it except I don't think it's clear enough, they resolved two issues here. Therefore, be it resolved that the public service prepare a report exploring means to link periodic Transit fare increases directly and automatically to increases in the cost of key inputs so that individual fare increases would no longer require separate Council approval. The question I have of this one is that it may not be a bad idea ultimately in the long run, is what are we talking about, key inputs? Well key inputs up here, if you look at what they mention is fuel costs and vehicle replacement. Well fuel costs in a recession go down like hell and swings ups and downs. I question whether the administration is capable of developing a kind of chart of the legitimate increases in terms of the Transit operation that would indicate how much more money they would need. I would like to see them as a separate agency that evaluates Transit and makes those kind of recommendations separately from Transit. I just don't trust Transit people making those decisions.

Furthermore it is resolved…now this is an interesting one…that the report also explore options for providing Winnipeggers below the low income cut off with Transit passes at a more affordable cost, including the provisions of a universal low income Transit pass

and/or off beat passes for later for use outside of peak Transit hours. Very good. We've been arguing that for a long, long time (inaudible). The question, however, is what's affordable? What are we talking about? Again it says more affordable. Does that mean we're going to pay half? At the present time a bus pass is $71? So are we going to pay what the seniors pay which is $35.50 or so? I would like to have some explanation by Councillor Pagtakhan and His Mayor Worship to indicate exactly what we're talking about because leaving it like that is going to have a real question because what is affordable for one person is not necessarily affordable for another person. It has to be clarified, if I would support the second, both points, and the first one is clear that we need to indicate what inputs are to be considered within the price range increase of bus fares as well as to be done by an independent body, not tied to Transit.

Outside of that, as I say, if all these improvements, these $142 million, well mind you it's $10 million so it's $132 million improvements…were completed by now, then the fare, bus fare increase would be justified. Ultimately at the present moment, with the recession hitting, all kinds of people here in Winnipeg that people will think, a no bus fare increase is justified at the present time. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ternette, there is a question. First question Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the delegation, Mr. Ternette, thank you for taking the time out this morning to speak on the issue of Transit fare increases. I also want to say I appreciate your thoughts on the motion that we're considering today. Just a quick question for you. I wanted to remind… perhaps remind you that this Council has a bit of a social conscience with respect to Winnipeg Harvest and the good work you do with that organization. But were you aware in 2005 that this Council did advocate and did support a $50,000 grant to Winnipeg Harvest for bus passes?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ternette.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I am not in the inside circle. No I'm personally not aware of it. I'm sure that David Northcott is but nobody from Harvest indicated to me that that was the position but that's very honourable that Council did that but I'm not personally aware of it, no.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith your first question.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Ternette, you come and talk about people with low income. How hard pressed they are with paying higher Transit fares. But what about businesses? Do they not benefit? Do not the businesses in Transcona benefit if people can get there quickly to buy goods and services? Can you comment on that because it seems to me the Chamber should be here and be opposing the bus fare hike.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ternette.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, Councillor Smith, I don't disagree with you. I have yet to see the Chamber of Commerce or any of the business communities ever speak on any of the bus fare increases or anything else in the last decade. As far as I know, the only people who ever come out are the low income people. I didn't ask to speak on behalf of Harvest. I want to be very, very, clear. I'm a volunteer there. I sort food out there once a week as part of my social duty as I call it and I was asked specifically because they knew I was going to be speaking on bus fare increases, to present these thoughts and ideas on behalf of Harvest. Normally I always speak on my behalf but I agree, business has an interest too and should be talking but I can't represent Chamber of Commerce unless the Chamber of Commerce asked me to speak for them, which would not happen, okay. So I mean…

Mr. Speaker: Your second question, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Ternette, could you not go ahead and contact the

Chamber and ask to make a presentation to them on bus fares?

Nick Ternette: To be honest, I haven't but I have talked to the Chamber of Commerce about democracy and other things. Dave Angus and me do have a working relationship but he is not, I don't think, quite in the same position as he was a few years ago, and I did spend some time as you know, I supported some of the issues that the Chamber of Commerce came here, especially in terms of term limits and also the whole issue of changing the nature of how City Council operated there (inaudible). So I have worked with them and they invited me. But there's been no indication from the Chamber of Commerce that they are concerned. I would suspect, if you want a blunt answer, is that the membership of the Chamber of Commerce do not use buses and will never use buses, and that's all there is to it, so why should they even bother talking about it because they never use buses. They will use their cars and buses don't exist in their mentality.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor Smith? Your third and final question. None? Councillor Swandel your first Question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thanks, Mr. Ternette for showing up today and as you always do on a regular basis. It's appreciated to see someone from the city coming out and addressing these issues.

When you appeared at EPC we had a bit of a discussion about who is responsible for the social safety net in the country. I guess you know, we are constantly having social issues downloaded on the Municipal level of government. We do what we can. I would like to start by asking are you aware that we currently subsidize the Transit system by approximately $40 million a year?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ternette.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, yes, I am well aware, but the question is, how do you view Transit. If Transit was viewed as a Police service or as an Ambulance service (inaudible), then it's a hundred percent supported by the tax base. Transit is the only service that is being provided by the City that is basically cost-shared close to 60/40, but you also know that the Provincial Government has fundamentally changed the structure of funding now and for ten years and twelve years I was arguing that you should be demanding a 50/50 cost-sharing agreement between the Province and the Municipality, and you couldn't get it. You finally are, as far as I understand from Mayor Sam Katz, you have gotten a 50/50 cost agreement. So in fact, the Provincial Government is putting significantly more money into Transit. Quite bluntly, if you really want my personal opinion, I don't think Transit should be the operation of the City. Nearly every other major city operation is Provincially operated. The Provincial Government operates a lot of services or creates an independent Transit authority that operates at arms length from both the City and the Province. We're one of the few that still has the whole system, but you guys are still directly responsible for it and I really wonder why.

Mr. Speaker: Finished your Question? No further questions? Thank you Mr. Ternette. Next to speak on the same subject is Valerie Wolbert, President of People First Winnipeg. You have five minutes.

Valerie Wolbert: Okay. Who are the people taking the bus? They are single parents rushing children to daycares so they can work at minimum wage jobs and struggle each day to make ends meet. They are all the people rejected by Handi Transit who now have to take public transit and don't understand it when rules change so often. They are the young professionals who want to be green and so take the bus. They are also the hundreds of school children that take buses every day to get to classes. What do they all have in common? Except for the young professionals, maybe, they all have no other choices when it comes to transportation than to take a bus. If you take home, home pay is $800 a month, an average rent is $500 a month for a one bedroom, that doesn't leave a whole bunch left over for food and clothing.

Never mind transportation. $300 a month for food and transportation. Usually there are two people living on that, sometimes just one and a baby. But for the most part can you see yourself living on $300 a month? For bus passes, $71, clothing $40, diapers, $50. That leaves just $130 a month for food and prescriptions if needed. Exactly how do the working poor afford yet another increase? What are we getting for that money? Has service improved? No it hasn't. Increasingly buses are overcrowded and hazardous to people with mobility challenges. Often at the front of the bus you will find five or six open strollers making navigation on a moving bus very hazardous indeed. I have seen people with canes and walkers try to get by all the carriages only to fall and hurt themselves. In one case that I know about quite badly. It used to, to be disabled had priority seating on buses but that is no longer the case as strollers take equal priority on buses leaving little room for others that have trouble standing. This practice means wheelchairs which are not nearly as plentiful as strollers will no longer be able to ride on buses. We would like all bus drivers to announce the stops. Also at most stops there are no signage telling you when a bus is expected to arrive, and most shelters do not have heat or doors that open easily enough for wheelchairs to come in from the elements. Many bus stops are under construction, making ridership hard to maintain. We keep hearing about how the last increase was to allow for better signage and more amenities for riders. Until we see the improvements we have already paid for, I don't know how you can justify yet another increase on the backs of those who live in poverty. The motto here in Winnipeg seems to be "give us your tired, your hungry, your destitute and your down trodden and we will make sure they stay that way." Thank you very much. Plus I'm representing Dawn Manitoba today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. You're representing Laurie Helgason but she was not able to attend, so you are in her place.

Valerie Wolbert: Right

Mr. Speaker: Any questions Councillors? If not thank you for your presentation.

The next delegation is Paul Hesse on behalf of the Winnipeg Rapid Transit Coalition. You have ten minutes, sir.

Paul Hesse: Thank you, Councillors. Thank you, Mayor Katz. Thank you Valerie for your presentation. Valerie has recently joined the Rapid Transit Coalition and has been helping us liaise with people from the disability community with People First self advocacy group. Since I last spoke before you, we have also had the Red River College Students Association join the Rapid Transit Coalition. We're very pleased to see all of you here.

So I'm here to speak in favour of a significant Transit improvement for Winnipeg. The plan to build a Rapid Transit system from downtown all the way to the University of Manitoba, a good plan to have commuter cycling paths along the whole way and an excellent plan to incorporate transit-oriented developments around the stations. What that does is it gives us better Transit improvements, better transportation options in Winnipeg, it helps us realize that Winnipeg is moving forward with improvements and by having Transit-oriented and pedestrian-oriented development, new apartments, new condos, new offices and retail around Transit stations, what we're able to do is intensify and improve existing neighbourhoods, which is great for residents in those areas. It's also great for City Council because what you're doing is you're increasing population close to existing roads, existing police stations, libraries and so on, which saves you money in the long run.

We've had an announcement and we're asking and hoping that you will, of course, fund this plan and that we'll move forward as a city, but we're also asking that it be built right. As I look at the plan, I have concerns and we have concerns about how it's going to be incorporated with Main Street at one end and whether in the Fort Rouge Yards it will be integrated into existing streets and also the other side of Pembina Highway to make sure that people on both sides of Fort Rouge Yards can use it and when you're coming

downtown to make sure that the Rapid Transit System that's flowing quickly doesn't bottle neck as it approaches Main Street and integrates smoothly onto diamond lanes.

Reminding you that we're talking about permanent stations now for Rapid Transit along the route and that this is an opportunity to build truly comfortable stations, heated, cooled, really heated during the winter, and that it does have the overhead signs that tells you, 60 Route is coming in three minutes, 62 is coming in five minutes. And also, that the guidelines that I've shared with Mayor Katz and Councillor Gerbasi from the World Bank that talks about building an accessible Rapid Transit System are incorporated into the plan from the beginning to make sure that there is no, say, vertical gap between the platform and the vehicle, so that whether you're coming in a wheelchair or whether you're coming with a baby stroller, you can enter the vehicles smoothly and easily. Other station designs that really don't cost anything if they're built in from the beginning that can make sure that everyone in Winnipeg can use it whether you're visually impaired, have physical impairments or other matters.

The last thing, we're asking Is that you involve the public in this project, because the citizens who live in the neighbourhoods around the Rapid Transit stations will have things to say about how to make the stations better, how to incorporate it into the neighbourhood better, and by involving citizens we can also make sure that more people use the system so that it's a financial good return. I've heard students from Red River College, I've heard students from the University of Manitoba who want to have now "uni-passes". They want to negotiate with Transit to make it so that all students would have Transit passes included with tuition, and I hope that Transit and the City of Winnipeg will negotiate with them so that they will make sure we have groups at one end of Rapid Transit at the University of Manitoba that will use it. That will be the key to a successful system that people will use, that people will want to use and that people will want to expand to the other neighbourhoods of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi your first Question?

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. And thank you Paul and to the members of your group for their involvement in this. It's been really great to have this level of citizen engagement on an issue here and I think it's made a big difference in moving this forward.

I just wanted to ask you if you have any thoughts about our future capital priorities because there's a lot of…as you know, there's a lot of demands, desires for road widenings and extension of our street network, which will ultimately compete with building future legs of Rapid Transit and this is a dilemma this Council is going to face, and I wonder if you have any comments on that.

Paul Hesse: Thank you Councillor. An excellent question. A few points on that. One - Plan Winnipeg talks about where future corridors will be. Those should be protected. Developers should know that this is a planned future route so that they can incorporate high intensity transit-oriented development around there. What we don't want to lose, is we don't want to lose those corridors in a short-sighted project and then lose a long-term opportunity. That's one issue.

Second of all I know that there's some discussion of road widenings, of the inner ring. I can say quite clearly that the Winnipeg Rapid Transit Coalition does not support an inner ring expansion program that isn't called for in Plan Winnipeg at this time. It's unnecessary, it's not a priority, and that certain other things that the City is planning like a bike bridge over the Red River, linking Elmwood and North Kildonan to Point Douglas and ultimately to downtown is a good project. It's especially important that that be built before construction on Disraeli happens so that there'll be something for citizens to use, a bike path that at least some will be able to use that will take some of the pressure off when

the Disraeli Overpass is done. Those are our views, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves your first question.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Hesse for your presentation and for your doggedness on this issue. I think congratulations are also due to you and your group on this.

You mentioned the universities and the universal bus pass. We've been down this road a couple of times in this City where even Council and our Transit authority has attempted to grease the skids to try to, I guess, get to include the university population to have some sort of universal Transit Pass. Is that anywhere close to a reality in the big schools here in Winnipeg?

Paul Hesse: The University of Manitoba Students Union wants it. The University of Winnipeg Students Association wants it. I believe there's been discussions with the Red River Students Association as well and I think there's a lot of support. Times are changing. We've got a Red River Campus that's expanding downtown, that's more transit-oriented campus. We've got a University of Manitoba Students Union that's supportive. What you've also got now is a significant Transit improvement that's going there. This is the time to be having those discussions again. But, the point here is that one of the frustrations that students have had before, is…let's just say on the pricing, where there's no…there's really nothing in it for students. And I think there has to be a little bit of flexibility in terms of the pricing to make sure that, you know, it's not close to the full price of a bus fare and then making it universal and everyone paying for it.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Steeves: Okay. Have I gotten a lot better looking suddenly?

Mr. Speaker: No! Sorry.

Councillor Steeves: On that, as much a comment as a question I suppose, but will your group be working with the university actively on this? Because I can tell you that historically there has been a lot of back and forth. I could be wrong. My understanding is that some of those issues you put on the table have been, I think, explored and there still wasn't quite a willingness on behalf of the universities to sort of take that plunge. I gather it's politically a bit difficult because you have to impose it universally on the entire population. I appreciate that would be very, very difficult. But as much a comment as a question I would encourage your group along with our Transit authority, who I think is pretty willing to continue working on that prospect.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Hesse?

Paul Hesse: Thank you and we will work on that and we've already been working on it in our work with the students unions and associations and I think you'll find a different level of willingness now than there has been in the past. I encourage you to start those discussions again.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Thank you Mr. Hesse. We're halfway through our delegation.

Nick Ternette in opposition to Item 3 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works in respect to Rapid Transit Corridor. Mr. Ternette you have ten minutes.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz and members of City Council. I'm here today to speak against the proposed $138 million bus Rapid Transit corridor that will run between The Forks and Jubilee Avenue which is the first phase as well as second phase which there is no funding for at the present time, which will connect Jubilee Avenue to the University of Manitoba.

The realities of BRT have rarely lived up to their promises. In city after city, despite assurances that BRT would provide cheap, flexible and speedy transit service,

the technology has proven costly, inflexible and anything but rapid. One problem that no one seems to agree on is a single definition of a BRT which we're still not quite clear on this one either. Some apply to grade separated roadways, others to enhance bus services on HOV lanes, buses that move from dedicated bus lanes to mixed traffic, as well as express buses between suburbia and the inner city. As BRT proponents would argue, you have to be talking about exclusive right-of-ways, exclusive rail-type stations, and I want to get back to that, and real land use changes around these stations to accommodate growth. While the City of Winnipeg will be able to implement tax increment financing, made possible, I understand, by new Provincial legislation, and that is a step forward because that's how most other LRT systems are built in the rest of the country, there is no evidence, however, that the BRT loan will be paid back. Studies after studies have shown that some development will occur along BRT lines but not the high density kind of transit development that you want. That will not occur unless you build an LRT system. You will have spread-out development, which every study has shown…we can produce ten or fifteen different studies showing that the amount of high density development and the kind of changes around train stations only occur around LRT's not BRT's. The primary argument for BRT that it's cheaper and easier to implement than light rail, and while it's undeniably less expensive to bus on existing streets than it is to build substantial infrastructure in order to create a new light rail transit system, there are other measures of cost effectiveness besides capital costs.

Questions that need to be asked. How many transit riders will a new BRT draw? How many of those were already riding buses anyway? How much can the City expand the capacity of BRT before the buses start slowing down? How much more investment capital would a fixed rail line bring to the area? And that is the real question. The data is clear. BRT draws far fewer transit riders and far fewer new transit riders than any other light rail transit, fixed transit system. In fact, as Mayor Katz himself has stated, BRT as it's going to be built, will not attract any more suburban riders to leave their cars at home. But light rail will.

Bus lanes, this is very, very important, unlike rail, can be easily converted for use by other types of vehicles; in effect, subsidizing private automobiles for public transportation costs. This is why you will never see real economic development around a bus station. Buses can be moved. Trains have to go where the rails go. It is one more reason why I suggest, and also those who are supporting LRT suggest, that BRT encourages, not discourages, suburban sprawl. BRT is tied to sprawl. LRT is not.

In analyzing the Winnipeg Transit $138 million bus corridor, I noticed that it's path to realization, (inaudible) of logistical and physical roadblocks, which have not been looked at by Transit officials. North of Osborne and Jubilee, several obstructions and bottlenecks exists, where it is clear that allowances will have to be made for expensive and tricky road relocations to free up sufficient space to afford the transit corridor's passage or else an elevated carriage way will have to be built.

Furthermore, a hydro substation lurks squarely in the middle of the side slated for the Osborne Rapid Transit station. The former will have to be moved to make way for the latter. And there is no cost figures added to how much that's going to cost. Additionally, and this is a very interesting point that we checked from the Transit Task Force report of two years ago, BRT has lower operating costs in hourly demands whether demand is up to 1,500 passengers per hour or what we would say, 18,600 passengers in a weekday. However, it has been estimated by your own Transit Department that there will be a ridership of at least 18,800 per weekday or per weekday, yeah, therefore making LRT operating costs lower than BRT. And that's your own statistics. If you check your own Rapid Transit report of two years ago, that's the figures. That up to 1,500 passengers per hour, the operating costs are cheaper but anything above that the expenses go up

to the point where the LRT operating costs are lower.

Most significantly, Mayor Katz's arguments that the southwest BRT will be built in such a way as to be converted to a LRT in the future is nonsense. As the citizens of Ottawa are learning today, and I have received even more information from Ottawa on what is going on. Ottawa citizens were told in the 1980's, that their BRT would be engineered so that they could be retrofitted to handle light rail in the long term, maybe five or ten years down the line. Now McCormick-Rankin and Company, the firm that designed and oversaw the construction of Ottawa's BRT, insists that all the stations will have to be demolished because railway stations do not fit the bus station's criteria because they build them completely different, and completely replaced and acknowledges that transit services will have to be suspended for a long time during retrofitting. This ensures, and I will (inaudible) repeat again for those who think that we're building a BRT now because ultimately we're going to move it to a LRT, this BRT will never become a LRT, and I think that's an important point to consider. In fact, Ottawa has just gone through a real public consultation process where thousands of citizens were involved and they are demanding massive expansion of LRT all over the city and have rejected any further BRT's, et cetera, et cetera, and they are moving forward because they understand that LRT will bring development and BRT will not bring development.

And most disturbingly, in my final comment, is the shear lunacy of going ahead with Bus Rapid Transit system depending on fossil fuels for untold years to come instead of touting Manitoba's advantage, which we fundamentally have. Abundant, affordable prize supply of cheap, renewable electric energy.

To have an LRT in Calgary which is the oil city, run by wind powered, all the way operated by wind power and to have Winnipeg continue that is the centre of electricity, to have gas spewed out on a daily basis, is just irrational. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Maybe some questions? If not thank you Mr. Ternette. The delegation speaking to the same subject is Jim Jaworski. Is Jim present? Jim you have five minutes.

Jim Jaworski: Good morning Councillors and media and everybody else. I've… with my presentation I've added an illustration of the Wilson's…not the Wilson Subway but a sub-soil conditions illustration that I got from the Wilson Subway Report that was done…the sub-soil condition report was done in 1926. And also, that pamphlet that I've been distributing during the summer months.

Okay I'll go through my presentation. In the past I've been satisfied by just maintaining a web site, that's TRUwinnipeg.org, and every now and then I have the media interview me on the Rapid Transit topic. But this past few months I was motivated by pro-BRT groups' efforts to promote their cause. I've been supportive of rail transit for almost 30 years and I realize that more needed to be done to counter the misinformation that was being disseminated.

During the past summer, I spent hours handing out TRUWinnipeg pamphlets to people at major destinations such as Portage and Memorial which would be the Wilson Subway Station that would be the most busy. Also on Corydon Avenue East where most of the middle class hang out on the weekends now. Some pamphlets were left on buses and some were posted at some transit shelters which I was told later on that I shouldn't be doing, but we don't have very much financial resources to put big huge billboards across the City advertising our cause. But anyway, TRUWinnipeg is a very, very small group. We don't have tens of thousands of dollars for large billboards and electronic advertising so we do what we can with the limited resources that we have.

In early September, Nick Ternette, Jeff Lowe and myself met with Mayor Katz on the Rapid Transit issue. Ironically, the date of the meeting was the Friday before

the announcement of BRT which was also coincidentally the very same day the Federal election was called. And in that meeting, Mayor Katz told us that basically it's a political issue, that the eastern provinces like Ontario and B.C. and in the west, B.C., are bigger, so therefore they get bigger transfers of money so they get a bigger share of infrastructure funds, so we're just small Manitoba and we can't, I guess we can't do any better than that.

What I plan to do in the next few months is to continue to promote the Wilson Subway Plan and I'm currently in the process of creating a power point presentation which I will be finalizing in the next few months, and I'll be making a presentation on that hopefully somewhere between now and the new year. Also, don't fall for the lie that BRT, which certain reporters like to refer to as "speedy buses" are, by implication, somehow faster than a rail transit vehicle. A bus can never be faster than an LRT or subway train because a bus can only be as long as an articulated model which of course isn't appropriate for our winter climate which we tested last winter and was found to not work very well, which I only saw in the time period between November and March when the articulated buses were tested. I counted maybe on one hand, the time that it went down Graham and that, the 60 Pembina.

The planned routing is ineffective regardless of whether it would be built as a BRT, or subway or an at-grade LRT. Who in their right mind who works downtown near Portage and Main and lives in the southern reaches of Fort Garry will ride this? Because it doesn't go all the way downtown. The terminus is at Union Station. The routing is incomplete and Winnipeg should not move ahead on this until a full route is funded. A bus can only carry so many people at a time which is generally 50 to 60 people plus the driver, whereas a rail vehicle can be lengthened by several railcars allowing several hundred people to be transported at once. So a train is therefore more scalable and modular than a bus.

Now that Ottawa has finally decided to spend $4 billion on converting its current BRT into an LRT, and that includes an underground tunnel through downtown Ottawa that makes it a subway, pro-BRT consulting group, McCormick-Rankin, I guess wants to find another proxy for their BRT lobby and what better than Winnipeg with bus manufacturer New Flyer.

Councillors, this is not over yet. It is not over yet. This is…this BRT plan is not any better than the one that was put before you by former Mayor Glen Murray five years ago. Please don't accept the lowest common denominator. Please don't vote for this because once BRT is built it will be next to impossible and very, very costly to convert, as Nick Ternette explained in his presentation, to convert from BRT to an LRT, despite the lies that the proponents of BRT tell you. Thanks for listening.

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

The next delegation is Mr. Jim Baker, President and CEO of Manitoba Hotel Association in opposition to Item 4 of the Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Baker you have ten minutes.

Jim Baker: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Your Honour the Mayor, Mr. Speaker and Councillors. Thanks for this opportunity to present the position of the Winnipeg Hoteliers in regards to the use of the accommodation tax.

Unfortunately, Helen Helliday, the Manager of the Delta Hotel, and Indu Brar, the General Manager of the Fairmont Hotel, are both immersed in some pretty serious budget considerations, but these two individuals and others have been working very diligently in the last weeks to try to understand the proposed use of the dollars and to see if there is some opportunity to enhance that use.

In any event, I believe I bring their words and those of the other Winnipeg hotels are vitally concerned about the use of the accommodation tax dollars. And in addition, I believe these comments fairly capsulate the feelings of the hospitality industry beyond just hotels.

Firstly I would like to thank Mike Ruta who is not here, Nelson Karpa and Brad Cull from the administration who worked very hard with us in the last five or six days assisting us in understanding the document that you have in front of you today and the amendments that appeared this morning. The document has experienced two significant amendments since its approval by Executive Policy Committee, and those changes came out of our discussions with the administration and have improved the program from that first approved by EPC for your consideration, so it's a slightly changed program.

I want to bring you a quick financial recap that is the basis of our opinion and comments later. The financial recap, and I think it's all about finances, is that in 2008, this current budget year, will see the City collect $2.5 million more accommodation tax than budgeted. Next year, 2009, will show approximately $8.5 million dollars collected rather than the conservative estimate of $7.2 million used for illustration in the document that was presented to you. That's just a matter of clarification and I understand the fellows that I mentioned are accountants like myself, so they always take a conservative approach and that's wise. The formula for the allocation of the tax commencing in 2009 allocates up to 40% towards the projected City portion of an expanded Convention Centre with a cap based on projected debt repayment. It provides the formula for $2.16 million or 30% of the tax to go to Destination Winnipeg, thereby replacing the historical grant Destination Winnipeg and incrementing the funding to Destination Winnipeg by a minimum of $700,000. The program has a further $1.5 million grant to the Winnipeg Convention Centre which will replace the grant structure that's been going on for 25 or 30 years in that regard. And any remainder of the collections will be paid to Destination Winnipeg. In percentage terms, 40% goes to the Convention Centre Capital Project, that's 2% of the five, 39% of the dollars replace a historic operating grant, and that's 2% of the grant. 12% of the dollars increments Destination Winnipeg's funding, that's .06% of the 5%. And 8% of the dollars go towards a special events acquisition fund, that's .04% of the five and that's straight math that I see a lot of glazed eyes there. I can understand that.

The good part of this formula for use is, as the collections increase proportionately, more of the money goes to increase Destination Winnipeg's funding, and that's very important, because Winnipeg will have approximately a third of the funding, a third of the funding that Calgary and Edmonton have had for several years, our major competitors in terms of meetings and conventions. Not only that, Winnipeg will lag behind Windsor, London and Hamilton, other competitors in our market. And we'll be on par for awhile with Regina and Saskatoon. The bad part, that's good because we're getting increased dollars coming in, though as you can tell by the percentages we're not too happy about the total. The bad parts are many and require correction. And just to reinforce what I just said is the City is years behind the competitive set and is missing an opportunity to narrow the gap and provide for the essential growth for an expanded Convention Centre and from getting prepared, and for those of you that were at the Chamber lunch a week or so ago, as Gail Asper recently put it, company's coming, let's get ready.

So the Winnipeg Hotels suggest the following to make the most effective and impactful use of the accommodation tax. The dollars allocated specifically to the Convention Centre should go into a tourism product development fund, a different name, thereby giving the fund manager more flexibility in the use of the dollars and providing for a use of any surplus funds. Perhaps this fund could be created in a year, you know, we're just new at this. The City is new at it and we have to determine just where the dollars are coming from and how much. So you know, if say in a year, and the financing of the expansion of the Convention Centre is clearer, this will give the fund manager more flexibility in the effective use of the funds as the years go by, and the fund accumulates. Accountants are sort of…we have to take the end game. What if the expansion doesn't happen and you

have accumulated $40 million? What do you do with it? So we've generalized the name of the fund to this tourism product development fund so it can go to other purposes. I don't see that not happening.

Secondly, the operating grant for the Winnipeg Convention Centre should remain as a budgetary item within the annual budget process as per the last 25 years. As an alternative, there is a suggestion that as the Convention Centre achieves self sufficiency, the grant is reduced by any surplus created within the Convention Centre, and I am on the Convention Centre Board. This isn't a suggestion coming from the Convention Centre, it's coming (inaudible).

Point 3. The budgeted surplus from 2008, that's the $2.5 million I mentioned at the beginning, has to go immediately into marketing the City. So I tried to simplify this for everybody. 2% of the tax goes into the tourism product development fund and 3% is managed by Destination Winnipeg. I hope you realize that we, me representing the hotels in the City of Winnipeg, aren't saying kill the tax. We did come forward at one point in time and said kill the tax, but rather we're saying you've got a lot of money, and a lot of money from our guests. Use it to enhance their stay and for them to come back soon and bring friends. Use it to get ready for the impact of the Canadian Museum for Human Rights and ensure that the impact comes right when they open their doors, if not before. Use it to build a demand for the expanded Convention Centre and use it in consultation with the industry. Very short and sweet or maybe not that sweet but very short, so Mr. Speaker, questions any?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any questions? Mr. Baker, thank you for your presentation.

Jim Baker: Those questions are easy when they're not asked.

Mr. Speaker: The next delegation is not, delegation number 9 is not going to appear. Before I call on the final delegation, Mr. Colin Craig, on behalf of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, I would like to, to my right, up in the galleries, they were to be here earlier but they are here now, students from the St. John's High School led by Mr. Marvin Copps, the teacher, welcome to our chambers.

The final delegation, Colin Craig. You have ten minutes.

Colin Craig: Thank you. Well good morning and thank you for the opportunity to present here this morning on behalf of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation. I would like to note that I'll be speaking to both motions that both Councillor Steeves and Councillor Gerbasi tabled, given the similarity of the two.

I would like to begin by saying that no matter what motion is passed, Council will be better off than it was this morning and for that the members who brought both motions forward deserve praise.

In the past there have been instances where the opinion of a Conflict of Interest Commissioner could have assisted this chamber by providing an opinion, an outside opinion, on a particular matter. And no doubt such matters will most likely arise again in the future. The improvements to this area will not only provide the public with greater assurance that matters at City Hall are dealt with in a fair and just manner. It will help all members of this chamber by ensuring there is someone that they can discuss their activities with and receive an opinion on a matter should they wish.

As someone who recently met with Manitoba's Conflict of Interest Commissioner, I would like to note that by having a Conflict of Interest Commissioner, it's only a benefit if he or she is utilized. Now while it may sound strange to introduce a Conflict of Interest Commissioner and then turn around and ignore their services, I witnessed that happen first hand. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation recently appealed to Bill Norrie to review and provide an opinion on the per vote funding policy that was put forward by the Provincial Government. This came forward in Bill 37. As such, a review did not occur before

Ottawa passed similar legislation, that being their per-vote funding scheme in 2003. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation felt it was important for Bill Norrie to provide an opinion to the Manitoba Legislature. Unfortunately, the per-vote funding scheme passed prior to an opinion being determined by Bill Norrie. This happened despite all parties knowing that Mr. Norrie is currently reviewing the matter. Obviously we recommend that if such a commissioner is established by this Council, that his or her opinion should be sought and listened to for appropriate matters.

In terms of the motion put forward by Councillors Steeves and Fielding, the CTF supports extending the reach of a Commissioner to all City employees. In terms of the second initiative proposed in that motion, members may remember a letter circulated to all members of this Council this past August by the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, and in that letter the Canadian Taxpayers Federation commended Council for improvements that it made to the disclosure of Council expenses. The letter also included recommendations for how such disclosure could be further improved. Should Councillor Steeves' motion pass, the CTF hopes that the "enhanced accounting monitoring reporting system" for elected officials disclose the details of expenditures made by elected officials through all budgets at their discretion. This would include budgets available to committee members…or committee chairs rather. While scanning the receipts and making them available on-line, as the Scottish Parliament recently did, would be ideal, simply having them in a book that is available at the Clerk's Office would be an alternative solution. Obviously as Council members are at the top of the City of Winnipeg hierarchy, it is important that the public have access to such information.

Finally the creation of whistle blower protection is a great initiative. Anything that helps employees speak out against waste is a step in the right direction. In terms of creating a hot line, the CTF recommends the creation of a fraud and waste hotline. Such measure was introduced as a recommendation in the Economic Opportunity Commission report and has helped the City of Toronto identify thousands of dollars in waste and fraudulent activities.

Again, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation applauds Councillors Gerbasi, Wyatt, Steeves and Fielding for coming forward with these initiatives. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Craig I believe there will be a question. Councillor Wyatt you have the first question.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Thanks for your presentation Mr. Craig.

It seems the Provincial Government disagrees with you with regards to one of the motions before us today, specifically the one regarding the Conflict of Interest Commissioner. In a letter that we received, some Councillors received the following letter sent to the Premier and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs states, "As you may be aware legislative authority currently exists to address municipal conflict of interest issues. The Municipal Conflict of Interest Act, which applies to the City of Winnipeg and all other municipalities in Manitoba, establishes rules for disclosure…" and it goes on and on and on.

So what are your thoughts on that and your response to the fact that the Province thinks the status quo is fine?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Craig?

Colin Craig: I think they're right There are guidelines in place for municipalities and their elected officials to abide by, but as I mentioned in my speech, I think having a Conflict of Interest Commissioner is an useful tool that all members could use to seek opinions on matters that affect their activities as well as the public in the case of myself meeting with the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, provincially, Bill Norrie. As I mentioned, the key is to respect that office and to seek its advice on such matters and not to ignore it.

It most likely would make sense for one commissioner to serve the entire Province, to serve the Provincial Government as well as all municipalities. At the Provincial level, Commissioner Norrie is not a full-time position. It would most likely make sense to have someone potentially in a full time position to provide that advice to elected officials across the Province.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. So would it be fair to say then that you and the Federation disagree with the Provincial Government with regards to the fact that the existing legislation is fine and that the motion before Council today should go forward and ask the Province to amend legislation and you're disagreeing with the Provincial Government? Would that be fair to say?

Colin Craig: Well it…and I'll leave this up for this chamber to decide how best you think it could be implemented. I think it would make sense to have one Conflict of Interest Commissioner to serve the entire Province to provide that advice to all elected officials when they seek it. Throughout your debate here you may find that it's more appropriate to have someone work part-time at the City level to provide that service to all employees and that's sort of the difference there. I believe the Conflict of Interest Commissioner at the Provincial level only serves the elected side of things, but you know, you may find in your debate that it's more appropriate to have someone just at the City level. I'll leave that up to you. I think I've expressed how I would structure that.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: So in other words, you support the motion that's before us today on the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, and asking the Province to amend its legislation?

Colin Craig: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. And I just wanted to clarify…It's pretty difficult for…when you haven't seen the letter from the Premier to comment on the position of the Premier, because I think the Premier has not wanted to intervene in a specific instance that happened at City Council, but I think if there was a Council resolution that all of Council agreed on, I don't think…I just want to clarify that…I don't think the Premier has said it would ignore a Council resolution to look at whatever changes Council brings forward today.

But I'm trying to sort out between these two motions which we've only seen in the last minute, and I know you may have only seen it the last minute too. But is there any difference between strengthening consequences and accountability measures for not meeting any of the criteria in existing legislation which is in Councillor Steeves motion, and asking the Province to change the legislation? Is that not the only way to make more accountability is to ask the Province to change the legislation?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Craig.

Colin Craig: Well certainly this Chamber has the ability to, sort of, determine your own fate with regards to conflict of interest guidelines as well as the establishment of a Commissioner, so if this Chamber chooses to have more stringent conflict of interest guidelines or something that's different, then we can support that, and just a clarification to Councillor Wyatt's final question, we would support the motion that you put forward if you come up with an alternative that gets to that same means, or same end, then we can support that too. Whether it's a Commissioner at the City level only then that's fine, too. What I've stated here today is that we believe that it's a tool that can help all elected officials but it also helps provide the public with an assurance that you know,.(inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Gerbasi

Councillor Gerbasi: You also indicated that considering there is a Conflict of Interest Commissioner that only at this point in time is available to MLA's, you feel it might be logical for that role of that particular individual to be widened to include the City-elected officials. Is that correct?

Colin Craig: Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes. My question is concerning the Mayor's motion. In the…it says "establishing accountability commissionaire that oversees all City employees not just elected officials". Does that not interfere with the CAO and department heads? Can you explain how this would operate? In your mind?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Craig?

Colin Craig: Sorry did you say the Mayor's motion?

Councillor Smith: Well, it's, we know it's (inaudible)

Colin Craig: Just making sure I'm talking about the right one. I think that there may be an instance whereby someone in this chamber disagrees with the CAO's opinion or someone else on the administration's side, and it might also be that someone from the public disagrees with that opinion too, and they may seek to receive some kind of an opinion from such a Commissioner, as we did with Councillor Norrie when it came to the per-vote funding scheme. So I think that you know it is…it's a step forward in terms of transparency and improving the integrity of this administration.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith your second question.

Councillor Smith: My second question is do you think that Secretariat Committees review these things? Do you think this is really very strong as a motion?

Colin Craig: Well, it's…I mean, I think both motions spoke to improving the guidelines and such so there's no hard and fast recommendations coming forward on either motion, and so if there is a, you know, in that recommendation, that Secretariat Committee review the matter. Secretariat Committee can then have an opportunity to discuss with all Councillors how they would improve those guidelines as well as seek input from the public. For example if that Committee entertained presentations from the public, I would speak to point number 1, establishing, or pardon me point number 2, creating an enhanced expense account monitoring reporting system for elected officials. So if there's an opportunity for review we recommend allowing the public to make presentations to them.

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

Before the next one I would like to remind Councillor members there is such a thing, and you Mr. Craig. The City of Winnipeg has a collective agreement with every union that works for the City of Winnipeg, which is legal and binding.

Councillor Swandel you have the first question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Craig, as you are probably aware, the Province has created legislation that basically makes it only proper for individuals to make contributions to political campaigns, taking corporations and labour organizations and basically anybody who is not an individual out of the election contribution process.

Does the Taxpayers Federation have any position on whether or not, at the Civic level, we too should also exclude corporations and labour organizations and permit only individuals to make

contributions, as it would seem to be more appropriate than having corporations or labour organizations influence the Council.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Craig?

Colin Craig: Our position is that if someone wants to make a donation to a political party or a candidate they should be allowed to, whether they decide to set up a lemonade stand and sell lemonade in an attempt to raise funds to support a political party. You could call that lemonade stand a business, and if they wish to dedicate their time and resources to do so then they should be allowed to make that donation to a political party or a candidate at the Council level. So anyone should be able to…any one or any organization should be able to make those donations but at the same time, there should be transparency in terms of where particular candidates are receiving their funds. So it's a combination of individual freedom plus ensuring that there is transparency so that everyone knows who's being funded by who.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Do you not believe that organizations making contributions to political candidates could be considered as influencing that candidate and their decision-making process?

Colin Craig: It could be considered that but if there's transparency in terms of everyone knows who is donating to which party, then if a particular initiative was voted on by a member that supported one of his or her donors then certainly everyone would be familiar with that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question period's time is over and that's our last delegation. Mr. Craig thank you for coming.

We have a report of October the 15th, Executive Policy Committee. Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 3, 2008

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think I'll do October the third first if that's okay.

Mr. Speaker: Oh pardon me.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: And you have also the Item 4. Motion Number 1? I'm on the wrong one. Okay report of October 3, you've moved Mr. Mayor Items number 1 to 4.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'm actually doing 1 through 3 because I'll introduce No. 4.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Numbers 1 to 3. All in favour? Contrary? (inaudible) No. 3. Okay and the others? All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 3 - Ceasing the selling of bottled water in Civic Facilities
File FB-1

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to hear from Councillor Smith and then I would be happy to respond to his comments.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know if you…the last time the Environment Committee met before it was eliminated by the leadership of EPC, was December the 19th, 2005. The fact is this Council has not been very good on environmental concerns unless we're getting grants from other levels of government, then are environmentally conscious.

You know, we are spending $300 million on a water treatment plant, and by selling bottled water, which the producers say is better than tap water, we are as a city agreeing that bottled water is better than tap water. That, in effect, that bottled

water is water for you to drink and tap water for all other uses. You know, it's incredible. It's not safer. You know, the bottled water companies spend millions of dollars promoting bottled water. Some of the labels have glaciers and you know, talk about spring water. Whereas most of the bottled water from both Pepsi and Coke are…is tap water that is filtered.

Now we test our water hundreds of times a month while the Federal Government through the Canadian Food Inspection Agency tests bottled water once a year. Once a year. And you know, when I was before EPC, I mentioned that Coke had to withdraw half a million bottles in England because of Bromate contamination. You know, the spokespeople for the industry that followed me, they didn't argue with that. They didn't even mention that. They didn't give any explanation whatsoever. The fact is tap water is safer than bottled water. Now especially, by the way, as I mentioned to the speaker who came here about recently Health Canada has added Bisphenol A to the list of toxic substances. A study in the influential journal of American Medical Association last month linked Bisphenol A to heart disease, diabetes, and liver abnormalities in adults. Earlier this month a study from the University of Cincinnati found that it interferes with chemotherapy used to treat breast cancer raising the possibility the chemical undermines the efficiency of cancer-fighting drugs.

"I think the new round of data that has come out over the past six months that focuses on the effect of adults needs serious visitation," said Peter Meyers, Chief Scientist of Environmental Health Sciences, a non-profit public health organization based in Charlottetown, Virginia.

The fact is, tap water is far safer than bottled water. Now, how about all those unnecessary plastic bottles that are discarded? The bulk of them are not even recycled, filling up our landfill. And we don't need them. We don't need them. You can go to the tap or to a water fountain. You don't need bottled water, and do we set the record straight and tell our citizens the advantages of tap water as a safe drinking water, one that is superior to bottled water? We don't. It should be noted that New York City, in 2006, spent $700,000 promoting their tap water, and we should do the same. We should promote tap water because we're spending as I say, 300 million to make it even better. And why we have bottled water being sold in our facilities is beyond me when tap water is so good. Thank you. And so please don't support this stupid motion.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: To file it….(inaudible). Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I would like to speak in support of Councillor Smith's motion and raising the issue of eliminating the use of bottled water at city facilities and I'd like to congratulate him for showing some initiative and bringing forward an environmental issue. I am the Chair of the Mayor's Environmental Advisory Committee, so I did canvass the members of the committee and asked for their views on it. And the majority of them felt it was an issue we should be looking at. They certainly were very aware of the environmental issues around bottled water and the question always is, what approach do you take and how do you do that?

A number of jurisdictions in Canada are looking at eliminating the use of bottled water within their own facilities which is a very simple step to take. It's not going to bankrupt anyone or create some huge problem. It's really a simple initiative we can take to have an environmental impact and one of the earlier delegations already went through some of the points I was going to make about the environmental reasons, but just to put a few on the record, the primary raw materials from the plastic in bottles is derived from crude oil and the extraction of these raw materials involves both oil and petrochemical industries contributing to the environmental degradation and use of increasingly scarce natural resources.

Some of the statistics I was going to list have already been said earlier by the

delegation. But it's pretty powerful stuff to note that it takes twice as much water to produce bottled water than what is sold in the bottle, and once it's ready it has to travel many miles where it's consumed, burning massive amounts of fossil fuels and emitting CO2 and other pollution.

Another point I wanted to make is the question of recycling and waste arising. We aren't doing that great of a job in recycling plastic beverage containers in Canada, which was only less than 50% in 2002 and in the United States only 23% of the 5 million pounds of PET plastic which is the type of plastic used, was recycled. So these containers remain in landfills for a thousand years and on and on and on. They actually can also break down in ground water, so adding contaminates in surrounding ground water releasing chemicals and other toxic additives. And when burned they contribute a huge amount, again, more toxic atmospheric chemicals contributing to global warming and climate change. Just in case anybody wonders whether this is a legitimate issue, we are in a climate change crisis. This is a real issue, and this is simply a small step of looking at our own municipal facilities.

One argument I keep hearing is that if you ban bottled water, people will simply choose less healthy alternatives such as soft drinks, and this is something that was discussed by some of the members of the Environment Committee as well in our little private discussions. And this is a concern that should be addressed. It's a valid concern. But we are talking about city facilities where we have the ability to provide plenty of fresh water alternatives to bottles. The City can ensure we have adequate water fountains or bottleless water dispensers, and we can also make the decision to sell healthier drinks rather than soft drinks like many school divisions have done in the City. This isn't really that complicated. A ban on bottled water in city facilities should include a policy providing alternative more environmentally friendly sources of water and healthy choices for drinks.

I would also just like to thank Councillor Smith in bringing this up because simply the awareness of having this discussion about bottled water has gotten people thinking about it. I know on many of the committees, I know the ones I Chair such as Historic Buildings, Access and the Environment Committee, we are no longer going to have bottled water at our meetings. And I know at some of the other meetings, Council Seminars, we have made that change.

We live in a city that has a good clean source of water, so it doesn't make sense to drink bottled water when clean water is available at all city facilities. And I think Councillor Smith made a good point in terms of promoting that choice which is something we could do by taking this kind of a stance.

Recycling rates are not as high as they should be, and there are often not adequate opportunities for the recycling of plastic bottles at our city facilities including City Hall, which I think is an embarrassing deficit that needs to be addressed. And other cities that already have or are considering strategies to reduce bottled water include London, Ottawa, Vancouver, Toronto, and Kitchener, so I put to you that Winnipeg has an opportunity to be a leader on this important environmental issue to do what we can to make a difference. We should be doing…maybe they seem like small things…but there is really nothing standing in our way from doing that and I urge you to keep an open mind and support this modest step. And again, thank you to Councillor Smith for bring this forward.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

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

I don't agree with this motion as some might suspect. But there's some basic questions to be looked at. Why only bottled water? If you want to take vending machines out of all City of Winnipeg facilities, banning the sale of, at least, liquids in them. Get rid of the Coke and the Pepsi and whatever. That's fine. Carry it a step further. No more juices from concentrate. They have to be in their

natural form. You could do that. I might even support it. Might. But I would definitely look at it. If you want to change it you could have these vending machines sell only bottled water. That would be a hell of an improvement over the syrupy sugar crap that we do sell. If it's the plastic bottles you don't like, how come you can sell 10,000 soft drinks in plastic bottles and not say a word about it for every 10 bottles of water you sell in plastic and it's the end of the world? You don't need Coke! Jeez! Up down your mouth, not up your nose, anywhere.

Tap water, tap water has chlorine and fluoride. There are a lot of people against chlorine and against fluoride. Your kind of people, Harv. And we do nothing about it. We just keep putting it in. Other cities are considering, so the crack pot motion on the floor in 5 or 6 other municipal Councils of Canada out of the hundreds, they haven't passed it. It's like saying Winnipeg is considering. We're not going to be considering it in about 15 minutes. One way or the other. This is complete and utter nonsense. If you want to get rid of the vending machine and the harmful stuff in it, get rid of the soft drinks, get rid of the chocolate bars, get ride of the chips, get rid of the cheesies. Get rid of everything I like, that's fine! But for crying out loud, if you're going to have this crap in our institutions, at least give them the choice of having water and if they're dumb enough like I am, to pay a buck and a quarter for it, that's their business. We're not Big Brother.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't know if I can top that brilliant rhetoric. But I think it's ironic that the person that brings the motion forward is the gentleman that usually brings a can of Coke with him everyday when he's on the floor of Council and I see today he's brought a glass of water. He is to be commended. Hopefully it'll be good for his health.

You know first thing…just off the top of my head…it troubled me listening to Councillor Smith speak about this, and I don't know how responsible it is as a leader to be setting this sort of contest between which is safer…bottled water or tap water. I think we all should be cognizant in going forward in this conversation that, you know, there's been as many boil water issues in this country for a municipal tap water as there have been issues of health concerns with bottled water, so we don't want to be setting up that balancing act of which is safer. I think we have to be responsible as leaders. For those of us who care about whether or not we're creating a situation of liability for ourselves by saying we are safer, I think it's important that we be cognizant of that as we go forward.

You know at the end of the day, and I think Councillor O'Shaughnessy said it kind of at the end of his speech is, it's about choice. The more we can do in the world of education and informing people as to what is safe, what is better for the environment, they will make their choices and as consumers make choices in this world, so do marketers. And I'm sure that if we are to be promoting our water such as the City of New York did and talking about how we treat our water and how it's delivered in the system and why it's okay to drink it, then I think you will see a shift away from bottled water to our water and if there is a shift away, then the vendor's not going to take up the space in their machine where they can be putting Councillor Smith's can of Coke in there or a bottle of Coke in there to put a bottle of water. So, on a very simple level, this is about leaving the ability for individuals to make a choice as to what it is that they would like to drink on any given day at any given moment, and to be able to exercise that choice. I think the more consumers exercise the choice not to drink bottled water, the less we'll see them in our establishments. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Smith for bringing this item forward. I don't know that I'll necessarily be supporting it at the end of the day but I have some sympathy for this position and the idea that he is trying to advance.

I think there is some frailty, some of which have been touched upon already by a couple of my colleagues, but the reason I do have this certain level of sympathy for the motion is because I've always found the issue of bottled water to be somewhat questionable in our society (inaudible). I think any person would at least have some questions about whether or not this is something that really does serve a positive purpose in our society. As has been stated, there is abundant high quality water in this City that could be accessed, I think, by anybody with reasonable ease, but there are some problems.

I also say this: I don't know if anybody from the industry is going to be listening to this debate this morning, but there are some commercials out there, and I don't even recall who…which water company is responsible for these commercials, but they are down right offensive. And I'm talking about specifically the commercials that draw comparisons between drinking water…not necessarily the City of Winnipeg, but municipal drinking water, public water sources, and the water that flows into your toilet. And obviously as everybody knows, municipal drinking water is in fact the water that flows into your toilet but that doesn't mean that it's not pristine and clean. Of course once it arrives in the bowl there could be some questions, but as far as it's concerned, that could be French champagne flowing into the toilet and then it would be called into question only at that point. Those questions are irresponsible. Those commercials are irresponsible and they are wrong, and whoever is responsible for them should take them off the air. They are not right and they don't behoove, and they are not respectful enough to municipal water supplies. I'll just make that comment.

Personally, I don't mind telling you Mr. Speaker, I do not buy bottled water on principle. There have been some limited exceptions in my life for doing so, but there was a time when our household did. But we don't anymore, precisely for the reasons that Councillor Smith enunciated. I don't think it's necessary, and for that reason I'm against doing it, personally. It's a choice that I make personally.

The problem of course is that in our society, free and democratic and beautiful as it is, there's a lot of things that are questionable. If I had the power I would probably wave my magic wand and eliminate a lot of the fast food restaurants that my kids drag me into on all too a regular basis. You wouldn't see Nancy Grace on television, and people would spend more time talking about me as opposed to Paris Hilton, and of course I have to make this comment: I would want some of the $17 million that I currently have invested in Hanna Montana paraphernalia back, Mr. Speaker, if I had that power.

My point is in a free and democratic society, people have this free will and they have the free will to make purchases and choices as we all know that don't for some of us make sense or, in certain circumstances, are not healthy. It is, I think, a big question to ask, can we, as a free and democratic society, sort of talk about the banning of bottled water in the same, I guess, forum where we're allowing things like cigarettes to be sold? Now I know we don't allow the sale of cigarettes probably in our civic facilities so to a certain extent it's a different debate. But I only make that point to illustrate that we allow people in our society to make these choices. It is the way that it is, and with the exception of every other system of society in the world, democracy is probably the worst one that exists.

The bottles that we talked about in question are a bigger debate and I think subject to a wider scope of scrutiny. As Councillor O'Shaughnessy stated, if there are indeed medical problems with bottles, attacking them through the bottled water debate is not the answer. I'm certain that bottled water represents only a relatively small percentage of the total amount of bottles sold. If indeed there is a health issue with respect to these bottles being sold, then that should be addressed across the entire compendium of plastic bottles being sold in this society. That's not a bottled water issue, in my respectful opinion.

I asked one of the people from industry when they came to Executive Policy

Committee, a little question, a debate that happened in my household. After I said that I wasn't interested in having bottled water brought into our house on principle, someone in the house suggested what about this new bottled water that has flavour added to it? It's a good question actually. They take the same bottled water and add flavour to it and it's raspberry flavoured bottled water now. How do you exactly differentiate between the sale of bottled water, water that now has artificial raspberry flavouring added to it, and diet Coca Cola? It's difficult to make these types of hair-splitting decision isn't it Mr. Speaker. Exactly. but the difficulty is how can you say that only bottled water should be banned? I guess you're saying implicitly then, that if we ask the bottled water companies to add in some artificial raspberry flavouring, well then that's okay. Or, are you saying you can't do that? But you can still ban the sale of raspberry flavoured bottled water but you draw the line between that flavoured water and Diet Coke. The argument breaks down and that's the problem, Mr. Speaker. It's unfair to single out any single merchandiser in this context unless everybody is going to be placed under the same level playing field and dealt with accordingly. And we've had this discussion. Councillor O'Shaughnessy brought up the debate on the soft drinks and I've touched upon it myself. It is, as Councillor Swandel alluded to with some irony, that that's coming forward from Councillor Smith, who, as you know, drinks between 45 and 60 cans of Coke every single day.

There are some legitimate uses, Mr. Speaker, to bottled water and we see it all the time. We run some youth programming out of some of our arenas during the summer time. We see parents going in there and accessing bottled water. Their kids are going out. They haven't had a chance to pack bottled water. These things happen. They put them with the kid in their little lunch pack and off they go and they have a day outside and they have to drink water. When you're travelling with a baby, anyone who's ever done that, sometimes you need this type of stuff to take on the plane to make your formula and those types of things. As Councillor Swandel alluded to, there are periodically, thank god, not in the City of Winnipeg in recent memory, boiled water advisories in the vicinity of Winnipeg even. In those circumstances, it is nice and convenient to have the market place stocked with bottled water because people do need it.

In this bizarre consumerist society, I actually think that people do make a choice to buy bottled water instead of Coke, and I do believe that in certain percentages of the time, they will choose to drink Coke if there is no bottled water available, and we don't want to promote that.

For all of these complicated reasons, I'm afraid that with respect, I cannot support this motion as originally tabled.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I'm not sure, after the last three speakers, how much more I can add, but I will say this. I don't want to pile on my good friend Harvey Smith but I won't be supporting his motion. In my opinion a can of Coke or a bottle of Coke should only be used for cleaning your car battery. There are about 20 some tablespoons or teaspoons full of sugar in a can of Coke, and when I go to the MTS Centre or the Bertrand Arena or the Maginot Arena and my 10-year-old son and his buddy want to buy a bottle of water from the vending machine, I think that's a great thing. And that's something I think that really hits home for me as a parent. Does that mean I support the privatization of water services across Canada? Absolutely not. I think that's a totally separate issue. It's one…there's connections made here, but I think that's a leap and a half to go there. And I think at the end of the day, we have excellent water in the City of Winnipeg. Probably the best in all of Canada if you look at our source, Shoal Lake. I think that speaks for itself. And I have no hesitation in drinking City water. I do have some concerns, however, with the lead pipes that bring in that water in some of the older neighbourhoods, and that's

an untold story that nobody talks about, but it's there. It's a reality, and I think for all of those reasons I won't be supporting the motion on bottled water. I think there's lots of education to do. I have confidence in the quality of Winnipeg water but I think we need to offer choice, and when we have young people who are choosing water over Coca Cola, I'm not going to limit that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor. No further Speakers? Mr. Mayor can you close debate?

Mayor Katz: I would very much like to, Mr. Speaker. It has been very enlightening as well as entertaining.

Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone sitting in the gallery at some point in time has consumed tap water, at some point in time has consumed bottled water. We all make choices. Every morning when I make my daughter's lunch, I have two containers for a liquid. One, which I'm sure Councillor Steeves will understand, Hannah Montana, the other one, the Jonas Brothers. I fill them both with water, filled with water, tap water. All right? Which I agree with everybody is something that is a very precious commodity that we here take for granted, and if only you travel to other third world countries you would appreciate how wonderful this asset really is.

But the realities are, Mr. Speaker, we're making a choice. Just like here at City Hall. You can go downstairs. There's a fountain and you can have tap water. Mr. Speaker, this whole debate arose because another jurisdiction decided to make this move. Right away the media asked questions, and a Councillor decides here's the response, here is what I'm going to do. What the action should have been is action similar to what some of us have done in the past: A long time before this became an issue, Mr. Speaker, bottled water was eliminated from my office. We have no bottled water. We didn't promote it. We didn't tell the world. We made a decision because we believed it was a good decision. When we have meetings that every member of this Council attends downstairs, seminars, you will see pitchers of water. We're making a decision. We're doing the right thing. That doesn't mean we should take away the opportunity for others to exercise their right to consume what they want. And in some situations they don't have an opportunity because as we know, it's not always easy to take water from a fountain which I believe the City of Winnipeg can do a much better job of making sure the pressure in our fountains is better, that they're cleaner, etc. We can do that and I already spoke to Councillor Smith, and I said as a result of his motion, I think we've been brought to light that we could do better on that. But the facts are, sometimes in City-owned facilities you don't even have that opportunity. When you're sitting there, you want to consume something right beside you, it's not there. It's bottled water. And I agree with the health critic, Councillor O'Shaughnessy. That drinking bottled water is much better than some of the opportunities out there. But you know what? It's all about choice. We all have that choice. So you know what? Let's enlighten, let's educate. That we can do. And let's make sure more people drink tap water and eventually what will happen, you'll see the sales of bottled water slowly decreasing, decreasing and decreasing, and what will happen, simple economics, supply and demand. If the demand isn't there, the supply will go away and they'll fill the void where it does exist. It's just that simple Mr. Speaker.

And there is one issue I need to address. There's all sorts of numbers thrown out. I'm not going to get into a debate of what's safer, what's not safer. You know, I hear people from the industry saying it's very safe. I hear others saying it's not safe. We talk about recycling. First of all bottled water, the bottles are recycled at a rate of 60% right now. I have said we can do much better, and that's what we should be doing. We should be meeting with the industry to do more recycling and get it up to 90%. That should be our job. Not debating this issue, Mr. Speaker. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. So on Item No. 3, the Report of the Executive Policy Committee that motion be filed. All

in favour? A 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, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal, and Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi and Smith.

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 2.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is carried. Item 2 is carried. Item No. 4

Item 4 - Establishment of a Destination Marketing Reserve Fund
E-File FI-7

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to introduce the motion and the clause. I believe everybody has seen Motion 1, Mr. Speaker.

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

THAT Recommendations 2.A and 2.E of Item No. 4 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 3, 2008 be deleted in their entirety and replaced with the following:

"2.A That a grant equal to the greater of $2.0 million or 30% of the annual Accommodation Tax revenue be provided annually to Destination Winnipeg Inc."

"2.E That the remainder of the funds, net of the above, be paid to Destination Winnipeg Inc. for the Special Event Marketing Fund. If yearly contributions to the Special Event Marketing Fund exceed $ 1.0 million, any excess above this amount be paid to Destination Winnipeg Inc. in the form of an additional grant. Dispositions from the Destination Marketing Reserve Fund for this purpose require approval of the Fund Manager."

Mayor Katz: What it basically does, it replaces 2a and 2b and the whole purpose of this, Mr. Speaker, is quite simply to make sure that if there is growth in this fund, that it is distributed based on a percentage basis. That's what this is all about. And that's what obviously Destination Winnipeg, that is our marketing arm, if you know you hear different numbers of 7.2, 8.5, or reaches $10 million that their funding would be increased as well, and to be very frank with you, Mr. Speaker, we've talked about this for a long time. And I believe we have an opportunity for the first time to do something that's never happened in our City. Number 1, to increase the funding of Destination Winnipeg, and I'm talking about significantly, well over 50% and possibly doubling in the near future.

Number 2, and god-willing it happens, Mr. Speaker, we are setting aside funding for the expansion of the Winnipeg Convention Centre. We all know there is still work to be done on that. I think we all know the importance of that. The Convention Centre has said that they basically create demand for 90,000 rooms on an annual basis. I think we know the valuable input of the Convention Centre. But the realities are they are a tier 2, and they're going to fall into that category. They need more space. What we have done for the first time we've planned ahead and we've come up with a plan on how to accommodate the funding of the Convention Centre. They still have to make sure that both the other two levels of government are on board and hopefully that's a job they'll be successful at.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, for the years that I've been here and long before that, Winnipeg has always done special events. The Junos, World Curling, women's hockey, Grey Cup, these events

quite often, Mr. Speaker, can be asking anywhere up to half a million to three quarters of a million dollars from the City of Winnipeg. We've never had a fund available for that. We're always scrambling around trying to figure out a way to deal with that. We know it's a good event for our City. We know it's going to stimulate business. People will spend money. We know that every other level of government except for the City of Winnipeg will get money from it because of P.S.T. and G.S.T., and now what we're doing is creating a special event fund that we can actually actively go out there through Destination Winnipeg and pursue these special events as well as, Mr. Speaker, be proactive and go out there and get, I guess, aggressively go out there and get conventions which we know the impact they have on the City.

So the special event fund, Destination Winnipeg, along with the Winnipeg Convention Centre, that's what we've always said this would be. We maintain that and all the Motion 1 is doing is basically making sure that everyone understands that there will be growth potentially if the numbers are larger and where that money is going. This is very good for our City. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker that I've had direct communication with people who basically run hotels, and they are very supportive of this and I believe that Council should be supportive of it, and this will basically pay great dividends in the future. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor on the…no further Speakers. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt. I just want to rise to just say I think this is a very significant development for our City, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Mayor. I think the leadership here has been excellent to bring about an accommodation tax as Council has talked about an accommodation tax for years and years. It's never occurred. It's one thing to talk about it. It's another thing to do it. There is no doubt in my mind that the fact that we are actually setting up a reserve and saving for a future expanded Convention Centre is crucial to the renewal of the Convention Centre. We risk becoming a third tier Convention Centre City if we don't expand our Convention Centre. I don't think Winnipeggers want to see that. I think they want to be a City that is visited and is marketed and can have a convention centre facility no different than other larger cities across this country, so it's crucial that we expand it, it's crucial for downtown renewal and this accommodation tax makes it possible. So I welcome the motion here today and encourage that it be unanimous, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Nordman and then Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Nordman: Thanks Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, just some of the logistics inside the presentation here. It outlines that our Chief Financial Officer will be the fund manager and later…on the Event Marketing Fund…and later in the program it suggests that we will have two representatives from the City of Winnipeg on the Committee. Will that include the Chief Financial Officer or will he be separate from the five person committee?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty? The Mayor will address that, Councillor Nordman, when he will be closing. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to say I won't be supporting either the motion or the original proposal. My concerns are, I speak to people in the event industry. We're (inaudible) opposition to the motion here. There is a $1 million cap on money that's going to go annually into the annual fund. My understanding is some relatively small events in recent times have been lost to other cities because, you know, the Destination Marketing Funds in other cities have provided relatively small amounts of money to relatively small events to make the events happened. We lost an event to Calgary recently. I don't…I forget the specific event but again, it was relatively small but again, by capping the $1 million it doesn't give full advantage to the possibility of this

program being successful and having that pot grow as opposed to just general funding for Destination Winnipeg for general over-all marketing, which would be stuck within the organization.

My other concern as I stated with the hotel tax is we still have absolutely no support from the other levels of government for the Convention Centre. I, along with his Worship Mayor Katz and board member Councillor Nordman were at the introduction of the new plans for the Convention Centre. It is exciting and I think it is an interesting project, however, at this point, there is no level of support from the other levels of government. In fact the comments from the Premier I think were quite negative towards Provincial contributions towards this. So for that reason I think it's premature to be having this much money being allocated towards a reserve for an expanded Convention Centre. So in terms of the annual grant, again, I think it's not inappropriate necessarily to have it funded by a Destination Marketing Fund, but it should be from downtown hotels exclusively. Why should guests at airport hotels be paying for a downtown Convention Centre? I don't see the connection. So for those reasons, similar to what I stated on the hotel tax, I won't be supporting this. Thank you.

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I will be enthusiastically supporting the clause, I have a slight concern, and it says that this committee that will decide what national events to go after and how much to subsidize trying to bring them here, this Committee will have two representatives from the City. One senior official from the Mayor's Office, the other one, someone from some other department. I really see a possible danger here. I think there should be someone from Council on this committee. I think there are decisions that would not be politically wise to go after. There will be some…I don't want to mention anything specific but there's a million things that could spark an unnecessary controversy. We could be bringing in…trying to bring in a convention that one of their major platforms is that they are pro-choice. Another could be a group that is known openly to be pro-life. If you can use either one of those flawed descriptions but they easily show who you are talking about. And you can go way beyond that. I think someone with the political savvy to immediately get their antenna tingling and know what this can be and have it checked out first to see if it is the will of the Council of the City to promote such an event, would be wise. So I'm going to support it but to have two bureaucrats on the committee representing Winnipeg may not be the wisest thing of all.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. No further Speakers. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all for clarification Mr. Speaker, there will be a committee of five, which will basically manage the special event fund. There will be two representatives from the City of Winnipeg, two representatives from Destination Winnipeg and one representative from the Manitoba Hotel Association. Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that these would all be very able people who have the ability to know what's good for our City and what's not good, and I understand Councillor O'Shaughnessy's concern. I think it's very unlikely, I think it is actually improbable that something like that could ever happen although I do appreciate where he is coming from. We were talking very astute, bright people who will be part of this process.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the other levels of government, I did make that comment right at the beginning and Councillor Browaty basically reinforced it, that they are not there as far as funding is concerned today, but I can almost quote the comments that the Premier made and he said that to me as well. We'll have to kick the tires and we're going to have to kick them real hard. I think what the Premier of our Province is basically saying is I want to take a good look at the cost and make sure that we are not spending more money than is necessary, and from my point of view that's a good

thing. That's part of your due diligence. But I do believe that the Provincial Government will be part of this, and hopefully the Federal Government will buy into it as well. Keep something in mind. I'm sure everybody on the floor of Council is aware of the fact that we were the only City to basically build a Convention Centre because we were the first, with no Federal funding whatsoever. We did it a long time ago because there were people here who had vision and saw the light and hopefully will have the vision to expand this Convention Centre and keep going with what was created many years ago. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. On the motion Number 1, All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Do you want to be recorded in opposition? Councillor Browaty.

On Number 4, as amended**.** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mr. Mayor I know you have an engagement at 12 noon so Report of October 15, 2008, if you can maybe do it real fast?

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 15, 2008

Mayor Katz: With the cooperation of Council, maybe, we'll see Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I would like to introduce the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 4.

Mr. Speaker: Number 1 has been stood down. On 2, 3 and 4 - All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item number 1.

Item 1 - Implementation of the Mayor's Trade Council Recommendations
E-File GG

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to hear from Councillor Gerbasi and then I will try to respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I did appear at EPC to speak to this as well and I do believe that it's a very important issue, that's, with a lot of the other issues we're dealing with today, is just kind of quietly going through and I just wanted to bring some attention to it and put some comments on the record.

We've heard a lot lately about Winnipeg becoming an inland port, and that the Mayor's Trade Council report has recommended a number of transportation-related approaches to help strengthen Winnipeg's economy. And I want to be clear that I am in support of most of the report and most of the direction that it is going.

The Mayor's Trade Council report, authored by Chris Lorenc, a former City Councillor and President of the Heavy Construction Industry's lobby organization…this report was approved in principle at Council last March. And the problem that I had with one part of the report and the problem I still have because it's still there is where the report recommends a number of road widenings and expansions of our street system, be brought forward for priority consideration in the next Capital Budget. This includes recommendations such as the over $100 million possibly widening of Kenaston Boulevard and a further extension of the Chief Peguis Trail, beyond the one that we're already building right now for $64 million and are in the process of implementing. This is essentially a black hole of infrastructure spending to increase automobile capacity and it is going in the opposite direction that progressive cities across Canada and the world are going. Road widenings have minimal benefits as they encourage expansion of the use of the automobile, and as we are in the midst of a global climate-change crisis, we might want to look at the bigger picture before we shift our immediate priorities in this direction. Making choices to widen and expand our car capacity in this manner will reduce our ability to make further investments in sustainable transportation options. There is only so much money to go around.

In Appendix A of the report, this…and what has come forward this time…last time it was the actual report. Now it's the implementation plan, and what it says in Appendix A is that the Director of Public Works and the Director of Planning, Property and Development will ensure that…and the Chief Financial Officer…will ensure that the projects identified by the Mayor's Trade Council as priorities under the trade route system are brought forward for priority consideration in the context of the next Capital Budget. So this is an immediate shift in our actual budgets which we are in the process of, which are being worked on right now. And then when you go to Appendix B it lists those street systems that I referred to… widening Kenaston from Assiniboine to Taylor, a stage completion of the inner ring-road consistent with Plan Winnipeg Plates B and C. As you know the widening of Kenaston is one of the projects that is not in Plan Winnipeg, although we're already funding the initial stages of that project.

Now keep in mind that these projects, until now, have not been priorized ahead of a number of other projects that are also included in Plan Winnipeg, namely, the expansion of our transit infrastructure. And we also know that Plan Winnipeg contains additional expansions to the Rapid Transit system, and we don't yet have a financing plan to build Phase 2 of the BRT corridor to the U of M, nor begin the eastern part of the transit corridor, all of which were recommendations from the Mayor's Rapid Transit Task Force report which was also endorsed by Council, yet when that report came forward there was no immediate recommendation to shift our Capital Budget planning to reflect those new priorities. So if we're going to make these things a priority, why are we doing that outside of the context of other important priorities such as Rapid Transit? There hasn't been adequate cost benefit analysis for this. When this came to Council last March I asked, I moved a motion that we refer this back to…for a full Council seminar for discussion so we can look at all of the Capital Budget priorities, not just this road expansion idea, and that motion was defeated. So essentially, by adopting this today we're accepting verbatim that these are now our new priorities and that's why I'm rising to raise this point of concern. There has not been proper public consultation about this. The Mayor's Environmental Advisory Committee certainly hasn't been asked about this. There was no Council seminar. There has been no grass roots consultation. Something as big as this, this is unacceptable. There should have been an extensive analysis of the environmental impact of these choices and one thing about the report is that it's pretty quiet when it comes to talking about climate change and the environmental impacts of these decisions and of our over dependence on the automobile. The Province has stated, who supports the inland port idea, that they are very keen on becoming the greenest province in Canada, and they too should be speaking up on these issues as well. And I'm afraid it's just not on anybody's radar and I really don't know why.

So I don't want to repeat myself here. I believe that the priorities of the City in our Capital Budget should be first to maintain our existing infrastructure, and we have some expensive infrastructure projects we have to do such as the Disraeli Bridge, for example, and also to invest in environmentally friendly, sustainable alternatives such as public transit which I'm thrilled that we're doing today with the first phase of Rapid Transit. But this…these new expansions of automobile infrastructure have been on a lot of people's wish lists for a long time but they are, they should really be further down our list of a City as priorities for our City. And again I'll point out the Rapid Transit Task Force was adopted in principle, and an implementation report was brought forward and yet in that report, it costed-out the cost of all the transit corridors and it also included extensive information about the benefits of it and so on. And yet those projects have not been priorized in our Capital Budget, so I really think we're putting the cart before the horse.

The last point I'd like to make is that when I spoke to EPC on the matter last week, members of EPC urged me to support this Trade Council Implementation Report

so that Council could be unanimous in going forward on this, and I said this there and I'll say this again here. That I would support it wholeheartedly on one condition. I would ask Council to remove the part of the recommendations that directs the public service to radically proceed to immediately change our Capital Budget priorities ignoring the environment, ignoring public transit and sustainable infrastructure.

So I urge Council to…I realize at the last minute, you seem to be intent on this direction but I hope that you'll consider what I'm saying before we make, ultimately make those Capital Budget decisions. I'm very concerned that this is going ahead and telling our staff to change our Capital Budget in this fashion. I believe it's out of context. I believe it's short-sighted, and it's a huge concern not just to me, but I think to a lot of citizens who are concerned about sustainability, to students and others that have spoken about this already today. And the Rapid Transit Coalition and others support this. So, thanks for your consideration and for listening.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors we have about 4 minutes to 12 noon and I would suggest we should adjourn to 1:30 because the Mayor…we have two more Speakers. Are you willing to go right through? Okay go ahead. Councillor Fielding you're next.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support the implementation plan before us. In my opinion the development around the inland port, or Centreport, as we're calling it, as well as the strategic infrastructure priorities are some of the most important developments here in the City of Winnipeg over the next 50 years. For me the project really represents the future of Winnipeg and endless opportunity that the Centreport can bring.

Now we all know that Winnipeg of course is strategically as well as geographically the centre of Canada. I think our citizens know that as we put that on our signs recently. But I think we really have an opportunity here, and if we get this right, the Centreport can really become a reality here, and revolutionize our economy in my opinion. What this really means to our average citizen is jobs. Jobs and expansion. Real jobs, Real jobs for real people.

For the project to go ahead the private sector and the public sector need to get together, come together with a plan, and that's exactly what we have here today with the implementation plan. We need to give the project the necessary tools to get off the ground and be successful. Part of the tools is to strategically invest in infrastructure to allow businesses to come and have this vision or reality here for the City of Winnipeg.

We also need to do things such as the innovative financing, the TIF's as we call them, coordination of regulation, as well as reduction of red tape to ensure this project moves along in a strategic as well as a fast paced action. I know there has been some opposition. I heard my good friend Councillor Gerbasi talk, and I do want to talk about some of her suggestions in terms of the strategic investment in infrastructure. And I think there…I respect it but I think they are completely wrong, and that we should be looking at things such as widening Kenaston and the ring-road that would be associated with it. I'd like to also suggest that this is a new vision for Winnipeg.

What the project really means to our citizens is economic development from the private sector and the potential to transform our development. We need to invest in widening Kenaston as well as some of the ring roads that it's associated with. The People that are opposed to this infrastructure, I'd like to ask the question, essentially, how do you think we're going to get the infrastructure that's there? You're trying to put together products at the airport, you can't just use sustainable development that's…that's there in terms of the bus service. You need to expand the road system that's there. This also has to take a look at terms of some of the development that's along Kenaston. We've seen substantial development that's there. We're going to see more at the Polo Park location. We need to expand if there's going to be future

development in terms of residential development, whether it be through Waverley West, when the barracks come on line. This is an area that needs expansion, not just for the airport but for the greater good of our citizens. So I very much support this. I think there has been much talk about sustainable transportation and, you know, for the record, I think we should be using, you know, more transportation in terms of bus services. But it struck me that recently, the term automobile has suddenly become a dirty word here in the City of Winnipeg, and the fact of the matter is, there is a lot of people that are going to, you know…we should encourage them to use transportation but let's face facts. The majority of Winnipeggers do use automobiles and you're not going to be able to change that. You know, for myself, we have a young family, we transport our children to and from daycares. We have a business. There is a busy society and transit is not an option for us all the time, and thus we cannot just look at one direction in terms of transit. You need to look at the automobile and the infrastructure deficit and infrastructure priorities that we need as a City. So I think you can do both and you need to do both. And for these reasons I very much am in support of this. I think the vast majority of Winnipeggers would support this. And I will be supporting it when the vote does come. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I rise today to enthusiastically support this motion before us here today.

Winnipeg has a very unique advantage in that we are located centrally in the middle of the country. Our existing transportation assets are huge, whether it be the fact that we have both of the major railways. I mean our start at the confluence of two rivers. Winnipeg has a great history of transportation. I have the privilege of being an intern at the University of Manitoba's Transport Institute, and today the undergraduate program and programs in logistics at the University of Manitoba are a huge thing. In fact, a lot of the students that will be taking these programs will be taking Rapid Transit in the very near future to go study. We need to create these jobs here in transportation, and it will fuel things like Rapid Transit to get out to the University of Manitoba. I think it's a phenomenal opportunity, and I think it's ridiculous that today some of our major trade routes go down specifically Kenaston Boulevard, go down a street with single family residential homes. This is one of our most major trade routes. I don't think anyone needs to be…I don't think anyone should be surprised that we need to address that and we should address that soon. So again, I will be enthusiastically supporting this and I will let everyone move on to lunch very quickly. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Browaty. No further Speakers? Oh, Councillor Swandel. Not that soon Councillor Browaty. Councillor Swandel followed by Vandal and Smith.

Councillor Swandel: I just want to clarify a couple of points, Mr. Speaker.

We often hear this…I raised this at EPC as well...we often here the rhetoric that Plan Winnipeg has settled priorities for us, the widening of Kenaston, for example, is not in there. Just for everybody's information, the widening of no streets are in Plan Winnipeg. Plan Winnipeg includes the…on its map…the creation of new streets in areas like the inner perimeter and also includes the Rapid Transit corridor pieces, or better transit. So just so everybody is clear, something like the widening of Kenaston would never be in Plan Winnipeg.

We often fall in this trap. Councillors get caught up on one particular page of Plan Winnipeg and they often neglect to read the preamble to Plan Winnipeg and I'll just read you a brief excerpt from it. "This plan sets out explanatory texts in a series of numbered statements within five chapters. Collectively this represents policy direction for the City of Winnipeg. The numbered statements include a blending of plans, policies and proposed initiatives which for the sake of interpretation, are proposals as referred

to in Section 583 of The City of Winnipeg Act. Section 583 of the Act states that the passing of the Plan Winnipeg by-law does not require Council or any person, association, organization or departmental agency of the Crown to undertake a proposal contained in the by-law, but no public work undertaken or development shall be inconsistent with the Plan Winnipeg by-law. When two or more statements in this plan conflict or may conflict in their application the Council of the City, the Committees of Council and the officers of the City having jurisdiction shall apply their judgment regarding the best balance between or among those plans and policies." So basically it's saying we're elected as Council to come here and to weigh these issues, and so I'll just read a couple of pieces from Plan Winnipeg and the first piece is called Providing Economic Direction and Support. It's about helping our economy and the section is "2C-06 Support Intermodal Transportation Strategy. The City shall support an intermodal transportation strategy in co-operation with local business, the Province and other jurisdictions by identifying those opportunities associated with the mid continent trade corridor for air, rail and truck transport industry development which are consistent with the City's economic development strategy, and participating in the development of a business plan and budget for intermodal transportation and required infrastructure." That's right, required infrastructure. "Securing adequate funding from the private sector and all levels of government in determining evaluation criteria for projects' success." It goes on to say "That the City shall partner with the Winnipeg Airports Authority on initiatives which capitalize upon the airport's capacity to generate strategic economic development by participating in the development of intermodal linkages to the airport including supporting the construction of a new east-west linkage to the west Perimeter Highway as noted in Policy Plate B, subsequent to a business case analysis. Improving street connections, urban design and signage along a designated route between the airport and downtown. Working with major industrial users of airport facilities and airliners to identify their needs in support of strategic economic development." That was on the economic side on Plan Winnipeg and then when you go to the transportation side which is what was specifically raised here, and in the category known as "Integrating Transportation in Plan Winnipeg, provide integrated transportation network" is what it says. And Item 7 in that category says "Designating truck routes that ensure the safe and efficient movement of goods and the protection of existing neighbourhoods, through standardized speed, capacity, access, traffic signal synchronization and weight limits harmonized with Provincial and Federal regulations", and Section 8 goes on to say "Improving the truck route between the airport, the downtown, the Perimeter and intermodal access points." So what we are talking about here is something that is entirely consistent with Plan Winnipeg. And remember we are not talking about here, is we are not talking about the effective, or efficient movement of people. What we're talking about here is the efficient movement of goods. In order to have a City that is vibrant, you have to have an economy. In order to have an economy that is vibrant, you need to be able to move goods, and for us, many of our trading partners, layouts, or much of our economy lays outside of the City of Winnipeg. So not to be supporting this, you know, and when you go through all of Plan Winnipeg, you read the preamble to Plan Winnipeg, you understand how the document is to be used and you actually understand what appears in the Policy Plates in Plan Winnipeg. Not to support this I think would be irresponsible. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. We have four Councillors to speak. Councillor Vandal, Steeves, Smith and Wyatt. You want out? So we'll have four, we have three Councillors that want to speak. We still want to continue? Let's break? Who moves adjournment? Councillor Smith moves adjournment to 1:30, so next to speak after Vandal, Smith and Wyatt. We stand adjourned until 1:30.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of October 22, 2008 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, Please get into the chambers so we can commence continuation of our Council meeting. We have three more speakers to the issue that's before us and then the Mayor will close if there is no further Speakers and we vote, and then we will continue. It's raining outside. The weather is lousy. But, Mr. Clerk do we have a quorum?

Deputy City Clerk: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have quorum.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Let's get on with the meeting. The next Speaker is Councillor Swandel. Did you speak already on this issue? (inaudible). Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I was all wound up there before lunch, but I lost my momentum. Mayor's Trade recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns me about this report, and I put this on the record back in January, I think, when we talked about it, is when you have six priorities you don't have any priorities, and I look at the long list of priorities in this issue on page 14 of 17, and I add them on to the Rapid Transit priorities and we're at about one and a half billion dollars. Waverley West connection from Bishop Grandin to the Perimeter, it's…I support that, it's necessary. I don't know how much it's going to cost. Development of road connection to the Perimeter Highway, west of the Airport. We support that. I don't know if they're costed out but we can imagine order of magnitude numbers, given inflation. Kenaston Boulevard widening, stage completion of the inner ring road,.consistent with Plan Winnipeg, beyond 2020. We're going to be approving, I believe, $90 million of borrowing for Rapid Transit Phase 1. Phase 1 is really, doesn't serve its purpose without Phase 2 which is about $200 million. I don't know how we're going to finance that yet. We haven't even talked about the inland port, what exactly that means for the City of Winnipeg in terms of contributions. So we're up to, I would say conservatively, one, one and a quarter billion dollars without knowing how any of this is going to be re-jigged, without knowing how it's going to be financed, and we're being asked to simply approve this, let the administration do its work and we're going to re-jig the Capital Budget. I said it back in January I didn't think there was enough information here. There is no mention of rail which is, I think, an essential component of the inland port. At the time, I had briefed myself on the National Trade Strategy, which was co-authored by Mr. DeFehr I believe it was, which was heavily reliant on rail. Why aren't we considering rail and what are our ultimate costs going to be for that? So for all of those reasons I'm going to vote against this. I don't think there is enough information. I think it is superseding capital budget deliberations and that's the point I wanted to make. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith. No.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very important initiative that's before us today, and I guess I'm a little frustrated with regards to some of the opposition. Specifically, with regards to the development of new infrastructure, Mr. Speaker, new strategic infrastructure throughout the City being some of the transportation networks that we need to build as a City. And I get… and I think there has to be maybe a common sense check here or a reality check. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that if you look at a lot of the regional streets in the City, especially the so-called inner ring streets if you like, the existing ones that have already been built such as Bishop Grandin, such as Kenaston, the Kenaston extension, such as we're contemplating with Chief Peguis, but the existing ones that are already built, you look at the use of those streets Mr. Speaker. Yes, the automobile uses those streets. Yes, our buses also use those streets. And, Mr. Speaker, what I think they were primarily built for was the

movements of goods and services, believe it or not. Trucks. Everybody in this City, last time I checked, goes to the grocery store and buys goods. They buy milk. They buy fresh vegetables. They buy fresh fruit. How do these goods get to these stores, Mr. Speaker? They don't fly through the air. They are not transported by an air ship, not yet at least. They are transferred by truck. Trucks throughout our City, throughout our country, Mr. Speaker, moving goods back and forth, goods that we manufacturer here to other destinations. Parts and materials that are coming in to insist…to add to our manufacturing industry, Mr. Speaker. All of this is done by and large, to a large extent by trucks and by rail. Mr. Speaker, this is our backbone of our economy. This is how our modern economic system has developed, with the transportation network at hand. And, if we listen to the Speakers who are opposing this, they want this simply just to stop. That we shouldn't be growing the economy. That we shouldn't be growing the City. That we shouldn't be looking at alternatives. Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker, about the benefit of having alternative transportation routes like the future Chief Peguis Trail, because it was about 20 or 30 years ago…you would recall this debate Mr. Speaker… you were in the Council Chamber when it was debated and the decision was made, and I say that respectfully to you, Mr. Speaker, by the way. Respectfully. The decision was made by this Council to remove Jubilee as a truck route. Jubilee. Which constituency is Jubilee in? I believe it's Fort Rouge, Fort Garry today. To remove it as a truck route Mr. Speaker. Why? The residents in the area were outraged with the truck traffic going up and down their residences, their houses built right on the street and they were furious about it. And rightfully so. Their houses were shaking, trucks are going up and down, but how were we able to do this Mr. Speaker? We offered an alternative. Bishop Grandin just to the south for another east-west connection. Otherwise where would these trucks be going Mr. Speaker? They use Bishop Grandin today instead of using Jubilee. It makes a lot of sense. No different, Mr. Speaker, than in the future, the trucks will be using the Chief Peguis Trail instead of using Springfield, and all the houses up there that have been hammered over the years because of the truck traffic. Try driving down Springfield at 2:00 in the afternoon, Mr. Speaker. You're at a crawl because of the car traffic and the truck traffic going up and down that street, and we're supposed to grind everything to a halt? Whether we build the inland port or not, Mr. Speaker, the City still has to keep progressing. Same goes up in the Maples area, in the North Kildonan area, and Leila. Residential, both sides. And the future extension that would take it around the City, Mr. Speaker, and connect into the entire trucking industry, which is virtually based up on Brookside Boulevard. Mr. Speaker, you can go down to the corner of Portage and Notre Dame and stand there at lunch and literally count truck after truck after truck. Why are they rolling through there? They're the big CN piggyback trucks, you know, from the intermodal terminal. Who made that decision? The Council before 2002 election. Who was on that Council? The Mayor, the previous Mayor, Glen Murray, including Councillor Gerbasi. I've looked up the minutes and I don't see her opposing the decision to build the Kenaston underpass and relocate the Winnipeg Intermodal Terminal to the east side of the City. It was carried on the Council floor, and I think other Councillors who were around at that time supported the decision. Was any money invested in the east side of the City, Mr. Speaker, to fix the road network? No, absolutely not. As a matter of fact, you can go there now, today, and you can see the state of Plessis Road. You can see the state of Dugald Road and all those trucks, Mr. Speaker, which, by the way, the majority of them have to get to this side of the City, the west side of the City, to get to businesses, and to the industrial park, to the airport and elsewhere, literally, Mr. Speaker, rolling through the centre of our City and knocking the heck out of all our roads. Wonderful public policy decision, Mr. Speaker, wonderful. These Councillors voted yet, and they voted to initiate the process to start the Kenaston underpass construction, Mr. Speaker. It's amazing how short the memories are, Mr. Speaker, and it's amazing how it seems that in one example, there is no problem,

you can go ahead and do this. Only a few short eight years ago, Mr. Speaker, or six years ago actually. Six years ago. And yet this, Mr. Speaker, to continue that process is unacceptable. Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the rationale. It doesn't make any sense and I think it's clear it doesn't make any sense and that's why clearly this clause should be supported wholeheartedly.

Putting aside the whole idea, Mr. Speaker, of the concept which is addressed in the clause, which is the inland port, and it's, you know, it's still not a guarantee that this inland port is going to happen, or that it's going to work. But I'll tell what you, Mr. Speaker. If it does work, if it does happen, maybe we should be more positive. When it does happen it's going to create thousands of jobs. Not just in Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, but in the entire Province. People wanting to supply goods and services onto trains, to take them back out to Prince Rupert and on to China and back again, Mr. Speaker, this is going to be…this will have a huge benefit to our City. This is about the future of our City, Mr. Speaker, as a transportation hub that we built the City on transportation. We relied on the rivers originally and then when we had the…when the rivers were not efficient enough and the railway came in, we relied on the railway, and then we had the foresight to build a national highway system, Mr. Speaker. And now we're going to take the next step and that is to combine highway with rail in an efficient manner to not just do inter-provincial trade, Mr. Speaker. Not just to do international trade with the United States in North America, or Mexico, but international trade abroad, Mr. Speaker, across the Pacific into Asia. That's what this is about. So, you don't even have to support it for that reason, Mr. Speaker, you should be supporting it for the very reason that we need to build a modern road network for trade, for goods and services like we have in the past, and we need it for the future, Mr. Speaker, because the economy…we cannot allow the economy of this country or City to grind to a halt as some people would like us to do. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. No further Speakers? Mr. Mayor do you want to close on Item 1.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard some very interesting discussion, Mr. Speaker.

For some unknown reason it appears there are a few here who want us to live in the dark ages and get back into our caves before the wheel was invented. I don't want to be part of that. I want to see progress. I look on the floor of Council, Mr. Speaker, and I see a lot of young students from Red River, and you know what, Mr. Speaker, this is our future. This is what it's all about. This is why we're here. And if we want them to stay here, if we want them to get quality jobs, if we want them to have a good life, because now you have to have a good life, you know just getting by it doesn't cut it any more. You want people to live, to play, to work here. You want to attract other people their age to come to our City. If you don't support this, that tells me you don't want any of that. And sometimes I've heard so often and probably more often than not, it's been Councillor Steeves who has talked about wouldn't it be nice if a motion was unanimous. I've come to the conclusion that's just not going to happen. It's not going to happen for reasons I can't quite figure out, Mr. Speaker. Councillor Wyatt has talked about short memories. It's not short memories. It's hypocrisy. End of story. And sometimes I wonder if maybe it wasn't called the Mayor's Trade Council, maybe it would get support. Maybe if it was the Speaker's Trade Council it would get support. This is something very good, something positive. You hear criticism because it's not part of Plan Winnipeg. Well Professor Swandel has told us over and over again it does qualify. It is exactly what it's supposed to be. People make all sorts of statements on the floor of Council. They don't have to resemble truth in any way, shape or form. Just say it. Hopefully no one disagrees and, you know what, it gets out there. No one disagrees, maybe the media will pick it up. It becomes reality. You know what, I don't care about perception, I care about reality, and if you're not supporting this

you don't care about the growth of our City. Because, you know, when I look at this…and I was very happy to hear Councillor Gerbasi say that, the majority of this she is supportive of. And if there is one thing taken out she would probably support it. You know when I went to school, if there were ten items on a list and you got eight of them right, that's pretty much a passing grade, Mr. Speaker. You don't fail someone because they got one or two out of ten wrong. This is good. This is positive. This is growing our City. This is making our City of Winnipeg a place where they and they want to stay, bring up a family and our City will continue to grow. If you don't want that, don't vote for it. Don't vote for it. Stay in your caves, stay put because you know what? We don't need you to get the right thing done. We need people who believe in what we're doing, who believe that we should have progress in our City, who believe we should have quality jobs for our young people, because what else is going to get them to stay here? Minimum wage doesn't cut it, Mr. Speaker. Quality jobs. That inland port could be the best darn thing that ever happened to this City! And you know what? It's really sad that not only do you have to fight other cities in western Canada like Edmonton or Regina or Saskatoon who are trying to do this. We have to fight on the floor of Council? We can't even get unanimity here? Mr. Speaker, it is what it is. This should all be supported by every single Councillor here. If you care about our City, want us to grow, want us to prosper. If you don't, then vote against it. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Well, we'll soon find out. Recorded vote.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi and Vandal.

Mr. Speaker: And the vote?

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 2.

Mr. Speaker: The item is carried. EPC Notice of Motion. Councillor Gerbasi? Councillor O'Shaughnessy?

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Before we get any further, I don't know if this is the time, that'd be up to you. But I want to, because these two motions are so obviously intertwined, I would like to move both be referred to the Secretariat Committee through EPC for report back within 120 days.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Clement: We have a motion on the floor.

Mr. Speaker: We have a motion on the floor.

Councillor Gerbasi: It was a Notice of Motion. It' suppose to be debated today.

Councillor Clement: No we can't. No we have to (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Maybe I'll throw this onto the table…I talked to Councillor Gerbasi about this and if it pleases you, Mr. Speaker.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Vandal: Should be voting on the motion rather than…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves. Preference takes place on Councillor O'Shaughnessy's motion.

Councillor Steeves: I was standing up before him, the rascal. He snuck in.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves. You have an opportunity to vote against it.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy's motion of referral to the Secretariat and report back within 120 days am I correct? All in favour? Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour of Councillor O'Shaughnessy's motion please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Clement, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Swandel, Wyatt, and Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Fielding, Gerbasi, Smith, Steeves, and Vandal.

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 6.

Mr. Speaker: So the motion is carried. Councillor O'Shaughnessy's motion is carried. That will come back within 120 days and both motions will be dealt with in due time. EPC motions.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Councillor Swandel: I don't know if this is a point of order or a point of clarification. In one of the motions there is an item speaking to whistle blower legislation and pieces involving the employees of the City of Winnipeg as well as the politicians, and I'm wondering if it would not be appropriate to also ensure that the representatives of the employees are invited to speak in delegation. I'm not sure how to do that through Secretariat.

Mr. Speaker: They will be.

Councillor Swandel: I'm just saying when it goes to Secretariat.

Mr. Speaker: All that's.... what is going to the Secretariat is what was passed by... What's that? Yeah refer to EPC. Okay we're dealing with motions now. Which motion will we hear first? Number -- motion No. 3 is automatic referral by Mayor Katz and Councillor Steeves. Automatic referral unless if you want to deal with it now, Mr. Mayor.

Motion No. 3
Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz
Seconded by Councillor Steeves

WHEREAS with the October 9, 2008, Royal Assent to Bill 47, The CentrePort Canada Act, the City of Winnipeg is required to appoint one person as a nominee director on the Board of Directors for CentrePort Canada Inc., for a term of no more than three years;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Art Mauro be appointed as nominee director on the Board of Directors for CentrePort Canada Inc. for a 3-year term commencing October 22, 2008 and expiring October 21, 2011.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that we suspend the rules to deal with this now. It's Motion No. 3

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 3. Whereas with the October 9, 2008 Royal Assent of Bill 47. You've got that Councillors? Okay. This is the…to deal with it now. Anyone wants to speak to it? If not I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motion No. 3. Next one is No. 4. Councillor Nordman, automatic referral but Councillor Nordman I understand you want to move the motion?

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Nordman,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

WHEREAS the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games are taking place in Vancouver, British Columbia, and this will be an event of special significance to all Canadians;

AND WHEREAS the Vancouver Organizing Committee for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games has invited the City of Winnipeg to participate in the Olympic Torch Relay to take place prior to the Games, by hosting a special event to welcome the Olympic Torch Relay;

AND WHEREAS the prospect of Winnipeg's hosting an event to welcome the Olympic Torch Relay represents a unique opportunity for the City, as the eyes of the world would be focused on Winnipeg;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg conclude an agreement with the Vancouver Organizing Committee for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, committing the City to provide funding and services-in-kind in support of a civic celebration related to the visit of the Olympic Torch Relay to Winnipeg in January, 2010, in an amount not to exceed a total of one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000);

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the necessary funds to meet the City's obligations pursuant to the proposed agreement with the Vancouver Organizing Committee for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games be allocated in the 2010 Operating Budget, and that the Public Service commence planning related to the visit of the Olympic Torch Relay to Winnipeg, in consultation with government and community stakeholders and potential partners.

Councillor Nordman: Yes, I'd like to suspend the rules and deal with this today.

Mr. Speaker: OK you've heard the motion. Councillors all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Nordman, do you want to….recorded vote? (inaudible speaking in the background). It's on the table now. It's for discussion. Councillor Nordman, do you want to introduce it?

Councillor Nordman: All right. I'd like all of you to sort of cast your memory back to 1988. In 1988 our Mayor and myself were in our mid 30's. Councillor Browaty was in grade six, so there is a generation that's gone beyond the Mayor and I that have never had the opportunity to see an Olympic Torch Run in their City. And that's what this motion is about. The City of Winnipeg has been approached by the Vancouver Whistler Olympic Organizing Committee, and they would like Winnipeg to be among the capital cities across the provinces that host an Olympic Torch Run in January of 2009, or 2010, sorry. So at this point, ladies and gentlemen, I would like you to give consideration to taking advantage of this marquee event. The Province is already involved in many of the organizing festivities and as the City's part, we would like to use an amount in kind, mostly services in kind of upwards to $100,000 but not to exceed that, to participate in the Olympic Torch Run in January of 2010. We certainly have been approached by Mr. John Furlong, who is the face of the Vancouver Olympic Society and the reason for the urgency today is that they would like to announce their schedule in early November and henceforth we've asked for you to give it consideration today.

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Chairman, I did hear the last words on this issue from Councillor Nordman, but nonetheless I feel it would be highly irresponsible not to have this referred to EPC for consideration during the budget process. So I would so move.

Mr. Speaker: You're moving that it not be referred.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Be referred to EPC for consideration during the budget process.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillors you've heard the motion. All in favour? Opposed? It's carried.

Councillor Nordman, it will go to…through the budget process. Number, Motion No. 7.

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan,

WHEREAS the Neighbourhood Multiple Family/Mixed-Use Building Grant By-Law No. 122/2007, which was passed by Council on May 16, 2007 has been a huge success with the program funds being fully committed. This program has facilitated the development, redevelopment and conversion of existing properties, added 475 new residential dwellings and leveraged $75 million of additional investments for the purpose of renewal of existing and older neighbourhoods;

AND WHEREAS the limit of $5 million authorized by Council, based on a maximum tax grant of $15,000 per dwelling unit for units with an assessed value of less than $250,000, has made it possible for previously economically marginal housing projects to proceed, creating employment in the construction industry and more affordable housing in Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the Neighbourhood Multiple Family/Mixed-Use Building Grant Program is an innovative program that encouraged renewal of existing neighbourhoods, the use of existing civic infrastructure, the development of new street level commercial activity and greater urban density, all consistent with Plan Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS with the introduction of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) legislation in the last session of the Manitoba Legislation, an opportunity may exist to expand the program to include a tax credit on education taxes, making previously economically marginal housing projects far more viable;

AND WHEREAS the 'slow down' in the housing market makes the renewal of the Neighbourhood Multiple Family/Mixed-Use Building Grant program even more of a priority;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the maximum total grants of $5 million under this program be increased by an additional $10 million to a maximum of $15 million for the duration of the program which is set to expire on June 1, 2010;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service work with the Province of Manitoba to expand the program to include a credit on education taxes, as well as the municipal taxes.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. It's automatic referral. Do you want to move suspension to hear it now or automatic referral? Motion No. 7 is automatic referral and I believe that's it for the motions, and Councillors on Councillor O'Shaughnessy's motion on Councillor Steeves, will be going to EPC and then EPC will refer it to the Secretariat. Yes it's moved that way. I just want you to…it will be debated at Executive Policy Committee.

EPC Consideration of By-laws, first reading only, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would like to move the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 147/2008, By-law No. 148/2008 and By-law No. 149/2008.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 147/2008, By-law No. 148/2008, and By-law No. 149/2008.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that By-law No. 154/2008 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 154/2008.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that By-law No. 154/2008 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried

Clerk: By-law No. 154/2008.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 154/2008 be

read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. Councillor Gerbasi.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor. Last year, I believe it was in last year's budget, rather than proceed with a Poverty Reduction Strategy, a Municipal Poverty Reduction Strategy as some of us on Council were trying to do, we gave a one-time grant to the United Way to support an initiative on a Poverty Reduction Council by that sector, of the charitable sector, and there was to be a City representative on that committee.

This Council has heard absolutely nothing about that since then, absolutely nothing. And there has been no participation in the Raise the Rates Campaign and other initiatives that have been in the community.

So I guess I'm just wondering about the sincerity of this effort in terms of this Council being willing to do something as a Council. And I would like to know, I would like to have an update and know what is our strategy on poverty, since we haven't really done anything since that time?

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi. The City did have someone on a committee and I think Councillor Gerbasi is aware of that, aware of the fact that it was the former CAO. Obviously she is no longer here.

We then did a search. We found a new CAO and the new CAO, I believe, is on that committee. And what I will do at this particular point in time, I will endeavour to get an update and I'll be happy to report back to Councillor Gerbasi.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes, through you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Mayor to give us a run down on some of the discussions on projects that his Environment Committee have been discussing.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as Councillor Smith is aware of, Councillor Gerbasi is the chair of that Committee. I believe he probably speaks to her on a regular basis. If he wants to have coffee with her, or a coke or a bottled water, that would be his prerogative. He could sit down and I'm sure she would be happy to share with him whatever goes on there because I'm usually finding out from Councillor Gerbasi on the floor of Council what is going on there. So maybe we'll all get together for a glass of wonderful City of Winnipeg water.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith that's it? Do you have a second question?

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor I'd expect you to be able to tell us about one of the projects being discussed at least by your Environmental Committee.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I said to you, there is a Councillor on this floor who chairs that, and just like anybody else, she could probably tell him exactly what is going on there and maybe at the same time, I could get an update as well. And I'm sure Councillor Smith would love to do that.

Mr. Speaker: He'll do it. That's it Councillor Smith? Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: How about Rapid Transit Councillor Smith? My question is, Mr. Mayor one month ago along with Premier Doer you rolled out Rapid Transit, Bus Rapid Transit with great fanfare and then you said that, and I quote, "you didn't think this would get

anyone out of their car to use Rapid Transit". So my question is if you have so little faith in Bus Rapid Transit why are you championing a report here today to borrow $90 million dollars to get it done?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, number one, the announcement was about Rapid Transit. I repeat Rapid Transit. We also specifically stated, both the Premier and myself, that this would be permanent and dedicated. And we also stated that the goal would be that it would become LRT, Light Rail Transit. You've heard delegations here earlier talk about going to Light Rail Transit.

And the reason that I support it is quite simple. This is not a debate about today Mr. Speaker. This is a debate about our future. What we want our City to be 20 years from now.

There will be some, I hope, who do remember former Mayor Steven Juba. Councillor Browaty might be the exception to that rule. The realities are he had that vision a long time ago and no one acted back then. We are the only major city that has no form of Rapid Transit, number one.

Number two, if you want people to think of Winnipeg as a progressive, exciting city and wanting to live here, we'd better get on board right now. And if Councillor was aware of the fact that when we talk about specifically Bus Rapid Transit, I've made it very clear, and I think Nick Ternette has as well, that LRT is the way to go. And I've made it very clear that I believe that LRT will get people out of their cars.

By the same token, if you have BRT, and if you work with our administration and figure out a way to get people from their homes to the line it will work. And for the first time ever, as opposed to five years ago, we have a business case that shows how this pays for itself.

So the realities are, unlike what the Councillor said, we're borrowing all this money. In days gone by, this City used to borrow money without any idea how to pay for it. Just put it on the backs of the future generations. We've identified exactly how this will be paid for. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal your second question.

Councillor Vandal: Well I can only quote the words that you said at the press conference "this Bus Rapid Transit somebody", "this Bus Rapid Transit System will not get anybody out of their cars." Why then, if you really believe that, are you bringing forward a motion to borrow $90 million dollars if…Do you not have the courage of your convictions Mr. Mayor to vote for what you believe?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker it's apparent some people still haven't gotten out of their caves. The facts are this, is that right now, we are moving towards Rapid Transit. Want to call it BRT, that's fine. And we also know what the next step is, and you know what? Before you run, you walk.

This is our first step to something that is very progressive, very innovative, very sexy. And you know what? Maybe with a little co-operation from the Councillor, who knows, maybe we'll get to LRT much quicker than he thinks, which is where this City should be Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Your final question and Councillor, not too much of preamble.

Councillor Swandel: No preamble.

Mr. Speaker: Just get to the point.

Councillor Vandal: What preamble? Mr. Speaker you cannot find a Councillor more succinct than me.

The very same press conference you said "Light Rail Transit was just around the corner". Mr. Mayor, can you tell us when "just around the corner" is in your mind?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker it's really unfortunate but obviously some of us are aware of the fact that Canada does not have a national transit strategy.

Some of us who maybe got out of our caves are aware of the fact that there's just been an election. There is a government, a minority government.

And as I said before and I'll say it again, Mr. Speaker…

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, Point of Personal Privilege. I'm asking the Mayor a respectful question.

Mayor Katz: Are you, excuse me, I've never interrupted you once…

Councillor Vandal: He is insulting me.

Mayor Katz: ever, ever.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor wait a minute.

Councillor Vandal: Will you please do your job Mr. Speaker.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Well you insulted him.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor, please. Councillor Vandal, the Mayor is responding.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker if you don't mind I'll continue.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Mayor Katz: Thank you. We have a new government that's just been elected. There has been discussions about such important topics as crime and safety, okay. Talking about transit, talking about our infrastructure and the hope is that there will be funding coming forward from Ottawa for transit. I think that's the hope of everybody. And I think it's time that Winnipeg gets its fair share. Other cities have gotten it and maybe it's time we get it.

And, if you recall, both the Premier and I said that for stage two of Rapid Transit we're looking for the Federal Government to be a partner, one-third, one-third, one-third, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement your first question.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker, and through you to the Mayor. At the last Council meeting Mr. Mayor I asked you a question related to handicapped parking passes. And while I'm fully aware that we haven't charged people to park, in fact, parking hasn't been free for years. We're all aware of that. But we haven't enforced it.

And when I asked the question, you answered the way that I was under the impression that there isn't going to be any change in that, but I keep getting calls from constituents, and when I tell them that they say well then why are the commissionaires telling us that they're being told by the Parking Authority that we are going to in fact start charging. And have they got the authority to do that or do we have to give them some direction or do we have to give them some direction to cease and desist on that issue?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I vividly recall the question and the answer at that point in time was 100% accurate. And I can tell you as of this week, once again, I have been told that although we've always had the ability to enforce the rule, a decision was made not to. That continues today as we sit here on the floor of Council.

So I think what's happened is that unfortunately the CEO, there is a new person came on board for the not-for-profit organization, and they did not have the proper information, and I know there was a campaign that went out about letters, et cetera, but right now we are not enforcing that. It is the status quo. There will be a meeting with the powers to enlighten them to know exactly what's going on and they will hopefully resolve that issue and work out exactly what's going to happen in the future.

But, I can assure Councillor Clement that nobody is being fined. We are not enforcing it, exactly the way we've been doing for many, many years which I'm sure most Councillors probably never even knew.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement that's it?

Councillor Clement: That's fine.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions Councillors? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker through you to the Mayor, recently I had an interesting conversation at Winnipeg Harvest with a member of the Aboriginal community in Winnipeg. Some great ideas for the City of Winnipeg. I know that we have a bit of a strategy on the go on Aboriginal issues and affairs in the City of Winnipeg.

I'd like to know if you can provide us with an update. You know, to date with having the largest urban Aboriginal population in the country, I have not seen an urban reserve for lack of a better term, in Winnipeg. I'm wondering if you can provide us with a bit of an update on where our Urban Aboriginal Strategy is at.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all on the, we call it an economic development zone but you can call it whatever you want, most people are aware of the fact that there is plans for one, not far from Madison Avenue. I believe that the City has done everything that it has to do and right now it's up to the Federal Government. The Federal Government is in control of LT's. They will make the final decision. We basically negotiate, you know, fees in lieu of. So that is moving forward and the City of Winnipeg has done everything that it possibly can do.

I can also share with Councillor Swandel that I have had several meetings with both the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, Grand Chief Ron Evans, who was just re-elected, as well as the Manitoba Métis Federation, David Chartrand. And I can tell you that I am hoping that within the next maybe 30 to 60 days, to have an announcement on a very important project which will be one of the first steps in addressing some of the issues that are out there right now. So there is some good things around the corner and I'm hoping there will be many more in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question? That's it? Is that it for the questions? Councillor Vandal your first question.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Mayor, Justice Minister Chomiak has announced that he is going to be advancing on a, some sort of a civilian oversight for police officers who have been charged with a crime. I'm wondering if you have any information that you could share with this Council on how that could potentially affect the City of Winnipeg Police.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Vandal for the question. I have heard some of those comments. I have not had the opportunity to meet with Minister Chomiak but there will be a meeting in the very near future and as soon as I get more information I would be happy to share it not just with the Councillor but all members of Council.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor Vandal? No further questions? Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, report of October the 2nd of 2008, Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED OCTOBER 2, 2008**

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will move…let me get to the right page here. Going so fast now. I'll move Consent Agenda Items 1 through 10.

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: I'm just getting there. I have to switch here. One moment please.

Mr. Speaker: Take your time. By-laws to be read a first time.

Councillor Swandel: I'll be there in a sec. Almost there. Mr. Speaker, I will move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 144/2008, 145/2008, 146/2008, 150/2008, 151/2008, 152/2008, 153/2008 and 158/2008.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 144/2008, By-law No. 145/2008, By-law No. 146/2008, By-law No. 150/2008, By-law No. 151/2008, By-law No. 152/2008, By-law No. 153/2008 and By-law No. 158/2008.

Councillor Swandel: I will move that By-laws numbered 144/2008 to 146/2008, both inclusive, and 150 to 153/2008, both inclusive, and 158/2008 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 144/2008 to 146/2008, both inclusive, and 150/2008 to 153/2008, both inclusive, and 158/2008.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 144/2008 to 146/2008, both inclusive, and 150/2008 to 153/2008, both inclusive, and 158/2008 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. No questions? Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Councillor Steeves, Report of October 6th of 2008.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED OCTOBER 6, 2008

Councillor Steeves: I'll introduce the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Pardon? You are opposed Councillor Clement. In opposition to Item 1? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions? None. Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Steeves.

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

Councillor Steeves: I move that By-law No. 156/2008 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. is 156/2008.

Councillor Steeves: I move that By-law No. 156/2008 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 156/2008.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 156/2008 be read a third time and same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Questions. No questions? Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Report of October the 7th of 2008. Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED OCTOBER 7, 2008

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd be happy to move Clauses 1 and 2 as Consent and I'd like to introduce No. 3.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: I would like to be recorded in opposition (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal and Gerbasi in opposition to No. 2. No. 3.

Item 3 - Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor – Stage 1
E-File TT-1

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all I'm rising to move the clause in front of Council. This is something that…it's an issue that's been discussed for a lot of years and the Mayor was mentioning earlier that it goes all the way back to Steve Juba who was around in the 70's, I think, when some of this was discussed, and the idea of a Rapid Transit System has certainly been a serious topic of discussion not only at City Council, but amongst a lot of Winnipeggers over the course of the last number of years. And I'm moving this forward, Mr. Speaker, because I honestly believe that it's time that we start this system. I'm not going to tell you that I'm not extremely disappointed that we are not moving forward with an LRT system, because I honestly believe that an LRT system would make more sense. I'm a little concerned that a BRT system might not be as sexy as some people think it might be, I think is the word somebody was using, and so, I have some problems with that portion of it other than we have to move forward. And the reality is, the reason we actually started reviewing this again was because the Federal Government put some money in an infrastructure program across the country, and approximately $18 million was made available in the Province of Manitoba, and most of it, I believe, about 17 and a half million dollars is coming to the City of Winnipeg. That left $120,000, Mr. Speaker. And it's certainly my understanding that the Provincial Government and the City were going to share that, and they are to some degree. I am not going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I'm thrilled with the accounting that's being structured for this. Everybody knows that I've long championed the idea of the City not borrowing money and trying to get out of debt and certainly to lower the expectations on our current budget, because the Mayor was quite right. Back in the 80's, and I know I was here, I was a new Councillor at that time, and I can tell you, I remember the discussion when the budget or the capital went from being a $50 million capital to being a $110 million capital over night. And you were here, Mr. Speaker, as well. And it had all to do with interest rates at the time because we were paying exorbitant interest rates at the time on the 50 million we were borrowing and then all of a sudden we were told that we could actually borrow 110 for the same money and wouldn't that be a great idea and away it went like a runaway train. And that's exactly where it was going and we arrested that. So, I was a little concerned about the borrowing except that I honestly believe that the project is a solid project and I honestly believe that there will be development as a result of this transit corridor being implemented, and I'm talking about housing that's not currently in that general vicinity, but I believe that there will be new and enhanced housing along that general corridor. I believe that the hubs will generate commercial activity, and all of those are going to generate tax dollars that we don't have today.

And so, I believe that there will be enough money generated that will service the money that we have to borrow. Notwithstanding it's a change in terms of what we've been doing, and I'm a little sad that that's going on. But, at least there is a way to pay for it without, in my view, being on the backs of the taxpayers.

The other portion, certainly we don't have anything other than a Memorandum of Understanding from the Province, and I also recognize that when we pass this today that we don't have a deal yet and that that deal still has to be signed off on, but the anticipation is from the Memorandum of Understanding is that the Province of Manitoba is going to service half of this $90 million loan, as well as they are going to pay for half of the cost of operations over the course of this time, which is about 30 years. And I guess we'll wait and find out exactly what that document states, but without doing this in the first place, we can't get there and can't find that out. I believe that they will honour the Memorandum and based on that, at least even though this is an odd way of doing business, we're essentially borrowing money for the Province to some degree. Everybody will have their twist on this, of course, but the reality is if they're putting up 55 million, we're putting up 55 million and we shouldn't be borrowing 90 million unless we're borrowing some of it for them, and that's essentially what's happening. It's just the way it's structured. It was the way that they wanted to come to the agreement and that's what's happening. But it's an odd way of approaching it, Mr. Speaker, and something that I've never seen before in terms of Provincial and City agreements, and I'm wondering about future agreements. I guess I shouldn't do that but I've learned from being here for a little while that you have to read between the lines sometimes and I've been looking between the lines and can't find anything that points to any kind of a future issue with this particular structure of financing, but I'm concerned about future agreements, it being structured like this, and getting into it. But having said that, I think that the young people in this City believe that we should be seeing a sort of Rapid Transit System. There is a reality to what we can afford, we all know that. It would be wonderful to have something that would be rail-related. Mr. Jaworski that was here this morning made a fairly good comment in that regard, when you're driving a bus, there are only so many seats on a bus and that's it. When you're in charge of an LRT and you're pulling that one forward you can have several cars on an LRT and move many people at the same time. So I'm hopeful and one of the things I was certainly talking about, and talking to the Mayor about, was that this could be transformed over time into an LRT. I don't know enough about the technology to understand that real good, other than I'm being told that it is available to be done, and I hope that one day that we will be able to do that, Mr. Speaker.

But, it's an exciting initiative, other than the financial parts that I have a bit of a problem with. The issue itself is exciting for our City, it's exciting for the younger people in particular of our City because they go and they travel in other cities and they see the types of systems that are available there, and I wish we had double the population that we've got right now so that we could afford more than we can, but the realities are what they are in terms of the size of our City and the size of our wallet. And the other thing that we have to point out, this is a huge amount of money when the Federal Government is only in for $18 million. Generally speaking they would be in for at least a third of a package like this so we not only took their $18 million and instead of making it into a $54 million package of something, we went way beyond that and we pushed for the first leg of this. So we've stuck our necks out pretty good that we think that this is a very positive thing for our City and I would hope that when the vote takes place that this vote will be unanimous, unlike the last one. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course I am strongly in support of this and I am pleased to reach this day where this Council is moving ahead with the Rapid Transit System.

There is…there are many benefits and I guess I'm a little disappointed with….the lack…oh it's too bad we can't build the LRT. We're only building BRT. I really think that we've been having this LRT, BRT debate in this City for many, many years. In fact some would argue that debate kind of killed it in the 80's and we never proceeded with BRT. In the early

80's, Ottawa and Winnipeg studied BRT and studied rapid transit, and both cities decided that BRT was the best model and our Council didn't proceed. There may have been other reasons, but we did not proceed and Ottawa did. Now they have an extensive BRT network as well as LRT which is how you build the system. You start somewhere.

(yelling in the background)

Councillor Gerbasi: Excuse me, Nick.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi. Hold it. Hold it. Just a minute.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Can you stop my clock please.

Mr. Speaker: Nick, leave! Just a minute. Councillor Gerbasi, please leave it. Nick, please leave. Leave the gallery. Leave the gallery. There is no need for that kind of outburst. Sorry, Nick, you know better than that.

Councillor Gerbasi: There's many benefits to moving ahead with rapid transit in Winnipeg including downtown revitalization, infill development, where we have existing schools and community clubs. We're going to see more housing going in, in transit-oriented development. We're going to see those things. We're going to see a significant amount of travel time reduced, the real bottlenecks and going out to the University or going across the Donald Bridge and at Confusion Corner, and this will address those problems.

We also have, are dealing with the significant cycling infrastructure that is a huge concern and a lot of citizens are supporting. I think part of the reason this is happening today is because of citizens participation and, you know, Mr. Ternette is somebody who has always participated and I'm sorry he is so angry at me. I do appreciate his participation as well and not everyone agrees but the Rapid Transit Coalition has taken the position of supporting, moving ahead with some form of rapid transit and they do feel there will be significant benefits from Bus Rapid Transit. I think we all agree there is or we wouldn't be building it. It's unfortunate that this debate has kind of overshadowed that because I think that this is an exciting initiative for Winnipeg for many, many reasons. I think we are going to see a lot of benefit, and I think when the citizens see this first leg of it built they're going to want the rest of it built quite quickly. And it's only going to build on the momentum of that because it is building a system that has to be built over time in pieces, and one of the difficulties with building one little piece of LRT is that you have to use a train. So you'd have to take a bus to that one little train, go part of the way, get off and get on to another bus. I mean it's just almost impossible to start with that, with the size of this project, and at six times the cost we would be paying $804 million to build light rail from downtown to Jubilee. So I think that's a big challenge that obviously, with some of the debate we've had today, we can't afford it. If there was endless money, you know we probably would be building that subway that Mr. Jaworski wants. But we do have to do something practical. And I guess I'm not disappointed that we're building this. I think it's great that we're building this. I think it's been talked about repeatedly in studies and task forces. They've all recommended it. I sit on the Canadian Urban Transit Association Board Members' Committee and I meet with Councillors all across Canada on a regular basis, and their building plans include, many of those cities include BRT, LRT and even subway extensions but they all have their place and they have their benefit and I think all the experts who have looked at Winnipeg have agreed that this is a good approach for Winnipeg. It's a very good start. And I'm certainly not…I'm very pleased that this is upgradeable to LRT. I think that's fabulous and I support that.

I just want to give some kudos to the students who have hung in there to the activists who have hung in there wanting to see this happen and it's happening today, and I think a lot of credit goes to the people in the community that kept talking about Rapid Transit even though it turned into a bit of a dirty word for a few years. And I congratulate you for your patience.

I also just wanted to comment briefly on the Mayor referred to the National Transit Strategy. Unfortunately Jack Layton didn't win. He was the only one who actually promised money, but I still believe, having been to Ottawa and lobbied a number of Conservative MP's along with my Canadian Urban Transit Association Colleagues, that they're all waking up to the…they're all quite aware that cities want to invest in transit and that they need money for that and that we need national funding like what they have in the United States, which is why you see things like LRT in Minneapolis and places like that. Because they have incredible amounts of Federal funding for that which we don't have. We haven't had any at all until the last few years.

I'd also point out that other cities have used a significant amount of the new gas tax revenue that they got to invest in transit infrastructure; some of them as much as 100% of it, others 50%, Alberta cities and cities like Toronto and Vancouver. Some of those are 100% of their gas tax money whereas our's is going into roads and bridges. So I don't think we have to feel like we're spending too much. We're doing a lot less than many other places, but we are taking a very bold step for us in Winnipeg to start building Rapid Transit and I think people should feel proud of that.

I just wanted to respond to something said earlier by Councillor Wyatt that I supported the Kenaston Underpass in 2004. I did because we were supporting Rapid Transit at the same time and we kind of agreed to do that. So I'm not sure what else he was referring to. But you know, I just thought I would put that on the record.

In any case, this is a good thing. This is something we can all feel good about. I mean, it also shows that we can work together on issues when we share common goals. And you know, I don't think any of us are living in caves and I don't think any of us don't care about our City. I think we have different views of our City. I would like to see some members of this Council care about the environment a little bit more than they do. But this is an effort showing that you do care and there's other efforts that you've shown that you care. So, I think this is something our Council can be very proud of. It's not an easy issue. There's a lot of differing opinions. It's a happy day for me to see us taking this step forward, and I know my kids have been waiting a long time for this. They're very proud to see this day, too. So I would like to thank the Mayor and the Premier.

I also want to mention the 50/50 funding formula that is enshrined in legislation provincially to have, so even whatever Provincial Government we have in the future, they are going to have to fund operating and capital costs for transit. I think we owe Gary Doer a big thank you for that, too. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors the curious outburst by Mr. Ternette is very unusual for him to do that. He's been coming to the chambers for many, many years, and I'd like to ask our Clerk to send a letter to Mr. Ternette. One more outburst like that and he's being barred from coming here. Okay, next Speaker is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I think this is quite a historic Council meeting. There's not many times, I think, in public office where you can say that you played a very, very, very, very small role. I think we can all say that in this chamber with regards to the development of a Rapid Transit System in the City of Winnipeg and the decision being made today.

This is the kind of stuff I think, Mr. Speaker, of legacy. This is the kind of thing, I believe, in time will probably be looked back on in the same that we look back on things like the building of the aqueduct at the turn of the century, the building of the floodway. This is a significant, a significant development for our City. We truly were the last major City in this country not to have any form of Rapid Transit, and that was starting to become a black eye for the City. This, Mr. Speaker, changes that. Bus Rapid Transit has been shown to work. The City of Ottawa, which has been used as an example, Mr. Speaker, of how successful

Bus Rapid Transit can be, started building their Bus Rapid Transit over 20 years ago, and they have Bus Rapid Transit now running throughout the entire City. By the way, when Ottawa started building their's, they're about the same size as Winnipeg is today. Maybe a bit smaller, actually. And they started building it and it's taken off to the point where they are at a point now where we've heard earlier, they are contemplating LRT. It's been actually something that's been quite, very much debated there as BRT and Rapid Transit in general has been debated here, and somewhat controversial there. But nonetheless, they are at a point where they've been able over the last 20 years to increase their ridership, Mr. Speaker, in public transit because of the fact that they built a Bus Rapid Transit System throughout their entire City. So this is the stuff of, I think, legacy. This is going to create a heritage for our City for future generations to enjoy, and that's why it does make sense, Mr. Speaker, especially since funding has been identified as the Mayor rightly says. Funding has been identified by the Province funding 50% of the cost of borrowing. But it's only fair that not just one generation pay for this, that more than one generation should be paying for this. It should be spread out over a number of years because clearly more than one generation is going to be benefiting from this new Bus Rapid Transit System dedicated corridor.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is definitely a cost involved. There's no doubt about it. We have the report in front of us. Just speaking on the particulars of the report, there is a cost involved. But there is also a cost involved when it comes to building new roads. There's a cost involved when it comes to widening existing roads. There's a cost involved when it comes to building new underpasses for existing roads or, building new overpasses or clover leafs. Call them what you like. There is a huge cost involved. And I think what we've heard more and more as a society in the direction we're moving is this recognition that the sky is not necessarily the limit with regards to infrastructure spending. That we have to be very smart and we have to be very balanced when it comes to our infrastructure spending. And that balance has to involve public transportation. And public transportation, Mr. Speaker, in modern cities is the core, one of the core principles of a transportation system for a modern City. I think Winnipeg is a modern City, we're a modern industrialized City, a western City with a transportation system that lacks one of those core principles up until today.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're going to be building this Bus Rapid Transit System, the first leg to Jubilee but then doing the whole loaf, as the Mayor rightly puts it, all the way to the University of Manitoba. Because clearly when we did our Rapid Transit Task Force report, which is here and signed copies are available for those who like, it clearly…one of the things we really wrestled with in the Task Force was whether or not we should be going just to Jubilee or whether or not we should be recommending to go all the way to the University of Manitoba. We also looked at other options as well prior to that, but when we got along and we concluded it was BRT, then we got to the point of where and how far do we build? And it was actually Professor Barry Prentice from the University of Manitoba who made the strong case in the Committee, saying "look you need to have a fully operational Bus Rapid Transit line to see the benefits, connecting right to the U of M, right to downtown. You have to have the economy of scale. You can't just build a chunk of it and hope for the best. You have to build the whole thing. You don't build a road halfway, you build a road all the way when you're building a road to get from one point to another. You do the same with Bus Rapid Transit." He was the one who made the case, and the convincing case and argument that convinced the rest of the Committee members that we should be building, going all the way from downtown to the U of M instead of just part of the way. So this is, today, Mr. Speaker, and quite often it's nice to put that in a report of course, but then, just to get things done the reality check kicks in and the reality is we are building today, we're making a commitment to get to Jubilee, but we have gone as far as making the concept and signing a MOU to go all the way to

the U of M. And that leadership is there. I want to thank the Mayor. I want to thank our CAO, Glen Laubenstein, for the work that he has done. Phil Sheegl has done a lot of work behind the scenes on this, there's no doubt. And I also want to recognize and thank, Mr. Speaker, Premier Doer and Minister Ashton who both of them worked very hard on this file as well. So you know this is a tremendous…there will always be the naysayers, Mr. Speaker, no matter what we do of course. There will always be those out there who claim that this is not going to improve transportation. There won't be greater efficiencies. But as our City grows and we have made decisions to make the City grow, Mr. Speaker. We have a huge development called Waverley West building on the southwest side of the City. As our City grows and Waverley West starts to fill out, you can be guaranteed that the demands on our street system is going to grow, and we will be faced with some tough decisions. By making this decision today, Mr. Speaker, I think we have bought ourselves an ability to make the right decisions in the future, rather than having to face widening Pembina, rather than having to face huge new costs involved with new infrastructure involved with roadways Mr. Speaker. If you go all the way to the U of M, it's very conceivable, Mr. Speaker, to build a wing of the Rapid Transit off to Waverley West in the future, you know. Servicing the entire City. This is what this is about, Mr. Speaker and it's a vision for the future of our City. I look forward to seeing this go to the U of M and then off to the eastern corridor and then to your end of town, Mr. Speaker, and then also to the western end of the City as well. You know, so we have huge opportunities here. We have one of the largest manufacturers of buses in North America headquartered right here in Winnipeg, New Flyer Industries who will probably be building a lot of the buses that we're going to be needing in the future. So why shouldn't we be the example for the rest of North America when it comes to Bus Rapid Transit and the technologies that are there. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that when we design this and we build this we are building it, keeping in mind that it can be converted to LRT in the future and there is no doubt that as technologies change, so may the combustion engine and the diesel buses that's we're dealing with today. That may change in the future too, Mr. Speaker.

So it's a positive step. I encourage all of Council to support this. I think this is one of these amazing…one of the few initiatives you have when you're serving in public office to say you had a bit of a role in, so it's an exciting time Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. So to the north end, you mean, it will be within five years.

Next Speaker is Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to take a bit of a different slant on this. Let me start by saying as the Councillor who represents the University of Manitoba, the area of University of Manitoba, I think I'm pretty-well obligated to support this and I could tell you that if I was investing in a piece of infrastructure to the University of Manitoba the first one I would invest in is a gondola across the river to get into South St. Vital, which would probably get more people out of their cars that go to the University than this link will, but I'm sure this will bring a positive result.

You know, the reality of the day is that this is where the money is landing. Before I get into that, I just want to respond to something that Councillor Clement said at the beginning. The talk of not going into debt, and I think as a Council we have to, sort of stop in these times, and we have a huge infrastructure deficit in the City of Winnipeg and municipalities across the country. We have interest rates at almost an all time low, and by not using debt to address our infrastructure deficit, the increase of the deficit might outweigh the cost of interest on the debt. So, it's a little more detailed when you look at debt than just saying we don't want to have debt. In a perfect world, nobody wants to have debt. But in today's world, we can get money going out 30 years. It's not five years and renegotiated, it's 30 year money we can get in around the 5% interest rate level.

When you consider that inflation has been running well over 5% in construction projects for the last few years and the increase in infrastructure deficit, it may be a time to sit down and really think hard about whether or not municipalities should be taking on some debt. I think the debt is not a bad thing as long as the debt doesn't outlive the life expectancy of the infrastructure you're investing in. So I just want to say that in the outset, that this is not as simple as saying we don't like debt.

There's a number of issues in here now. You know just another piece I'm thinking is, make no mistake about it, what we're talking about here are billions of dollars. We're not just talking about $128 million in the first leg or 350 something million dollars going out all the way out to the University. We're also talking about a leg going out to Transcona. Somebody mentioned Waverley West. Actually the Waverley West piece is not in Plan Winnipeg but there is a little leg of Rapid Transit Corridor that runs parallel to Wilkes Avenue in the direction of, well no but all the way out to Kenaston, similar to where Wilkes Avenue is right now, sort of Charleswood and the future Ridgeway Transportation Corridor, which is in Plan Winnipeg. So I think it's a great idea that we talk about Waverley West, but anyways, as I was saying, we're in the realm of billions of dollars here. And what is it that we're doing with this money? We're setting out to do something that is going to move people more efficiently and hopefully eliminate greenhouse gases, and we've jumped on the bandwagon of Bus Rapid Transit because that seems to be what's sweeping across North America, and in many cases around the world. But nobody has taken pause to stop and think about if I had a billion dollars and I want to move people more efficiently, and eliminate greenhouse gases, what would be the best way to invest my billion dollars? And you know, Bus Rapid Transit certainly does have its advantages. It also has its disadvantages. You know, you look at other opportunities, whether you're in the realm of a billion dollars we could be talking about moving the railroads outside of the City of Winnipeg. At least one of the major railroads for sure. What does that do for grade separation requirements in the City of Winnipeg? How many cars does that eliminate from sitting idling as trains go by? How much maintenance budget does it free up because we're no longer looking after these grade separations. So you know, we haven't done those types of talks and calculations when it comes to this, but we are on the bandwagon of Bus Rapid Transit.

One of the ways we talk about financing this is the fact that there's going to be development on these nodes along the Rapid Transit Corridor. One thing about BRT, another draw back to BRT is that it's not the best way to bring transit-oriented development because it is flexible. The buses can get on, they can get off, they can go wherever they want. So you know make no doubt about it, what we're saying here is that we're going to finance this in the future regardless of whether or not there is development. And recent initiatives, for example, Waverley West when the Province brought forward the idea of back lanes and front porches on houses, trying to eliminate, sort of the snub nose garage in front concept. Just the other day at Community Committee, they're now asking to convert those lots to front driveways because the market did not absorb those lots. And this could very easily happen here, so be prepared. And I think we are prepared to finance this ongoing without the growth related specifically to this. I anticipate, as is the Conference Board of Canada, that we will have some significant growth going forward in these years ahead, but you know, it may not be relative to this Bus Rapid Transit. It may just be natural growth and not new growth. So I would say today that we are here to finance this not because of any related to development because we are committed to doing something to improve our transit system.

You know and just to comment on the environment, I think we all care about the environment and just back to what I said before. If we truly cared about the environment we'd be taking a little better look at how to invest our dollars if our return on investment was the elimination of greenhouse gases, and then that

southwest corridor, I'm not so sure that this is the best way to invest 300 something million dollars if that's your only return on investment that you're looking at. It will bring us something and that's good. It's something that we can do today and it will have a positive impact, but let's not just throw words out there.

I just want to again, once again mention the idea of a bridge or a gondola over the Red River at the University of Manitoba connecting to South St. Vital. $15 million is currently being looked at being spent to connect Point Douglas and West Kildonan or Elmwood. How many commuters will use that as compared to a $15 million active transportation co-ordination between the University of Manitoba and South St. Vital. I would suggest that more and more would be using the University of Manitoba.

Those are basically my comments, Mr. Speaker. I think at the end of the day we all have to support this. It is a move in the right direction. It's where our partners want their money to be going. We've got a plan that will work and we are showing our commitment to doing something that is positive for transportation and positive to the environment and something that we can do today. It would be great if we could take a step way back and look at how to spend these billions of dollars that are, over a billion dollars in the long term, and whether or not this is the best investment, especially considering the fact that cars may not be powered by fossil fuels in the not too distant future. We really should be taking a sober look and thinking about investing these kinds of dollars. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't sure if I was going to speak but I decided I would be denying my colleagues something they would enjoy way too much.

I want to, if I can, the reason I did decide to speak is I would like to temper this discussion and maybe put a more celebratory edge on it, if that's possible. I think this is a great day for this Council. And if this passes, which I suspect it may, perhaps even unanimously, I hope, we will have accomplished something that has indeed been talked about since the days of Mayor Steven Juba, and everybody recalls that. I'm not sure if you were standing shoulder to shoulder with him or not, Mr. Speaker during those days. But this is something that this City has strived for ever since we've lost the trolley system that you see in pictures at the Old St. Vital Historical Society if you go and look.

What this will do is exciting. Think of where we started only, gosh, it was, I guess, three or four years ago. We come out of a Mayoralty election and a couple of by-election in a couple of councillor wards. There was, I guess, huge discord and acrimony on this Council, virtually right off the bat with a new Mayor, in a certain way, in a certain terrible way, Mr. Speaker, it kind of, I think, set the stage for a long period that is perhaps still on going of discord on this Council. The Rapid Transit debate that came out of the gates right off the bat, and you'll recall when former Mayor Glen Murray had made the announcement at The Forks, there really wasn't time before he left to run for the House of Commons in Ottawa. There was no time to put any paper in place, any agreements in place. It was really at the end of the day just an announcement. Not that there is nothing to an announcement. There was no leg work. There was no paper work that was really done to support that project. It became a source of some debate during the election itself for the new Mayor and when we arrived here, the decision was, not by unanimity I regret to inform, the decision was to not do that at the time. Some people supported it and some people did not. That's water under the bridge. What we did do, perhaps in some wisdom if we look back, is the Rapid Transit Committee, the Rapid Transit Commission, I apologize, I got the name wrong. I would like one of those autographed copies. You'll hold the glossy if you don't mind, Councillor Wyatt. The Committee was formed. And there was huge scepticism about that Committee and what it was being set up to exactly accomplish and exactly to do.

People thought this is just some sort of red herring that's not going to be followed through on. People thought this is not going to be a reality. It's a way to diffuse the tension on Council at the time. But to everyone's credit, specific credit to some people who were incensed about the idea of dropping the Rapid Transit Project at the time, some of those people elected despite that to join up with the Committee and join those forces and work towards this project. And the people know who they are. And here we are only what seems a few short years later, announcing this project. Nobody would have thought this was possible three years ago. Nobody would have thought that Council could have arrived at this point, which is why I hear some of my colleagues who I know are going to support the project, who don't seem all that excited about it. This is a great project. And the reason I think that is this means mobility. Simply put, this project means mobility for citizens in the City of Winnipeg. Mobility means economy, and economy means money. The more people can move around, the better their quality of life, the better the economy will be in this City. And it is that simple. There are innumerable people in the City who cannot afford a car. Many are not even old enough to drive a car. They are still functioning and important pieces of this City's economy. This type of project is exactly what is going to help them. If you own a car, Mr. Speaker, or if anybody in this gallery owns a car, think of what that does to your ability to earn a living. Think of what that does to your ability to play a functioning role in our economy. This Rapid Transit System, as it grows, and I hope it will, is going to be a car to all of those people under 16 or over 16 who can't drive, who don't drive, to access this economy and live a better life.

I would be excited about Rail or Bus Rapid Transit. To me the differentiation is not that great. I would agree with people who have stated at this juncture, given the, I guess the length of the corridor as it exists right now, we would have to look at lengthening it before we could, I guess, implement the Light Rail Component. I'm not sure if it would be cost effective otherwise. If I'm wrong I look forward to being shown those numbers and I make room for the possibility that I am. But in the meantime, a Rapid Transit System that can be accessed by on-the-street buses at either end is only going to serve to enhance the ability of our buses to move people around, and what a great thing that's going to be.

The question of financing on this project, I suppose, causes some concern. What I am doing as a member of this Council, is I am taking the word of the Chair of this Committee and the Committee itself in the recommendation that they are making, that this is the type of financing model that they want. I see the Chairperson and the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee as taking ownership and responsibility of this financing model. It's their responsibility to do so and bring it forward to this Council. If there is a problem with it, I only want to hear it today. I don't ever want to hear it at a later date. This reminds me of another debate that we had about financing in the past. You know what I'm talking about, where we had unanimity on the project as brought forward, but then all sorts of illusions about the method of financing, and then we had a plethora of comments about, oh yeah I didn't support the method of finance all the way through, I supported the report, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Not good enough, Mr. Speaker. This is a fulsome report, and the Chair and Committee will take responsibility for the financing model. That is my expectation.

This project will be exciting for this City and if we compare ourselves to other cities across Canada, they have this and it seems to be working. And if we can all support this I think it will serve this City…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Steeves: And my final comments are this: Do not try and guess, do not try and guess every positive outcome that may or may not come as a result of this project. As you build these things they lead to other things that are unpredictable. There could be all sorts of great events that spring as a result of this

project. This Council should be celebrating more than it is today. This is a great project for the City. But I dare say, in 10 or 15 years, when many of us who have probably will have moved on from Council will look back to those of you who remain on Council, and we will look back at this as one of our greatest days as an assembly. Congratulations to all of my colleagues on Council. This is truly a great day for the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal? Okay Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your role in this Councillor Wyatt and your Committee. Mr. Prentice, thank you. Nick Ternette, wherever you are, thank you for your role in this. Mayor Juba, first Mayor I served with on this Council, along with Councillor Lazarenko, thank you for your vision of a monorail, for your role. Now, the irony or at least the perceived irony of the following statement is not lost on me, I assure you. However, thank you Mayor Sam Katz. You will be known throughout history as the person who brought Rapid Transit to Winnipeg. Thank you again.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz? Or just a minute, Councillor Fielding do you want to speak? Go ahead.

Councillor Fielding: What's the old expression. "There is always one in a crowd"? I guess that's me here today.

I'd first like to rise in opposition of this initiative before us today. My reason for opposing this initiative is my belief is that the benefits of Rapid Transit do not, are not worth the extensive costs of the program. Being a City Councillor in my opinion is about setting priorities. Would I like to be able to deliver a whole host of different projects for my constituents? Absolutely. But we as a City Councillor need to make priorities and there's a variety of ones that are coming before us, whether it's the inland port, whether it's the water and waste upgrades, whether it's a new stadium, whether it's the current infrastructure program that's there. We all know that our current infrastructure, we've got about a $2 billion infrastructure deficit before us and I think we need to substantially move on this and prioritize that before we move into new infrastructure initiatives.

In a recent election campaign, but an election campaign two years ago, infrastructure, the current infrastructure priority was the number one issue for our constituents. I think we've made some good steps in that general direction but I think we need to move forward and as such we need to look at different initiatives that we're doing.

Another reason why I will not be supporting this initiative is because we are heading into tough economic times, and essentially we don't have a pot of money to go after different projects. Over the past number of weeks, we have all witnessed what's been going on in the financial markets and I can tell you, Manitoba, Winnipeg and Canada are not immune to this. We are not an island amongst ourselves and as such, all levels of governments are going to be looking to tighten their belts in one way or the other, and as such we need to take a hard look at the spending priorities and projects that are before us.

Another issue that concerns me is in terms of the total cost of the project. The current proposed budget before us is around $138 million. I think overall we've talked about $330 million for the grand total of the project overall to Manitoba. In my opinion, the cost of delivering the service that will service the southwestern part of Winnipeg and I think probably eventually will categorize and go across Winnipeg, far outweighs the cost far outweighed the benefits that Rapid Transit will come here.

Another item that does trouble me is the borrowing that's associated with it. We are proposing using debt financing to pay for the project, and I think, to a certain extent, I've got some serious concerns about going into the red $90 million for the project, that I'm not convinced will deliver the services or the benefits that are promised. If we need to borrow the money, we feel the desire to borrow the money to fix the infrastructure deficit right

now, it's my opinion that we should put that towards existing infrastructure that's there, because we do have that deficit. I still get calls from a variety of people. For $330 million we could construct somewhere in the neighbourhood of 300 to 500 residential streets. Now, as I mentioned the $2 billion infrastructure deficit is something that we need to look at. There has also been talk about taxing incremental financing and I generally am very supportive of this in nature. I think it does make sense on a variety of fronts, but the report before us mentions nothing about tax incremental financing, how we're going to use it, how it's going to be laid out and when it does come back to Council I will take a look at it and probably generally support it, but there is nothing in the report that we're voting on here today that talks about tax incremental financing.

A final point, or one of the final points, is in terms of time and reliability, you know, that's been brought forward. I know I've talked with our Council seminar. We've heard from the Director of Transit as well as our Public Service that Rapid Transit will save 5 minutes in non-rush hour and they say that anywhere between 8 to 10 minutes in rush-hour traffic. Well I'm not convinced the time savings that they referred to are necessarily going to be there, but I'm going to give them the benefit of the doubt on that. So let's average it out. So that's five minutes for non-rush hour and it's 8 to 10 minutes for…let's say on average it's going to save taxpayers, it's going to save a rider seven minutes on a ride. What that averages out to $20 million of taxpayer money for every one minute of time savings for Rapid Transit. I'll repeat. $20 million of hard earned taxpayer money for one minute of savings. I would suggest that $20 million per minute is too high a cost in terms of the benefit that can be associated with it.

Another issue that's been brought up is in terms of the carbon emissions, the reductions in this. And I think if you look at the report they suggest that this could increase ridership by upwards of 10%. And what I can argue, I mean, who would be opposed to reducing carbon emissions? I think everyone is moved in that general direction, but what is this going to save? Might save 100, maybe 200 cars from coming on the road. If you look at what China's doing in terms of their emissions right now, you know, once again, I think it proves whether you take 200 cars off the road, it's a step in the right direction but the cost of taking 100 or 200 cars off the road really, the benefit, and the cost associated with delivering this service is, (inaudible), is far outweighed by the cost of the project.

Now I would like to say that I am very much supportive of transit, spending more on transit. I do think if you do provide a reliable service for people, for our citizens, they will use it and I think that's generally a good thing. I'm not going to say that I think everyone is going to jump on the bus because as I mentioned earlier on in my comments, people lead busy lives. I think Winnipeg is, there is a lot of people that use cars, and you're not going to get everyone to travel the bus, but if you can get more people, great. I think Mayor Katz deserves some credit with his Federal colleagues and Provincial colleagues investing more money in transit and we should look at investing more money in a system that runs across the City, not just in one sector of the City or the other.

I also like the idea brought forth by the Canadian Taxpayers Federation. They talked about synchronized lights for bus transit. I think that's something that could dramatically speed up the cost or speed up your transportation from one area of town to the other.

So in conclusion, I will not be supporting this initiative. I do think that the costs associated are far too high than would be associated with the benefits of the program. So I will not be supporting this. I do want to say that I do believe that the votes are there and I will be supportive of this if this is the will of Council. I won't put any roadblocks up. You're not going to see me laying across the rails or the tracks or anything to a certain extent, but once again I will respect the will of Council but I cannot support this as it stands right now. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. No further Speakers? Mayor Murray? Mayor Murray. Excuse me. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I, like seven other Councillors in this chamber, it's my pleasure to vote for this for a second time. And I think we should be congratulating ourselves today for finally thinking like a major City. After decades and decades of procrastination and vacillation back and forth on this issue, we're moving forward in a positive way. I remember having a conversation with a very prominent Cabinet Minister about two years ago, who said that, I believe it was in the early 70's, where he had millions and millions of dollars to…for this sort of Rapid Transit Initiative for the City of Winnipeg and there were no takers. That money went somewhere else, and let me be clear. This is something that we should have done generations ago. This is something that could have made some structural foundational changes to how we've developed as a City. At that time, Rail Rapid Transit would have been more realistic and it should have been done generations ago but it wasn't and hindsight is 20/20.

As I said four years ago, Rapid Transit is a necessity for modern cities. It's good for the environment. It will reduce greenhouse gases. It will get people out of their cars and into transit. It's good for the infrastructure. It will lessen the number of cars on our roads which in the long run will be good for our capital budgets. It's good for downtown development, if only for the simple fact that Rapid Transit, or transit-focused infrastructure needs require less space than automobiles, so hopefully in five to ten years we're going to have less surface parking lots downtown and it's good for the residential infill development in Fort Rouge which we've all talked about.

Having said all that, I have to say that I am disappointed in the report that we're voting on because you can drive a light rail train through this report and not find a lot of financial facts on how we're going to pay this back or how we're going to recoup the money from the Province. When this was rolled out five weeks ago the Premier was there, Mayor Katz was there, it was 55 million, 55 million. If you read the report, the Province is in for 17.5 million not 55. I understand that there is some tax increment financing that's in the works. I know there is some Provincial legislation on that. Why there couldn't be a half page or one pager on how the tax increment financing mechanism is going to work to recoup some of that money. I don't know why that couldn't be. It would seem to me there would be a very reasonable thing to do, to see how we're going to get paid back on this. And I like the project and I like the Province but that gives me some heartburn. The Federal Government is in for 17.5 on a $138 million bill. The level of government with the billions and billions and billions of dollars of surplus is the Federal Government, and if we're going to move forward on Phase 2, I would hope that we could do it on a better cost share formula than we have now. So there is no talk of TIF's, there's not talk about how we're going to recoup the Province's money, there's no talk of Phase 2, time lines, how that's going to be paid for, and there's really no analysis of risks, and of the risk involved in fronting all of this money as we're heading into a recession. So hopefully the Mayor can cover off some of that as he closes or if he does close or Councillor Clement as he closes. But nevertheless this is something I'm going to place my faith in, in the Councillor's Infrastructure and Mayor Katz to bring home this deal on an equitable basis for our taxpayers. I know we've talked about this a long time and I want to thank the Rapid Transit Coalition. I know that they were very active in bringing this issue to the forefront. I'm sure they've called all of us to let us know how they feel about this issue. And I want to thank Mayor Katz for bringing this to the floor of Council and making sure that this does get done today. I know I've asked some tough questions but I feel that as a Mayor you have to answer the tough questions. And I especially want to thank Councillor Gerbasi because I know she has been relentless and unwavering on this issue and cuts through her ward so she's likely to be the biggest benefactor as this gets implemented, and I do have another concern however. I did mention it when we voted on the Mayor's Task Force with

all of the recommendations for Waverley and the ring roads.

I'd like to see an update on where we're at with all the money we're borrowing when we roll out the next budget, because we've been spending a heck of a lot of money, whether it's Disraeli, Chief Peguis extension. We've gotten now the priorities of the Mayor's Task Force, we're not sure which one is going to get funded. We've got Phase 1 of Rapid Transit, Phase 2. Is there going to be a Phase 3, Phase 4? We need to keep an eye on the long term financing of everything we're doing here and with all the spending we've been doing, I think it's time for some sort of update on our budgets and where we're going. But at this point, I share Councillor Steeves enthusiasm. I think this is a great day for the City. It's been a long time coming but it's going to happen. I think not unanimous but I think it's positive. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll be very brief.

It's my pleasure today to support this motion. I believe as many of my colleagues have already said today this is a very monumental day for the future of our City, for density.

Just going back to one of the comments that Councillor Swandel made. He was saying there's the possibility of, you know, if the tax incremental financing money isn't there, you know, you should be prepared for that. I'm saying I'm supporting today's first phase, and I think we're going to build it and the dense housing will come and the dense commercial stuff around the terminals will come. If it doesn't, I won't necessarily support Phase 2. But I think we need to build Phase 1 now, and I think the tax incremental financing methods of doing some of the funding for it is appropriate. So that's part of my rationale for supporting it. By the way, when it does come to new communities, I agree it should be market oriented and if there isn't the demand for back lanes and in terms of our costs of maintaining two sets of concrete I don't think is necessarily there. But in terms of waiting until there is dense development around our stations, I think we need to see it happen. Thank you.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll just be really quick. I just want to thank the Mayor's leadership on this issue as well as the Task Force Members, Gerbasi and especially our Task Force Chair, Councillor Wyatt for this. I know you've worked really hard on this, a couple or three years ago. And I'll be working hard to ensure that this thing…in the future on a "go-for-it" basis, connects the north half of Winnipeg with the southern half of Winnipeg. I just to thank all my colleagues all around for this great initiative.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all let me say that I'm happy that Council has the opportunity to debate this issue on the floor of Council and also have the opportunity to attend a Council seminar to get enlightened on exactly what is taking place. It's my understanding that never took place in the past.

The reason this makes sense is quite simple. There's a business case that supports what we're doing. So just to share some information because a lot of numbers were thrown around. It's $138 million and there is $89.75 million that will have to be financed. The Federal Government is putting in $28 million, not 18, it's 28. That's their total contribution. And, when you talk about, and I know that Councillor Clement referred to the Provincial Government, but let me just share something with you, because I happen to believe the way this is being done is actually beneficial to the City of Winnipeg. Number 1, those of you already know that as a result of the Rapid Transit Task Force, there is a request for a $5 million reserve. Well Council in its wisdom decided that should be 2.75. That's a line item in our budget. We have 2.75. That can't be used for anything else.

Alright? You can talk about it all you want but it's there for Rapid Transit. All we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is add $1.5 million to that and we have the money to pay for what we're doing here. Alright? We have 2.75, we've just got to add 1.5. That's all it takes. So you can talk about our 3 billion or $2 billion infrastructure deficit. It's $1.5 million per year, and Mr. Speaker, I can assure you from the activity that's taken place already and the conversation that I've had with the CAO, there are people ready to build high-density, single-family commercial right now that will more than cover this. We don't need TIF. We know the growth is there because the people have contacted the City of Winnipeg. They want to build. They want to invest in our City and I think that's a good thing. And I know that everybody would agree that we take, i.e., the Fort Rouge Yards, we already have the services there, and we can build a wonderful, exciting, vibrant community, that's a good thing for us. I'd like to think everybody believes that. But, Mr. Speaker, here is the other side of the coin. Thanks to the work of this Council, we now have, I guess for the first time in 17 years, 50/50 sharing on Transit with the Province. It's been a long time since we got there. But here is why this deal is probably better. There are some who say wouldn't it have been nice if the Province just wrote a cheque and I say maybe not people. Because in the past the way we would do business, we would work out a joint venture with the other levels of government for projects in the City of Winnipeg, and let's say the Province kicked in 25 and we kicked in 25 for a $50 million project. Guess what? Turned out to be $60 million project. Who got stuck with that extra 10, Mr. Speaker? The City. Because the other commitments were fixed, they're what they are. In this situation, if this comes in at less, we all pay less. If it comes in at more, we share in paying more. I think this is a much better deal than could have been done and I think we should do all deals that all levels of government are responsible for what the real cost is whether it's high or low as opposed to the City of Winnipeg having to always bear that burden, which has been the case in the past.

So Mr. Speaker when you look at this, you know, I like the idea of having an active transportation route all the way down Pembina Highway. I think it's wonderful, and I think most people here would agree with that. I like the fact that we have a situation where we are locking in, okay, this will be a 30-year term with the 30-year amortization. We know exactly what we're in for. We know what it's going to cost. And Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy at some point in time in the very near future to accompany Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Gerbasi and go all the way from Queen Elizabeth Parkway to the University of Manitoba and then maybe cross over in that wonderful gondola. Just gotta dream big Mr. Speaker. It'll be a wonderful day. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Clement closing.

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's pretty obvious that the majority of Council, in fact all but one I think, is going to support this and I think that says quite a bit because this Council is usually a little fractured on most things these days.

But to answer Councillor Vandal and I guess Swandel at the same time, it's true we've got a lot of projects that are happening, Mr. Speaker, and this is going to be an exciting one to add to all of the others that we're doing. But to this point in time, all of that is being done within the cash available through our cash to capital, and the way that we've dealt with the P3's, the same thing. And to this point in time there aren't any issues financially with any of that, but I can't let the…Councillor Swandel is accurate. There is money available out there for 30-year terms and that's great. The trouble, and why I'm a little edgy about it a little bit is that when you…it's…you do it one year and then you do it another year and then you do another year and when you all of a sudden do it for ten years, you've got ten different amounts that you're financing, Mr. Speaker. And that's actually what was happening to us in the past. And so, I'm not going to go there lightly. I understand the economics of it. And I understand that

when money is down that it's a good time to borrow and that type of thing.

I also remember that in 1998 that it was projected that we were going to have to spend $159 million a year, Mr. Speaker, out of our Current Budget to pay debt down. And as a result of not borrowing for not only that four years but beyond up until now, our debt service is only $72 million. That means that because of what we've done for the last ten years that we've actually got $87 million more money to spend this year than we would have had if we would have just kept on going down that path. So there's two sides to these things and we have to be careful and that's all I was trying to point out. And I think we will be and we have to be very prudent.

This is a great project. I've said before that I would have rather that it been something a little different but, you know, there are realities and I think that you have to start with something and that's what we're going to do. The Mayor and I can maybe differ on what we think is good and bad about the financing. He is quite right about the way he has depicted it. I'm just hoping that it's a one off. If we could negotiate all of the future agreements with the other two levels the way that he is talking that would be a wonderful thing. I'll wait and see because I don't know, I'm just trying to figure out whether this is an accident or whether that's where we're going, but, because frankly, we should be going one better than that. We shouldn't be in for one-third. If you look at what the City pays or should pay and what the Province should pay and the Feds should pay we should only be in for 15 or 16% of the 100% cost of these major projects, and we've been arguing that for decades. And so if we could ever get to the point where they actually do pay one-third, that would be great.

So congratulations to everybody and to Councillor Steeves. If some of us didn't seem too excited when the Province signs that agreement that coincides with the Memorandum of Understanding I'll buy the fireworks and the balloons for you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors on Item 1, ready for the question? All in favour? Recorded vote? You're kidding? OK, kid some more. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Do you want to be recorded in opposition? Yes, okay. Councillor Fielding will be recorded in opposition.

The motion. There is a motion that's automatic referral.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, if I may with your permission I would just like to read the "be it resolved" into the record as I believe this motion carries, if realized in the concept would do a great social good for our citizens.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz,

WHEREAS public transit systems across Canada, including in Winnipeg, are funded by a combination of system-generated revenue, and operating grants from the Province and the City;

AND WHEREAS the costs for key inputs to Winnipeg's transit system, such as fuel costs and vehicle replacement, periodically increase;

AND WHEREAS it is fair and reasonable that transit riders bear a share of these cost increases;

AND WHEREAS public transit represents a vital means of transportation for many Winnipeggers who receive income assistance, enabling them to meet their family obligations and to seek or maintain employment;

AND WHEREAS Plan Winnipeg 2020 Vision commits the City to promote equitable access to facilities and services by "ensuring all citizens have access to essential community services and facilities and facilitating access to

financial support where there is an inability to pay" (Plan Winnipeg 2020 Vision, section 2A-02, ii);

AND WHEREAS a transit system that is accessible to all Winnipeggers is an important contributor to employment and economic opportunity;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Public Service prepare a report exploring means to link periodic transit fare increases directly and automatically to increases in the costs of key inputs, so that individual fare increases would no longer require separate Council approval;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the report also explore options for providing Winnipeggers below the Low Income Cut Off with transit passes at a more affordable cost, including the provision of a Universal Low Income Transit Pass, and/or "off-peak passes", the latter for use outside peak transit hours.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my seconder Mayor Katz and with that move referral.

Mr. Speaker: It's automatic referral. Now Councillor Clement, Consideration of By-laws.

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

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 155/2008 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 155/2008.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 155/2008 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 155/2008.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 155/2008 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question Period. Councillor Steeves your first question.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chair of Infrastructure and Public Works. This summer was probably one of the worst I've ever seen in terms of back lane maintenance in my part of the world. I would like an explanation from the Chair, please.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I am not aware that this year was anything special but I am aware that the, that some of the back lanes are narrower than others and in the narrow ones we use a smaller machine I'm told. And I'm also told that that machine was down for a significant portion for repairs this summer and that caused some of the problem.

I know what I told them, frankly, it was that, you know, this is kind of silly. We have other companies around town that have machines of that size and if we have a problem we should go and get another one. And, and/or we should have more than one of that style of machine. And those are my thoughts on it.

But as I understand it, that was what the cause was, that we didn't have a machine that would fit in some cases. That may not be the answer but that's what I was led to believe when I asked the question on behalf of the honourable member from St. Vital.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I'm wondering why we spent the entire month of August without this machine. Many of us on Council were phoning 5, 10, sometimes 15 times a day for different lanes. Why were we not informed that this machine wasn't operating?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I'm not sure Mr. Speaker. I wasn't receiving those phone calls. I received one from the member from St. Vital and when I contacted the Director, the answer I was given was the one I just provided a couple of minutes ago.

When other Councillors may have been calling on their own to their supervisors and foremen, I don't know what they were being told by them exactly. But the answer that I was given was the one I've already mentioned here, Mr. Speaker, was that this machine was down and that that was the cause of the problem. There isn't another explanation that I'm aware of.

Mr. Speaker: And the final question, Councillor Steeves. Third and final.

Councillor Steeves: For the future, what steps have been taken to ensure this doesn't happen again?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I don't believe that as the Chairman of Public Works that I have the autonomy to direct anybody to take those steps other than to have those, have that discussion at Public Works.

I've already personally had that discussion with the Director, and my view was that they should invest in at least another machine identical to that and that if something happened that a machine went down and it was the only one that we had, that we should rent another one off of somebody pretty quick. Those were my personal thoughts. That was what I suggested to them once I found out that this was a bit of a problem.

And so I hope that they are watching out in TV land that we're having this discussion and that we actually are going to maybe ask them at a Public Works meeting about it. It just hasn't, that opportunity hasn't arisen yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Nordman your first question.

Councillor Nordman: Mr. Speaker, I too share the frustration of back lanes in St. Charles Ward and the news that there could be a possible second machine would be very valuable. I think to my colleague in St. James also. So I'm glad to hear that.

Just a comment rather than maybe a question. I would just like to recognize what a great job the Parks and Open Space folks did this summer with our boulevards and medians. The flowers that were planted and the outstanding comments that I think many of us did receive, and just to recognize them for the splendid care they gave our City streets. So pass that on Councillor Clement.

Mr. Speaker: What's the question, you said, did you know. Did you know, so your reply is yes. Councillor Pagtakhan your first question.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chair, will there be a fall leaf sweep program in the City and if so when will that be taking place?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: My understanding is there is and usually that takes place right now and should be ongoing. I'm not aware that it's not happening. It's usually about this time every year.

The leaves are just about down, they're not quite down yet. I noticed that the pile is getting a lot higher and thicker at the Assiniboine Park where I take my leaves every night. I do about a half a dozen bags every night. And I know that on a lot of the residential streets that they're just

about down but with that wind yesterday they're probably close. As far as I know they're doing it. It's usually the last couple weeks in October.

Mr. Speaker: They are. They're doing it. Your second question Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Would the good Councillor be so kind as to forward to us an email perhaps of the exact program period?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I'd be happy this afternoon to contact Mr. McPhail's office and have Mr. McPhail send out the program to everybody.

Mr. Speaker: That's very good, thank you. Councillor Swandel your first question.

Councillor Swandel: Through you to Councillor Clement, I just, we're coming into that part of the year and I hate to mention it where the snow might start to fall again. It's always a concern on how our snow clearing budget is doing. I think we were pretty fortunate at the beginning of this year, it didn't look that bad. I'm just wondering if the Chair could give us any indication of how healthy we are with our snow clearing budget.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: It seems to me that that would have been a more appropriate question of the Chairman of Finance because he would know how much money we've got there.

All I can tell you about the program Mr. Speaker, is that our policy has always been that if it snows we're going to clear the streets. If it's a three centimetres plus snowfall we go and if it's a ten centimetre plus snowfall we do phase three which is the residential streets. And it really doesn't matter, I mean it does to a degree but it really doesn't because we don't have a policy. If we're out of money we still clear the streets and we find the money. So there is no question that we're going to keep the streets in great condition like we always do. We've got terrific people and we get complimented on our snow removal all the time Mr. Speaker.

But once again I guess I can defer to Councillor O'Shaughnessy. I've still got seven minutes left. He maybe wants to answer that question. I don't know the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just thought there may have been some conversation with Public Works about how that was going.

My supplemental question is unrelated and it's on the back lanes. Back lanes, I guess, are you aware that the gravel back lanes throughout the City are an issue where it's difficult to get the local improvements done. Last year we provided some funding in the budget for gravel roads but nothing for gravel back lanes.

There was a cost issue that was brought forward that it was more expensive to grade the, continue it up, to keep the gravel back lane or roads in passable condition and therefore it was prudent to begin to hard cover them. Is there any such information coming forward on gravel back lanes?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well given that all that other information came forward during the Current Budget discussions I'm assuming that if somebody was going to raise that issue that they would raise it at the same time this year during the Current Budget deliberations which are just about to start but haven't quite started Mr. Speaker.

I think there is a small difference in the two issues however. The granular roadways that were just actually mentioned are rural roadways. They aren't, in fact they're almost like farm roads if you like. And examples, there are several of them around the City. Pipestone Road or Pipeline pardon me, in

the north end is a granular roadway. McCreary Road where the Fort Whyte Nature Centre is a gravel road. There's some in Transcona. There's some in Councillor Swandel's ward too, Lee Boulevard West of Waverley and Cadboro, streets like that. So, those are different types of roads than what the back lanes are. The back lanes are supplementary in most cases to the front driveways that a lot of people have. So I think it's a minor difference but it was raised during the Current Budget deliberations last year and that's where it would be raised this time I'm sure too.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Standing Policy Committee on Finance. No report. Motions? There is one motion moved by Councillor Vandal. Automatic referral to Finance.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE MOTIONS

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Vandal,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

WHEREAS the population and geographic growth in the southeast quadrant of the city are amongst the fastest in Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the current response times for fire and paramedic services for the residential homes who are located in the southeast quadrant of the City of Winnipeg are well below national safety standards;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT funding for the construction of a new Fire station in the southeast quadrant be approved in the 2009 Capital budget.

Mr. Speaker: Consideration of By-laws. None. Question period. Finance? None. Standing Policy Committee Downtown Development. Councillor Wyatt. Report of September 9 of 2008.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2008

Councillor Wyatt: I'll move the report and the adoption of Consent Agenda Item 2.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Report September 29, 2008.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 29, 2008

Councillor Wyatt: I'll introduce the report. I'll move adoption of Consent Agenda Item No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions none. By-laws none. Question period. Councillor Pagtakhan.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Chair of Downtown Development, the Bell Hotel stands adjacent to the new building, the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority building being constructed at the corner of Main and Logan.

Could the Chair provide this Council with some information relative to the development of the Bell? It's a vacant structure. It's boarded up. Is there possible discussions happening anywhere with regards to that structure being used for mixed use commercial and residential?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah I'll have to take that under advisement Mr. Speaker and get back to Councillor Pagtakhan. I know CentreVenture purchased the Bell not too long ago and I'm sure they're actively trying to find a use for it. So I'll need to get back to him. There are some discussions but I want to get back to him on where those are at. So thanks.

Mr. Speaker: That's it? No further questions?

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE DATED OCTOBER 20, 2008

Mr. Speaker: The Secretariat report, this is the report that is before you. I would like to ask Councillor Nordman to move it on my behalf. It's just only the schedule of meetings. Councillor Nordman moves that report. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Before we go into adjournment I would just like to thank the people that are in the gallery, some of them in here since the morning, and it's very enjoyable for you to sit and watch us work here. This is what we do all the time. We try to…due diligence is what we believe in to both sides. So thanks for coming and be free to come here any time you want.

Councillor Steeves moves adjournment. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll Call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 3:38 p.m.