COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, March 25, 2009

The Council met at 9:34 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Steeves.

ROLL CALL

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

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, I'm going to ask you to do something today that's very important to us, to the City of Winnipeg, and I'm going to ask John Orlikow to the floor of Council.

Mr. Orlikow, would you please come down and to be sworn in by the Deputy City Clerk, Marc Lemoine, the newly elected Councillor representative for the River Heights-Fort Garry ward.

Deputy City Clerk: Please repeat after me. I, John Orlikow,

John Orlikow: I, John Orlikow,

Clerk: do solemnly promise and declare,

John Orlikow: do solemnly promise and declare,

Deputy City Clerk: that I will truly, faithfully and impartially,

John Orlikow: that I will truly, faithfully and impartially,

Deputy City Clerk: to the best of my knowledge and ability,

John Orlikow: to the best of my knowledge and ability,

Deputy City Clerk: execute the office into which I have been elected,

John Orlikow: execute the office into which I have been elected,

Deputy City Clerk: and that I have not received,

John Orlikow: and I have not received,

Deputy City Clerk: and will not receive,

John Orlikow: and will not receive,

Deputy City Clerk: any payment or reward,

John Orlikow: any payment or reward,

Deputy City Clerk: or the promise of payment or award,

John Orlikow: or the promise of payment or award,

Deputy City Clerk: for the exercise of partiality,

John Orlikow: for the exercise of partiality,

Deputy City Clerk: corruption or other improper execution of the office.

John Orlikow: corruption or other improper execution of the office.

Deputy City Clerk: And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously,

John Orlikow: And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously,

Deputy City Clerk: believing it to be true,

John Orlikow: believing it to be true,

Deputy City Clerk: and knowing that it has the same force and effect,

John Orlikow: and knowing that it has the same force and effect,

Deputy City Clerk: as if made under oath,

John Orlikow: as if made under oath,

Deputy City Clerk: by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

John Orlikow: by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Deputy City Clerk: Congratulations.

John Orlikow: Thanks. (applause).

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed my pleasure to be here first of all, congratulations. As they say where I come from, Mazel-Tov.

It's my pleasure to present you, John, with a certificate of election. You are now officially Councillor John Orlikow, and I welcome you to Council.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. (applause).

Mayor Katz: I also want to welcome your family and friends, your lovely wife Sylvia and your adorable daughters, Nicole and Annika, who are joining us here today to celebrate your victory.

The people of River Heights-Fort Garry voted for what you've described as a positive choice, and I look forward to hearing a positive voice as we work hard to address the issues that concern residents not just in River Heights-Fort Garry, but the entire City.

Councillor Orlikow, you ran on a promise of supporting community centres, improving transit, fixing our crumbling roads, encouraging recycling, and keeping Winnipeggers safe, issues of commonality with myself and many members of Council.

I know its difficult joining Council during a by-election, and you certainly have a large role to fill, to meet the bar set by former Councillor Brenda Leipsic, but I know you are up to the challenge.

I want to offer you congratulations and remember, my door is always open. I look forward to your input on Council.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much.

Mayor Katz: Thank you. (applause)

Councillor Gerbasi: We should also put on the record that it's Councillor Orlikow's birthday today.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I'll tell you what Councillor, here is what we'll do. Councillor, here is what I'm going to ask you to do. I want you to stand up and lead us in singing Happy Birthday. Come on! Happy Birthday, Councillor Orlikow.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: The pages, we have today with us Rory Mitchell of Kelvin High School who resides in the Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward. Welcome. (applause).

Welcome of guests and announcements. Carlos, a condolence motion.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Swandel,
Seconded by Councillor Steeves,

That Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Harold Geske, grandfather of Councillor Browaty, which occurred on March 21, 2009.

This Council extends to Councillor Browaty, his partner Tara and his family its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Would everyone please rise for a moment of silence.

MINUTES

Councillor Browaty moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on February 18, 2009 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

We have a number of delegations here this morning. First delegation, Michelle Golebiowski in opposition to item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee

on Protection and Community Services. Is Ms Golebiowski here? And then followed by Gloria Cardwell. You can sit behind here so you wouldn't have to, we wouldn't have to wait too long for your coming up from the gallery.

Ms. Golebiowski, you have, you'll have ten minutes in your presentation.

Michelle Golebiowski: My name is Michelle Golebiowski and I'm here to talk to you today about how important the memorial sites are to those who've lost a loved one, and I'm speaking on particular of the site where Amanda Frizzley died on Donald Street and why I think the memorial should stay up for one full year.

Three months is not long enough timeframe for those to mourn and remember. It takes a significant amount of time to find the right partner, carry a child for nine months and raise and care for him for x-amount of years, him or her for x-amount of years. And as I said, this takes time.

Three months, I feel, is not sufficient when considering what I just mentioned on what's involved in the creation process. The memorial to Amanda Frizzley is not only to honour her life taken so recklessly on the job but it also should remain to those who like to continue paying their respects and to raise further awareness proactively on the subject of drinking and driving.

I feel that leaving up the memorial for, leaving the memorials up for the time frame determined and putting up a plaque could serve as a reminder to educate people on drinking and driving. If you take them down people will not have the visual reminder of the consequences.

Amanda volunteered to stay and work late the day that she was killed, clearing the streets for the Run for the Cure Breast Cancer marathon. Amanda was my best friend and from knowing her so closely, she too would see this as an opportunity to educate and influence the public on the painful results of bad decisions, choices or actions involving alcohol and drinking and driving. She would want people to learn from these mistakes.

The memorial should stay up for two good reasons. Number one, to honour one of Winnipeg's finest fallen citizens and number two, to raise awareness of drinking and driving.

Can we leave up the memorial for one full year? If it has to be taken down after one year can we appeal to both sides by putting up a plaque as suggested in the previous letter? If a memorial falls on residential property can we evaluate the area and find a place to put up a plaque nearby? If someone were to put up a memorial and take it down in four months can someone else put up another memorial for another four months?

I feel that extending the time limit to one year and putting up a small plaque afterward is an exceptional way to honour someone who put their life on the line on the streets of Winnipeg and should be remembered and respected as such. Please take a moment and think, what if this was someone close to you. It could've been your daughter, your sister or your friend.

Tomorrow on March 26th is Mandy's 28th birthday. Let us give her the gift of honour and remembrance as I'm sure those of you would wish this of your own loved ones. To preserve the memory of our friend Amanda should send a message to our citizens and visitors and I will quote this, "We the City of Winnipeg will remember and honour our fallen citizens." These actions will speak volumes of our City. Thank you for your time in this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Michelle just hang on. There may be some, any questions? Michelle, thank you for coming. Thank you.

Gloria Cardwell-Hoeppner and Barry Hoeppner on behalf of the Plessis Road Residents' Group in support of Item 6 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal. You have ten minutes.

Gloria Cardwell-Hoeppner: Good morning. I'm sorry, Barry Hoeppner has been called away today. With me is Tammy Chabluk from the Plessis Road Residents' Group, in case there is any questions if that's all right?

So good morning Councillors and a special welcome to Councillor Orlikow this morning, welcome.

Our petition with the signatures of 450 residents requesting the removal of the truck route designation on Plessis Road has been presented at EK-Transcona Community Committee, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure and Public Works and the Executive Policy Committee. Our presentations at those committees have already been fully detailed as to the reasons for the request and in the interest of your time I'm going to be brief.

In 2002 EPC endorsed a plan by CNR to move the intermodal terminal from Kenaston to Symington Yard on Plessis Road under the assurance that trucks will use the TransCanada Highway and as a result impact on the residential section of Plessis Road north will be minimal. Residents along Plessis and Grassie can assure you that fully loaded semis at 80,000 pounds rumbling by is not minimal. The impact on our community is significant. Gone is the enjoyment of our properties day or night, comfort in our property values, structural integrity of our homes and fences and a reasonable assurance of safety for our pedestrians.

A semi is 20-decibels louder than a passenger vehicle and the noise of one semi is equivalent to 32 cars. A U.S. study has determined that each decibel increase reduces our property values by 0.6%. Transport Canada recognizes traffic noise as a form of pollution causing an array of health problems. The vibrations from the truck traffic cause our houses to shake and household articles shift. Effects on foundations and fences are a real concern and the residents from the group have already been experiencing significant damage.

Every child in Kildonan Meadows and Kildonan Green has to cross Plessis Road to reach schools, community clubs and playgrounds, and an average loaded semi is 16 times heavier than the average car and takes 40% more distance to stop.

This is a heavy residential area. We chose to live here based on the information that we were given at the time. We didn't know that the CN intermodal would locate to south Plessis. We know that the truck route predates the residential but the residential predates the intermodal. I can tell you if we knew then what we know now, very few of us would have made the same choices.

We appreciate that trucks provide goods and services we need and want but we've already demonstrated that there are other, better truck routes available with negligible impact on the driving time.

Our residents have invested in this community, their money, their time, their families. Both the Transcona West Area Structure Plan and Plan Winnipeg speak about the surrounding neighbourhood needs for quality of life, safety and enjoyment of private property. These plans are in keeping with the planning of progressive Canadian cities.

We would like to extend our sincere thanks and appreciation to the committees who have already reviewed our request, Councillors Wyatt, Browaty, Thomas, Clement, Lazarenko, Smith, Vandal, Swandel, Fielding, Pagtakhan and especially to Mayor Katz for upholding these plans and recognizing the residents' needs, remembering the assurances we were given in 2002 and for bringing this issue forward to you today.

We also have the support of MLA Bidhu Jha and Daryl Reid, The River East Transcona School Division and The Manitoba Conservation Safety Routes to School. These letters of support have already been submitted with our original petition.

We ask that you correct an historic wrong and accept the committee's

recommendations to change the truck route on Grassie and Plessis Road to local access only. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors any questions of the delegation? Thank you. Thank you for coming.

Bob Dolyniuk on behalf of Manitoba Trucking Association in opposition to item 6 of the report of Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Mr. Dolyniuk, if you are present, please come forth, you have ten minutes in your presentation.

Bob Dolyniuk: Good morning. The Manitoba Trucking Association is appearing in delegation this morning in opposition to the proposal to delete Plessis Road north of Regent and Grassie Boulevard from the truck route system. The clerk is distributing a copy of our written submission. As a number of Councillors have already received or heard previous versions, I'm not going to represent it verbatim this morning. Rather, I would prefer to relay or present some of the facts on this issue as we view them.

To provide a history on the proposal, the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee recommended deletion of Plessis Road from the truck route system in November of 2008.

On March 10, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works concurred, but also amended the recommendation to also have Plessis or Grassie Boulevard deleted from the truck route system. March 19th, EPC concurred.

If our submission and my comments seem to reflect primarily on Plessis Road it's because Plessis Road was the original issue and Grassie Boulevard was an add on that occurred during the committee process.

I guess of significant concern to us is how did we get into this situation? How did Kildonan Meadows residential development and a new section of Plessis Road get constructed so close to one another? How has this encroachment between the development and the road allowance and the roadway allowed and approved? We have to recognize that this is the genesis of the issue, that's what it's all about.

There are approximately 500 metres of residential development along the whole length of Plessis Road encroaching on Plessis Road, on the allowance in the roadway. This occurred in spite of the City's requirements for planning, land use and transportation planning. The end result that we have today is that the residents are upset and now there is a conflict between the residents and the trucking industry, and yet these questions continue to go unanswered. Does that mean that this manner of development encroachment will continue to be allowed to occur in the City of Winnipeg? And who will be penalized for this? The residents, the trucking industry, or both?

Plessis Road has been a truck route for over 50 years. It's been used for local deliveries and as a through route. Conversely, the residential developments adjacent to and along Plessis have been built in more recent years. It is true that the CN Intermodal terminal is more recent but if we go back in history, we'll also find out that CN operated a trucking operation, CN Trucking, out of that same location, many years prior to the residential development, and they used Plessis Road.

It has been suggested that Plessis Road is being used as a shortcut by some trucks. Well in fact, that is one of the roles a truck route plays, as a through route from one area of Winnipeg to another. Nairn, Kenaston, Ness, St. Andrews and many other truck routes play the same role.

Based on the truck traffic trip numbers provided by the City of Winnipeg Public Works, detouring these trucks and tractor trailers to other streets will inflict at least a million dollars of unnecessary cost on the trucking industry and ultimately, the shippers and the consumers in Winnipeg.

Other presenters through this process have suggested that travel time is the

same by car. We don't question that, it may be so but the actual distances depending on the different routes that are available do create different distances and that is what impacts trucking costs.

Without question, time is a factor, particularly congestion such as Regent and Lagimodiere. Based on the same statistics, this proposal and the resulting detours will increase the amount of greenhouse gases emitted by 400 tonnes per year in Winnipeg.

These changes will make Winnipeg that much less competitive with other centres. The rerouting of this traffic will be forced on to Regent Avenue and Dugald Road, which are already more congested today than Plessis Street or Plessis Road. The problem will not be resolved, it will just be placed on other streets.

The rational presented by the residents group was that Plessis Road should be deleted from the truck route system because of major problems with noise, vibration, dust, speeding, traffic and safety. It would appear that the decision making on this issue to date has been based on the same rationale.

Plessis roadway closest to Kildonan Meadows development is the newest portion of this double divided roadway which was developed in the last few years and is far smoother than the older side. Noise and vibration, if any, would be evident on the other older side of the roadway, yet nobody has indicated that the older roadway was ever an issue in this regard.

There was concern raised about safety. Public Works identified the accident ratio on Plessis Road is 30% lower than the city-wide regional street average. And during the presentations there has not been one mention of collisions involving cars or trucks. Concrete and asphalt roadways do not create dust.

If this proposal is adopted it will set a precedent and the same rational can be used by the residents adjacent to dozens of other truck routes in Winnipeg and they will expect the same result. And how can Council say no to them?

It was suggested by some presenters that there was no truck traffic counts. Public Works provided a count in February of '09, which was presented to committee. There are a total of 428, two and three axle trucks and 98 tractor trailers in a 12 hour weekday period from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. along that roadway. These counts are significantly lower than counts on any other truck route in Winnipeg.

The City has spent $10 million in the last two years on this roadway developing it to its current truck route standards. To delete this route from the truck route system would be a waste of taxpayer dollars and particular when Winnipeg is currently holding a $2.8 billion infrastructure deficit.

Public Works has recommended that Plessis Road not be deleted from the truck route system and Winnipeg puts itself forward as a transportation hub and is currently attempting to attract businesses to Centre Port. This proposal will send the wrong message to those companies and industries.

For the reasons mentioned, the Manitoba Trucking Association requests Council not to support the elimination of Plessis Road and Grassie Boulevard from the full time truck route system.

In closing I have a couple of questions and a couple of recommendations for Council. First as I start off at the beginning of my presentation, how was this situation allowed to happen, the encroachment of a residential development on a major route, truck route? And what is the City going to do to prevent this from happening in the future?

If Council chooses to adopt this recommendation it will set a precedent and place the City of Winnipeg truck route system on a slippery slope. Residents of any residential area adjacent to or close to an existing truck route will be able to argue the same issues as presented in this case and demand the same results. What assurance will our industry have

that this precedent will not be allowed the same results for other truck routes in Winnipeg?

Rather than making a decision today, it is our recommendation that Council should defer the decision on this matter until an in-depth review of Plan Winnipeg is conducted.

Additionally and in light of initiatives such as Centre Port, the City of Winnipeg should conduct an overall review of freight movement and truck routes in Winnipeg with the intent on developing a long term sustainable freight movement policy. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Is there any questions Councillors? No questions? Thank you. We don't have any additional addendum delegations do we? Can we get on with the Executive Policy Committee report of March the 4th of 2009, Mayor Katz please?

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MARCH 4, 2009

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

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

Report of March the 11th.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MARCH 11, 2009

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

Mr. Speaker: All in favour?

Councillor Gerbasi: (inaudible) attached to this. There's a couple of motions isn't there?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh, I'm sorry!

Mr. Speaker: No. You heard Councillors, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of March the 18th.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MARCH 18, 2009

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1. Jenny now it's your turn.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh now.

Mr. Speaker: Now.

Councillor Gerbasi: I consent, Mr. Speaker because there is a motion on this.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. No he's on number (inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: You have a motion on… Number 1 and 2. Councillor Gerbasi?

Mr. Mayor, can you introduce that report?

Item No. 1 - Tuxedo Yards Redevelopment: southwest and northwest quadrants of Sterling Lyon Parkway and Kenaston Boulevard (Charleswood-Tuxedo Ward) Files EP-1.1(PW 2/2008), DASZ 37/2008, DAC 1/2009 and G-8

Mayor Katz: Yes, Mr. Speaker it would be my pleasure to introduce the report.

This is regarding Tuxedo Yards redevelopment, and for arguments sake it's where the new Ikea, hopefully, will be located, Mr. Speaker.

You know Mr. Speaker we talk about a growing city. We talk about keeping our young people here. We talk about attracting young people from other cities here and we're talking about development in a time where there is economic crisis facing so many other cities. You can see companies, media, cutting staff, laying off

people. You see empty spaces all over the place. And, Mr. Speaker, among all this insanity we have a phenomenal opportunity here in our City of Winnipeg.

Myself and members of EPC spent ten hours listening to the proponent as well as delegations, and what we heard over and over and over again is that everybody wants Ikea. They know that Ikea is a good corporate citizen. They know that Ikea does things that, I guess, are ground setting where they provide bicycles for their employees and they do things that most corporations have never thought of, so they certainly do set the bar. And they like what they hear about Ikea and their concern about the environment.

What seemed to come out of this was there was concern about the rest of the development. And I think people should probably have a little less concern knowing what we, who spent ten hours there, were told at the end, is that Ikea is a partner in this development, so I am sure that they will be conscientious of the environment and the needs of the citizens, Mr. Speaker.

But there is phenomenal opportunity here and I certainly hope that we do not lose this opportunity for the sake of Winnipeg. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement you have your Motion Number 1. Introduce it.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Clement,
Seconded by Councillor Steeves,

That Recommendation 7.C of Item 1of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated March 18, 2009 be deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"C. The City of Winnipeg issues a Building Permit for that lot; or that lot is sold or leased other than to the IKEA Developer Joint Venture; or 10 years from the passage of the by-law, whichever comes first."

Councillor Clement: Yes, Mr. Speaker. All this is, is a housekeeping motion. The Planning department wanted to alter the language in this one clause and so I'll simply move it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi on your Motion Number 2.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

That Council defer this Plan Winnipeg Amendment and related applications until the following information is made available for Council's consideration:

1. A cost benefit analysis which includes the capital and operating costs of the development including the implications of accelerating an expansion of the capacity of the regional street system throughout Southwest Winnipeg versus the incremental revenue the city will earn from the development.

2. A preliminary estimate of the cost to provide a level of transit service to this development that is at least comparable to other regional commercial centres.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I'm going to introduce this motion which is an opportunity to have a look at the true cost benefits of this proposed super regional commercial destination centre.

While this project is being referred to as the Ikea project we should keep in mind that Ikea will only make up about 1/8th of the entire development when it is fully built. Ikea is only 350,000 square feet out of a much larger total of 1.5 million square feet in other big box retail. A possible 500 to 800 unit condominium, 100 room hotel and 16 screen movie theatre complex included in the conceptual plan could easily add another million square feet.

While a lot of people are very excited about getting an Ikea, it is our responsibility to do our due diligence and properly consider the long term financial, social and environmental implications of the whole package. This is a massive and very significant development. It will have a huge, long term impact on the City well beyond the local neighbourhood.

This Plan Winnipeg amendment and application process has been like a whirlwind occurring within only a few months. While it is admirable to have development applications processed quickly, with something as significant and with as much impact as this development, we must be sure that all the issues are thoroughly considered. We received this application only 94 days ago. Places such as Toronto typically allow at least nine months for a process like this and yet there are four Ikea stores in the Toronto region. This demonstrates that doing proper due diligence is not going to chase Ikea away.

I would point out that there are a large number of critical issues that have not been properly considered to date. By agreeing to this motion, it would mean that there would be more information brought forward which would necessitate a new public hearing. This is not a bad thing when you consider that the residents of River Heights-Fort Garry ward who will bear the majority of the impact of traffic generated by this development have effectively been without representation for the past nine months.

The new Councillor for that ward has only just been sworn in this morning and was unable to be part of this process until now. The first resolve of the motion asks for a proper cost benefit analysis which includes both the capital and operating costs of the development including the implications of accelerating an expansion of the regional street system verses the incremental revenue the City will earn from the development. It is a pretty important and basic question to ask whether this development will cost the City money or make the City money.

The City will be subsidizing the infrastructure improvements around the development to the tune of $14 million plus interest. This money is to come from the projected $3.7 million per year the City would be getting from the incremental property and business taxes from the development.

However, what is being ignored is the enormous cost that will come when a huge increase in traffic generated by the development creates pressure to accelerate a whole slew of expansions of the regional street system in southwest Winnipeg. Preliminary estimates for projects such as the widening of Kenaston from Taylor to Academy, the widening of the St. James Bridge and the Waverley grade separation of the CN mainline are estimated to cost at least $236 million. This project will also put pressure to accelerate a future widening of Bishop Grandin.

To put this in perspective, it will cost us $5.7 million a year in lease payments for the next 30 years just for the recently approved Chief Peguis Trail extension project pegged at $64 million. That's just one project of $64 million. That's how much it costs us a year. With revenue of only $3.7 million per year in increased property and business taxes coming from the development it isn't clear if there will be enough money to pay these costs and the situation becomes worse if business taxes are reduced or eliminated. The financial implications need to be fully explained.

Creating this huge centre of commercial concentration will encourage people to shift their shopping habits away from places closer to home. Not only does this means more traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions, it will also reduce, result in a redistribution of existing revenues from consumer spending.

The sales and property tax assessment from other retail centres drop at Polo Park, St. Vital and in the downtown area, a shift to the new development, this will not create more revenue. Only through a more thorough cost benefit analysis can these issues be properly evaluated.

Now, as to the environmental impact, the discussion about this has been minimized and not adequately considered here. The initial report from the administration that recommended a public hearing checked off none under the category of environmental implications.

The summary for the second report prepared for the public hearing under environmental implications said the following seven words "appropriate redevelopment of an industrial brown field site" full stop. This is sorely inadequate. Yes, it is a brown field site but what about the implications of permitting the most auto dependent commercial development in Winnipeg's history on our environmental footprint and on the long overdue goal of having a community wide climate change plan? It is clear that the environmental issues have not been properly vetted.

It is stunning that the City's Environmental Coordinator was not consulted on the proposal at all. Neither was the Mayor's Environmental Advisory Committee, a group that includes the Executive Director of the Centre for Sustainable Transportation.

According to the traffic study, this project at full build out on a typical Saturday will generate 36,600 trips as opposed to 6,350 at its current type of use. This is almost a six-fold increase. Obviously with more than 7,500 parking stalls and the talk of massively expanding the roadways around the project and the wider regional street system this development is going to have a huge impact on transportation in our City and on our greenhouse gas emissions.

An inventory of greenhouse gas emissions conducted for the City has shown that transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in Winnipeg. Yet the information in front of us completely ignores this entire issue. We are putting our heads in the sand if we think that gas prices will remain low and that climate change is going to disappear if we just don't talk about it.

Transit is barely an afterthought in the deliberations, considering that the developer's 63 page traffic impact study contains only one paragraph on public transit and a mere two paragraphs on active transportation. A true transportation plan should have been done, that commits the developer to follow our Transit department's "Designing for Sustainable Transportation and Transit in Winnipeg" that is posted on our City web site as a guideline to developers. Plan Winnipeg requires that large new commercial developments such as this should be a focal point for public transit. This includes a proper transit loop close to the entrance, accessible and with proper transit routing. And how are bicycles and pedestrians going to cross up to 11 lanes of traffic on Kenaston which will be the roadways' width at its widest point?

The variance on reducing bike parking may be reasonable but couldn't the Committee have asked for something in return. For example, things such as shelter, locked facilities that are accessible and closer to the main entrance could have been requested from the developer. In other Canadian cities such as Richmond in B.C. and Toronto, Ikea has bent over backwards to provide free shuttle buses from either the downtown or to major transit hubs or subway stations. In Portland, Oregon, Ikea was persuaded to locate adjacent to the light rail system and offers discounts on home delivery to those customers who arrive using public transit.

Places that require and ask for more progressive environmentally friendly development standards tend to get more sustainable practices from developers, while places that don't get the opposite. Winnipeg will get exactly what it has asked for. It seems that we are so desperate to be placed on the map that we aren't asking the developer for reasonable things that more other, more progressive jurisdictions typically request.

Not only for environmental reasons but for social reasons and sustainability, it is unconscionable not to promote more public transit at this site. We know that virtually all future population growth in Winnipeg will be gains in international immigrants and growth in the aboriginal community, two groups which have a much higher reliance on public transit. How are these groups, plus lower income people, the elderly use and other transit riders going to get to this development, to work at these jobs that will be created?

These issues must be properly considered and funded.

The motion before you calls for a full and proper disclosure of the estimated cost to provide a level of transit service to this development that is at least comparable to other regional commercial centres. That seems pretty reasonable. The administration has not been given sufficient time to provide both taxpayers and ourselves with the true cost to provide a full range of civic services to this development.

We also have no independent analysis about the impact on the downtown and the inner city. If we are going to subsidize a massive autocentric suburban development, then we have to do a much better job of justifying that subsidy. It is simply not good enough to make a general statement that having a regional attraction like Ikea will help the downtown. We need solid numbers to back that assumption up.

To summarize, this motion is an attempt to ensure that proper due diligence is done. It is what the City Auditor, Plan Winnipeg, and our Strategic Re-investment Policy have all called upon us to do, to know the full cost before we make any major decisions about how, about expensive new infrastructure.

A new public hearing with more thorough information would give our new Councillor, I'll be finished in a second, a chance to actually represent the concerns of his constituents. Furthermore, it gives all of us a chance to consider making this development truly a smart development, not only in name.

We should be thinking about the long term impact and not only the short term excitement that, I'm almost done, that Ikea brings. Indeed, one of the six principles in Plan Winnipeg that we require to uphold is to recognize that long term goals are more important than short term gains.

We should be asking more of the developer and the overall plan for the site as other cities we compete with do. We should be ensuring that this project makes financial sense, minimizes environmental impact and is successful to all Winnipeggers. Thank you. I wasn't allowed to speak at the public hearing, so this is only chance.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Well you've done your share here. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to make it pretty clear that I won't be supporting the motion that was just discussed, big surprise I guess.

First of all, this particular site is wholly contained within my constituency, every square inch of it. The people that came to the public hearing on the Plan Winnipeg amendment, those that opposed it for the most part, there were a couple from my ward that certainly had issues and we dealt with them.

Most of the other people that came, and there weren't, there were a few, it wasn't a huge number, that were from a different constituency, were there because they don't like the idea of widening Kenaston between Taylor and the St. James Bridge which is a totally different issue all together. That's what they talked about when they came to the public hearing.

I've just heard, and sometimes I get the feeling that some people think that they're the only ones that care about the environment and active transportation and all these other issues that is we hear about from time to time. First of all, if you sat at Public Works where I do, Mr. Speaker, and I know you do, when the active transportation people come, they sometimes actually admonish us because we're trying to build bike paths and they don't really want bike paths. They want to be in the mainstream of traffic. They understand that they sometimes have to get on a bike path to get from a to b, but want to be in the main stream. They're not concerned about having to cross at a light when they come off of a bike path along a roadway and have to cross at a light.

I would also suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this particular site in Winnipeg is

probably the most bicycle friendly site in all of Winnipeg. It has bicycle paths coming all the way from Elie, from, right through Headingley, through Charleswood, through the Assiniboine Forest. People in Whyte Ridge can get there by bicycle. By this summer, people in East Fort Garry, in Councillor Gerbasi's ward, are going to be able to come down a bicycle path down McGillivray and then come back through that same system and get to this site. People in Lindenwoods can get there by bicycle and people in Linden Ridge can get there by bicycle and when we build the other 30,000 homes that the former Speaker didn't talk about in Waverley West, they're going to be able to get there by bicycle. It is the most bicycle friendly site that we've ever created. So that's all gobbledygook that this is not active transportation friendly.

As far as transit goes, I don't operate transit. We have people who do that. They're professionals at it and everybody in this room knows that when you have an issue with a transit route, you talk to Bill Menzies because that's his job. He is the one that determines how to make these routes fit. They're, they've got a transit hub in here. They've got a special entrance for the bus to get in. They've got a special place allocated for buses to stop and it is darn near at the front door. And it's right in the Ikea site.

There will be alternate changes to this, I'm sure, as time goes on, Mr. Speaker, and there always has to be. No different than there was when the Walmart went in at McGillivray and Kenaston, and subsequently, had to be altered a little bit because the Hopewell site was created across the street where Costco is. And by the way, the beneficiaries of that were people that lived in Lindenwoods and Whyte Ridge because they then all of a sudden had formal bus routes when prior to that they only had bus routes during school hours and work hours, and in fact not all work hours.

There isn't a city in Canada, Mr. Speaker, that wouldn't vote today, given today's economic situation, for a $400 million investment in their community. Nobody. If we don't go ahead with this, we'd be the laughing stock of probably North America, never mind Canada. To suggest that this has been done fast is a little bit unfair. We've had planning staff dealing with this particular application for several months. Some people have been dedicated to it for that period of time.

We have an ACG report here that every single group within our entire structure has had a shot at, whether it be the Fire Department, whether it be the Police Department, whether it be Water and Waste, whether it be Public Works, everybody has had the opportunity to go through this, and we have an appropriate document in front of us with a whole bunch of recommendations from the ACG, which of course is the Associated Coordinating Group, and they have gone over this from a to z.

Subsequent to that, we've had a public hearing where we did the same thing. In fact, we had some people chastising us because we were asking too many questions at the public meeting. In fact, the applicant started at 9:30 in the morning and we never broke for lunch until ten to 1:00 and all we talked to was the applicant during that timeframe.

Yeah, we had to cross some t's and dot some i's, that's our job here, and we did it, and we did it diligently, and so did the administrative people prior to that. To suggest that this needs more time is nonsense. It's the same old do nothing strategy that we've had for several years, and it started in 1989 with a group that we used to affectionately call Winnipeg in neutral, and you know, a couple of them I guess are still here from that group. I can't help that. I'm Winnipeg in motion and I want things to happen in this City and they are and this is a very, very positive development. It's going to create jobs. It's going to create investment and it's going to keep that area exciting. And the road system that people talk about that may not be adequate, whether this site is developed or not, there's a site north of it. If you think this one's going to cause some furor in the River Heights community, wait until the Kapyong site comes forward. Then you're going to have some fun. That one is a joint, that

one is in both wards. That's going to be the one that's going to be the fun one, because the people that are opposed to the widening are all going to be in those public hearings. This one here hasn't got really anything much to do with that. In fact, a lot of the traffic is going to come from communities, not only Waverley West which was not mentioned by the previous speaker but Linden Ridge, Lindenwoods and Whyte Ridge are all fully developed now. There's real people living there. And they're going to shop in their community. That's just the reality of life. And this particular development is going to provide a huge opportunity for that to expand.

And the one thing I know, Mr. Speaker, and you know, if you think that there's overkill, look at the number of Tim Horton's places in this town. They're all over the place. Why do you think that is? Because they do market studies before they open one. They know how much coffee they're going to sell and how many donuts they're going to sell before they open up and so does Wendy's and so does Burger King and so does McDonald's, and so does Ikea and so will every other big box developer or small developer like a bank, before they ever go in there, Mr. Speaker, they will do market studies. They won't go there unless they know that they're going to be okay and this site will go. And the other thing, by the way, that we keep hearing all this doom and gloom about the traffic, this site is going to take 10 years to develop. This site is not going to be developed in 24 months.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding moves to extend ten minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Clement: Thank you. First of all the road work's not even going to take place until 2010. The Ikea building which will be the flagship of this site won't even open until late to 2011, if at all in 2011. The majority of the other site will take several years, minimum, it will take 8 to 10 years to develop this site. By that time, there's going to be probably 12,000 homes built in Waverley West and we're going to be dealing with the Kapyong application between now and then, I would bet a lot of money. So we have to deal with these road issues now. It's not just about this site. The public hearing on the widening of Kenaston Boulevard between the St. James, well actually Ness, not the St. James Bridge, and Taylor are ongoing. It had nothing to do with this application. Why are we looking at that? Because there is an obvious future need and we have to look at it. And is there going to be some people upset about that? Certainly there is and I understand their concern and their stress. The fact is we're a growing city, and we need to develop where we can and we have to build roads where we can, and that's what we're looking at.

So, I would urge everybody to support this. It's a good application. It's been well reviewed by all of our staff who are professional at this and I think that we'd be doing our City a disservice not to move ahead with a project of this magnitude Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support the Plan Winnipeg amendment that we're debating here today. For me, what this project really represents is a regaining of confidence in our development as a city and shows the outside world that Winnipeg, once again, is becoming a city of opportunity.

The project is something that most Winnipeggers have been talking about and waiting for a very, very, very long time. What the project represents, as Councillor Clement had said, is a $400 million investment into the Winnipeg economy. And the signs, and it shows that Winnipeg is truly a city on the move. The development is also expected to create hundreds if not thousands of full time and part-time jobs at full build out. $3.7 million of incremental taxes at build out and really represents an opportunity to have a true destination centre here that will draw people from all over Manitoba, Saskatchewan, northwestern Ontario and

the Dakotas and throughout the United States.

Now I have heard some concerns. We, Councillor Clement had mentioned that the meetings were close to 10 hours. There have been some concerns of the project. I've heard that it's possibly too big or people don't like the locations, or the fact that some people are going to have to take cars to get to this location. I also heard the suggestion that somehow climate change is dramatically going to be impacted by this one development. I'm not sure that's necessarily the case.

The question that I ask is since when did development become a dirty word? Most jurisdictions, as Councillor Clement had so, had indicated, would be lining up in this challenging economic times to find a development where there is $400 million being pumped into our economy.

Another question that I might ask is what is the matter with giving residents some choice? These types of developments are obviously very popular. Anyone that's gone to Kenaston Common or gone to the Polo Park area, gone to Costco on Saturday, know that people drive to these things, come to these things in droves. So they're very popular amongst our citizens. It's something that I think we should give a choice to our citizens that are there.

Another issue that has been talked about is in terms of location. Some people suggested this should go downtown. They should, they don't like the location overall. I can tell you, there is a limited amount of space that a development like this can happen. I think we've done some good work in terms of the planning aspects, in terms of road designs and that sort. And I can tell you, it makes a lot of sense where it is.

But, if you do look at the land services, you know, some people have raised concerns about the commercial capacity. Do we have the capacity to do it? Well let's take a look at what the employment land strategy says and see if it makes sense from a land use strategy. The employment land strategy indicates the Tuxedo Yards lands are better suited for commercial use. Quote, unquote it says, "commercial lands currently available for the new developments are limited and will meet the short-term and long-term demand. Winnipeg does not have an adequate inventory of lands dedicated as areas of regional commerce and mixed use concentration to meet the needs of the market place. Normal annual market absorption of new retail space has been averaging around 300,000 square feet per year over the next decade."

The Ikea and the new stores that are associated that will draw close to 400,000 square feet for Ikea alone. So obviously there is a capacity for this type of development. No developer would risk spending $400 million of their own money or leveraged money to develop something if they haven't done the market research to say that there is a need and there is a demand for it.

Now, a lot of the issues that we heard for the ten hours in the committee hearings talked about some of the transportation issues. And I do, I don't want to under estimate the importance of them because they are, people are living in this area, they're traveling in this area, we need to make sure that we've accommodated, and I'm not going to go as far as, I know there's are a number of Councillors that turn into traffic engineers throughout the site plan. But what I can tell you is I've taken a look at a site plan, I've looked at what the administration has said, I've looked at what the applicant has put together and I think that the plan addresses the increase of traffic flows for the area in terms of not just the traffic flows for cars. Councillor Clement went into terms of all the active transportation quarters that we've done as well as there is a transportation study which we worked with Winnipeg Transit to develop further. I think if there is a need, there is a capacity, then we take a look at that further later on down the line. So I believe the traffic plan for the area addresses the added traffic flow needs that's been talked about.

And one other item, in terms of this, you know, the developer is, has suggested in terms of the plan and (inaudible) the

plans, that will do this development of all the roads up front. That's way before the build up of the whole facility. So you're going to see an excess traffic flow whether it be down Kenaston, Sterling Lyon Parkway before the conclusion, before that 2018, the full build up.

So in conclusion, the Ikea and surrounding proposal is a very positive development here in the City of Winnipeg. The job creation, investment in our community, is a benefit to our city as a whole, and shows Winnipeg is truly on a move and a city to watch. The transportation plan I believe addresses a lot of the transportation issues that are there and I'm very supportive and excited to see this development happen. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I encourage you all to support this.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not reiterate Councillor Gerbasi's concerns. I believe she's done an excellent job of identifying a lot of the concerns here, so I won't go into that.

I don't believe anyone is questioning the popularity, value, or the excitement around the coming Ikea project. I do a lot of shopping at Ikea whenever I'm in Edmonton visiting my relatives, and I find it a very great place to go. I like their marketing strategy and I like their products. So, I'm sure they do very good market research studies and they will go some place where they feel the market is needed. I don't think that's what anybody is questioning.

I think what concerns some of us is the planning and due diligence that needs to be done on our side of the agenda. When Revi, now known as Rona, first envisioned themselves coming to Winnipeg, they chose to come into my area and did a smaller box development in my ward, and it took approximately nine months of negotiations. They were very pumped and excited about that. They were coming in at least once a month to make sure that they got it right and fit into the community. We negotiated a traffic light on Munroe and Panet/Molson. They expanded the street of Panet between Reenders and Munroe from two lanes to four. We got sidewalks, we got all sorts of things that I don't see happening in this project.

It may be in Councillor Clement's ward but we do have a new Councillor who is very close to this area and I am disappointed he hasn't been given the opportunity for his input into this project.

I just scratch my head as to why someone thinks a market research plan has anything to do with a strategic action plan for the City where in the process and late of doing a Plan Winnipeg review, and that how the streets align, how transportation, both active transportation and vehicular transportation and rapid transit transportation, inter-relates, as well as how commercial, industrial and residential co-exist, all those plans are being looked at right now, later than they should have been but they're being looked at right now and this is proceeding ahead of those plans. This is proceeding without the necessary input, and this is something that I'm concerned about. I would really like to see them come but I'd like to see them come in a way that they could be an asset. Do you know that about 5/8ths of the capital program has been dedicated to the southwest quadrant of Winnipeg, in fixing and widening the streets and they are still complaining about huge traffic problems there. There needs to be more forward planning rather than reactive planning, based on some store coming in here or coming in there. I think that's been a problem with the southwest quadrant and why it takes so long to get around in that area. And it's because this Council consistently does not do their due diligence in planning. I'm one of those "winners" who was elected in 1989, and I would like to point out that acronym that another Councillor used is "WIM" and I prefer to not act on a whim, I prefer to act on a plan. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: There you go, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. This is the first of ten speeches I will give today. (laughing).

I will not be supporting this amendment to the motion because I don't think it really says anything. It does the same thing that we do all the time here in Council. It really doesn't make a decision.

Some constructive criticism through you, Mr. Speaker, to Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Smith. If you want people to understand what you're doing, and if you want people to follow you in the direction that you want to go, you have to make a decision, you have to say something.

After listening to Councillor Gerbasi introduce this motion, I have no idea if she is for or against this project. None. Zero. She didn't say she is against this store or the big box development there. I would actually respect her more if she stood up and said "I am against this development, it shouldn't happen, and here is why." I mean I wouldn't agree with her I don't think, but at least I would understand where she is coming from. But sort of to live in this milieu of never actually making a decision is frustrating, and that's why this motion is going to fail and that's why people in Winnipeg are not going to understand what this motion means or what it truly stands for. No one around this table can be saved from ultimately having to make decisions. We have to make decisions. It's what we're paid to do. I'm going to chastise her directly for bringing in the new Councillor in the way that she has, that's unfair. I have no idea the way the new Councillor, Mr. Orlikow, is going to vote on this, but I think sort of inculpating him and trying to bring him into her point of view at this early stage is unfair. I'm going to say this, I'm going to grant the new Councillor full amnesty, as far as I'm concerned, in terms of how he votes this morning. This is really a very difficult decision that he is put in, so whatever he decides to say on the issue, whatever direction he decides to go, I am not going to take it personally, because this is truly a very, very difficult situation.

The consultation piece is interesting. I recall sitting here as the Mayor said for ten hours. I'll give you a list of people I didn't see here in Council with me for ten hours, getting all the documents, listening and watching the power points, getting the back and forth of the questions. Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Smith. I might have saw them intermittently. Did I see them here for the full day? Not even close. I don't want to hear little explanations about how I was listening to it down in my office either. I won't accept that Mr. Speaker.

But I tell you what I am looking forward to in summation by Councillor Gerbasi. This is what I can't wait for. I can't wait for a detailed description, Mr. Speaker, of the full consultative process that we went through with respect to the MTS Centre. I want to hear that and how that went. I was actually on Council then, Mr. Speaker. You know how I found out about it? Front page of the paper. Yeah. Announcement. It was actually a picture of the building on there. Now I'm a big supporter of the rink, everyone knows that, but I'm looking forward to that in her summary, comments. How did that process come to be? And I want to hear about that whole process that was rolled out, consultation, cost benefit and all of that jazz. That is gong to be good stuff because I know she's going to follow it up with the same thing for the Provencher Bridge which I support as well. For the pork plot that she voted for just beside the stock yards, the Canada Packers site. I'm not talking about the one that didn't happen. Also when they contracted out the first half of the garbage service there, that, I can't wait for in terms of how that consultative process came together and was rolled up, and then, of course, we all know that she is going to have the grand finale with the process of the Kenaston underpass and the water and waste contribution that the Province said they would make and then we had to sort of grab them by the throat and shake it out of them. And then the rapid transit announcement because the way I remember it, Mr. Speaker, is that even though I was on Council, I received a phone call about 45 minutes before the actual blessed event occurred to go down to the Forks where all three people stood up and made the announcement.

That's the process that I remember for the Kenaston underpass, for the water and waste contribution and for the rapid transit

announcement. That's the way I remember it. But I know that I am wrong and I know that there is a detailed process of consultation that actually went on that involved all of the citizens of the City of Winnipeg and it's my error that I can't specifically remember it right now so I'm looking forward to hearing about that in Councillor Gerbasi's summary comments.

They never happened. Not even close. There was nothing like that. The great masses of the City of Winnipeg for those projects weren't deemed worthy. This process at least was a public process, and before we made any vote on it, before we pushed it ahead, we had a chance to listen to everybody come forward and they said their piece. I should say for the purposes of the record, Mr. Speaker, I don't think, after ten hours, that there was anybody who really said they were against the project entirely. A couple of people kind of moved up to that level. But I will say this. I'm not an expert in that many things but one thing I do feel I have some ability in is trying to gauge the feeling of the citizens of this town, and the sense that I get is that the citizens of this City are really pretty understanding of what's happening here, and they're actually okay with this project. And the vast majority of those citizens are more than okay with this project and they do see it as Councillor Fielding said, as a great economic activity, a great economic opportunity for this City. That's what it is.

So, if you don't agree with it, fine. I respect that but stand up and say it. This is a big box store. I don't care if it's Ikea or if it's Revi, if it's whatever. It's a big box store. If you're against big box development and you don't agree with it, stand up and say it because there will be people who understand that and there will be people who agree with it. There will be people who don't agree with it, but welcome to the club. From time to time if you put your neck out there and you make a decision, my friends, there will be people who don't agree with you, and I can't save you from that although I would dearly love to, I can't.

That's the problem with this motion, it says nothing. Let's do more analysis, which includes the capital and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. This is bunk.

Councillor Swandel: That's my line.

Councillor Steeves: Sorry. I said bunk. It's a legal term, Mr. Speaker. This is not a decision. This is not saying yea or nay, and you are paid to come to this chamber, to lead. Leading, Mr. Speaker, is saying yea or nay. Leading is not coming here again and asking again for more cost benefit analysis studies. No. Defeat this motion, let's go ahead, let's make a decision, let's be brave, and let's prosper.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. To make his first maiden speech, I'm going to call on Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Well thank you very much. I'll just come out and say I do support, I do support the project, the Sterling Lyon project.

I have grave reservations on not that project per se but on the whole area, Waverley West being the primary anchor there and how all that traffic and I made my report to Council quite a few years ago when Waverley West came up. I said well how are you going to get all that traffic through from Waverley West, downtown, without going down Cambridge and going down through Lindenwoods and going through our residential areas? How are you going to do that? There wasn't a lot to say back then. Some people commented well we need capacity before we can look at alternate transportation models. The capacity isn't so high yet so we're okay.

So, I stood back and I wasn't a Councillor at that time but I can tell you as a Councillor now for the next two years it will be one of my primary focuses on how do we make sure that these type of developments in the southwest quadrant, and that's what I'm looking at. I'm not even looking at the Sterling Lyon per se. It's happening. That area is going to be developed. Once Waverley West came up that was it. So now my responsibility, I believe, is and thank you everybody who

is trying to help me out, is to make sure in the long term that Waverley West is going to cause an enormous amount of flow through to River Heights-Fort Garry ward. How are we going to make sure not only Waverley West but the Kenaston Commons and now this new development plus the other developments that will probably occur as that area fills up as we look in our retail report, how is that traffic going to be managed properly? So I don't see Sterling Lyon as just one piece of that. We have to be looking at all the broad pieces and I look forward to working with Council and administration to look at stuff like the Sterling Lyon flow through, or looking at active transportation.

I am worried, I am concerned about how are you going to get nine, people across nine lanes or eleven lanes of traffic. I'm not sure how you're going to do the lighting but again at this point of my juncture, I am going to rely on the administration and my fellow colleagues to work through those problems as we go through. Is it a, you know, a tunnel underneath, is it synchronization in a certain way? I don't know yet and I really haven't had the opportunity. I've had brief meetings with some of the administration and really brief meetings with some of my fellow colleagues. But again, I believe that there is a way and this Sterling Lyon is one piece of that puzzle that actually helps us to develop that model so we can start moving away because it is happening now, people. There is no way around it.

I've knocked on about 9,000 doors in the wintertime which was quite a good event. Yeah well you know it makes sense, because you get extra poundage but the traffic is happening in our neighbourhood. These residential streets cannot handle either safety wise or just infrastructure wise, cannot handle the amount of traffic that is trying to funnel through, primarily the River Heights ward. It's actually causing an enormous amount of grief in our ward but we need to have a plan on how we are going to do that. So my objective is to work with Council and administration to be able to communicate to the public on how we are going to do this.

And it isn't one silver bullet. It isn't just a whole bunch of big roads everywhere and we still (inaudible) We're going to have to be looking at alternative transportation models. And I believe that Ikea could be a hub that will filter people from the Waverley, and I'm not a traffic planner, just a concept, where people from Waverley West could go into that Ikea development and skirt around and go around on an alternative transportation model. What the big plan is? Again, I haven't had an opportunity to meet with everybody on that.

Looking at the bike paths. I think it's a great opportunity to connect even more bike paths. People aren't going to stop for eleven lanes that I know of. However, if we do a fly over, are there other opportunities there? And again we've all mentioned this Ikea developer, they are a very positive environmental and community citizen. I believe if we approach them properly, they will be looking at alternatives with us.

So I do support the Sterling Lyon amendment. I do support the idea of moving from an industrial. One thing people did tell me is they do not want to see heavy industrial back there. That's one thing they are quite clear on. The second thing people are clear on when we went to the door is we do want Ikea. We think it's a great thing not only economically for our City but also morally for our City. It gives us a feeling that we are going forward, we are a city of pride and we can do anything we want. Ikea is just one of those models. MTS Centre was another one. We have quite a few of those happening now but that momentum always needs to be stoked a bit to keep it going.

Winnipeggers have a tendency to, you know, look at what we have, mosquitoes and the cold but they want to move forward. We're all positive Winnipeg citizens. We want to move forward. So this is a model that I believe a lot of people in my ward, regardless of what I personally feel to a degree, modeling it a bit, the people in the River Heights-Fort Garry ward, they want this Ikea, they want the Sterling Lyon development done and

they want the traffic brought around their neighbourhood.

So for myself at this juncture, I'm going to take the faith with my colleagues and with the administration that we will find a plan and this will be a part of that plan.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, thank you. Mr. Mayor you're not closing but you're speaking to the item?

Mayor Katz: Yeah Mr. Speaker. I would just like to speak to Councillor Gerbasi's motion. Mr. Speaker I will not be supporting the motion. The reasons are quite simple.

First of all I've heard, I've seen at least three Councillors who have spoken against this and I think Councillor Steeves eloquently said it, some of them barely showed up or just stuck their head in. Public consultation is so important. Why weren't you here to listen to what the people had to say or what the proponent had to say. Maybe some concerns might have been addressed or what our Public Service had to say. I find that absolutely amazing.

Quite often I've heard comments about our professionals, how valuable they are, how good they are and we should show them respect, which I think we all try and do. And yet our professional Public Service is totally in support of this, totally in support of this, worked very hard to make sure they got everything done right and yet, you don't agree with the Public Service, which is your choice. But don't agree with them when they side on your side or disagree with them when you don't like it. If you respect them, you respect them. And if you have reasons for not doing that, then say what they are. And I think it's probably about time where Councillors who are elected by the people do their job. You vote. Nay or yea.

Mr. Speaker we all know what procrastination is--suicide on the installment plan. Quite often I feel like it's a broken record that's skipping and you hear the same thing over and over and over again, but nothing gets done. You have to make decisions. They're not easy, and as Councillor Steeves said some people won't like what you did but that's what being a Councillor is all about Mr. Speaker.

And you know what, it appears somebody forgot to mention, our Provincial Government is totally supportive of this to the extent they're actually contributing money. Somehow, that was overlooked.

Mr. Speaker, this is a phenomenal opportunity, a phenomenal opportunity and for everybody not to support this makes no sense whatsoever. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll start off my comments by mentioning that I will not be supporting Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Smith's motion.

As Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Smith pointed out in 2006, this land is designated M2 heavy industrial. This land is zoned if fact, that you could put a hog processing plant on this land. They were doing it sort of tongue in cheek and I don't think they were seriously meaning that they should be putting a hog processing plant in Tuxedo, in Charleswood-Tuxedo.

So Councillor Smith doesn't want industrial, he doesn't want commercial, what does he want on this land? I don't think, you know, at this time where the economy is; this is a huge investment for our City and I think it's very positive.

In terms of adapting Plan Winnipeg, the document allows for logical change. In 2000 I don't think we anticipated Waverley West. It wasn't part of the plan. That's changed. This is an organic piece and this land now that it's no longer the rail yards, it's appropriate to redevelopment and I think commercial is the logical thing to be putting in there.

For those who worry about traffic on Route 90, I believe that can be addressed in several ways. I think having the developer front the cost for road

widenings is smart business and smart development for our City. We need to accelerate the widening of Route 90 from St. James Street all the way to Taylor as I've said in the media and in this chamber before.

I believe Canada Lands Corporation that owns the Kapyong barracks should in fact be a partner in this. There are examples in other provinces where the funds raised from selling lands at highest and best use are reinvested in the immediate area. That's happened a number of times in the province of Quebec. We should accept no less here.

In terms of commercial traffic and the effects of our inland port and traffic congestion, Centre Port Canada now has said and the Province has said that the traffic routes from the inland port area are going to head west out to the Perimeter Highway using a new route that eventually will actually by-pass going through St. Norbert to get south and again, having that high speed route to get out west. So Route 90 should see less truck traffic going forward because of the new routes that are being planned in terms of the inland port and Centre Port Canada are talking about.

And I don't believe that new commercial development in south Winnipeg takes away from opportunities, takes away opportunities from redeveloping our downtown. I do believe in downtown first but not downtown only. This is logical development in this quadrant of the city where there is demand.

I'm fairly well traveled. I've been a member of "Bring Ikea to Winnipeg" Facebook group for a long time. And I visited Ikea in other cities.

I like walkable, transit-oriented cities, and I've been to the Oakland store which serves San Francisco Bay area on a Saturday afternoon. San Francisco has rapid transit up the ying yang, whether it's (inaudible), bars, trails, it's a very walkable, transit-oriented city. But guess what? Huge parking structures, huge parking. People tend to drive to Ikeas. Not that there aren't other opportunities and shuttles possibly available in that location, but we do need to recognize the traffic needs there and having the developer front these costs I think is appropriate.

So again, I think this is a good development for our City, and I look forward to seeing this move forward. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Let me start by saying I like this new guy. This is the way we should be thinking around here. Councillor Orlikow's points were bang on. You know the issue here is, is, is, you know is this appropriate at this time, given what the application was. The application was a Plan Winnipeg amendment to move from an Industrial Policy Area to a Neighbourhood Policy Area and to change the zoning from M3, not M2 Councillor Browaty, M3, the heaviest, the most heinous land use that we have in the City of Winnipeg. And not only does it include hog processing plants, it includes all kinds of other manufacturing like munitions manufacturing and rubber manufacturing. You know that's, it's archaic that this land is still zoned this way in this part of our City. So on the issue of the land use it certainly makes sense to modernize this Plan Winnipeg policy and to modernize the zoning of this land.

From a cost benefit perspective, we have received a great deal of information and I think Councillor Gerbasi in her opening remarks mentioned the fact that you know what if business tax goes away. Well the one thing that's in this agreement is a sunset clause. That the incentives die out after ten years in one area and twelve years in another. I don't remember exactly what it was but the amount of time is twelve years that the incentives can be allowed, so if this development is not successful, there won't, the developer will be without their money. Their pay back will not come. There is a sunset clause.

When you look at it strictly from a tax generating perspective, it's generating

good taxes into the future. You can run those cost benefits compared to its current zoning is brown field non-usage, and you will see that getting this lands, these lands brought on line and realizing those taxes even though it may take twelve years to realize them, is a positive thing for our City.

Traffic, Councillor Orlikow talked about traffic, and that whole quadrant of the City and what that means. We addressed that in great detail when we went through the Plan Winnipeg amendment process for Waverley West. There was a complete transportation study, talked about volumes, when certain pieces would have to be implemented based on build out there, but just in general on the regional infrastructure, the growth of our City, not just specifically in the southwest quadrant of the City because it comes from all over the City into that City, but as population numbers got to certain levels, then we know that we would have to make certain improvements, but even since that time, those improvements, some of them that were suggested that would be required, we have new ideas on the table. We've heard the idea of an extension of Sterling Lyon Parkway through, past the Human Rights Museum, dipping under Taylor and taking a lot of traffic out, coming out pretty well where the Manitoba Hydro building currently exists on Taylor and Stafford. So there are many ways that traffic will be dealt with in those reports and also in the report that came there was a traffic study that came here with this application as well as what we previously had with the Waverley West application. There is many solutions to the traffic issues that will arise as our City grows, not just in this quadrant, but in all other areas of the City.

You know, the comment about morale that Councillor Orlikow made I think is bang on. Here we are, you know, I did my little rant yesterday about, you know, Our Winnipeg and you know and some of us see it as improving downtown and the new Hydro building and the M.T.S. Centre and Winnipeg Regional Health Authority Building happening on one of the ugliest stretches of our City on Main Street here, and the United Way coming into downtown, and you know, the Human Rights Museum turning soil and you could add to that list today an Ikea development and the related development that is coming with it, that is being done in a sensible and orderly fashion, taking “M3” lands, and if they were to be totally built out as heavy manufacturing of some kind, employing you know, even if it's just one shift a day with traffic coming at those peak hours, I don't know what 1.5 million square feet of industrial generates at eight o’clock in the morning when the shift starts or at 4:30 in the afternoon when the shift ends, but I would suggest it’s significant. So the traffic issue is a bit of a red herring here and if the development, or if there was manufacturing there of that magnitude that was to have three shifts a day running, then you would have three sets of peak hours through there. I think there is some logic to this outside of just simply trying to make some comments in the public forum here.

Toronto was mentioned taking nine months and, you know, I laugh at that because we'll do it faster, we'll do it better and our City has a better quality of life. Thank you.

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

Councillor O’Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In this motion I see a real danger, and the danger is delay for no apparent reason. It's not apparent to me in any case.

I draw the parallel in the same general area to Waverley West. We had an economic benefit analysis. We were two of them and they took two years and then we're still arguing about which one was right. They were both wrong by the way. Today, we've studied that thing to death. It's a good thing it was the Provincial Government and not a private developer because we started this thing in 2001 as I recall. The first house was built in 2008. That's only seven years. What private developer is going to put up with this nonsense for seven years so that we can piddle around with it? The studying has been done. In this time of economic uncertainty, actually it's quite certain that it's in the tank, these people want to build

here. The project is there. The Councillor for the area has told us…and not…I'm sure he hasn't surveyed every single individual, but the people of that area want it. In my ward, at City Hall, on the street, I have not heard one person show the slightest bit of concern about this development. They're all gung ho for it. Even the people like me who will probably never enter a big box store like that, think this is just great for the City of Winnipeg. This is delay on an item that has been so well studied and is so well accepted, this is an indefinite delay that we're talking years not months and believe me, private developers have a full right to change their mind and it's not their land. They don't have that enormous an investment in here yet, and I'm sure they've got lots of escape clauses. This is dangerous, bury it.

Mr. Speaker: No further Speakers. I'm going to call now in closing motion number 2, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I think that my motion has been somewhat misunderstood. I know there hasn't been an opportunity to speak at the public hearing, so the assumption is that I'm just dead against everything.

What I actually said in the motion is not shelving the project or not changing the use from industrial, but just that we do our proper due diligence and I don't think that's unreasonable. I don't think anyone's talking about seven years. I think three months for an issue of this magnitude. I think we should have the proper cost benefit analysis which is what our S.I.R.P. report called on us to do, which is what many other reports mentioned including our recent Capital Projects Audit, which said that we should do proper cost benefit analysis of the operation and construction of new capital projects, and we're not doing that. No one has answered those questions adequately. They've completely ignored the issue of the acceleration of the regional street system that this project will create and that we should be considering that in our financial planning. For example, the N.D. Lea analysis on Waverley West transportation review talked about the widening of Kenaston from Grant to Academy and it said that it wasn't justified for 20 years and that there was no mention of the need to widen the St. James Bridge. Now they're called M.M.M. Group but they're the same face in front of you at Council, and they're saying that these improvements must be a full decade sooner. So obviously there is an impact on accelerating the need to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on new infrastructure, and all I'm doing is representing the needs of, the voice of a lot of Winnipeggers who are concerned about the fiscal sustainability of having to spend that kind of money widening roads. Where's the money going to come from for that, let alone future expansion of rapid transit to finish what we've started and to go to the eastern part of the City. Where's that money…money doesn't grow on trees and all I'm doing is asking us to have some…I'm not asking for seven years Councillor O'Shaughnessy, I'm asking to give our administration time, not to rush them through and have them do a proper analysis of the whole transportation picture, a transportation plan. And I don't know what the sustainability summit we're having in April and our Plan Winnipeg's all going to be about if we're not going to ignore climate change. The word "climate change" and "greenhouse gases" does not appear in these hundreds of pages of documents at all. So we're just not…we're just pretending it's not even an issue. One paragraph on public transit is not adequate analysis for something like this, and I'm not trying to be a nay-sayer, I am trying to make some issues known that are very important. And you know, it takes a lot of courage to do this when I stood up here and I took a beating from just about everybody in this room and I respected the process. I did not come to the public hearing when I was told not to by City Clerks. I stayed out of the media. I'm not trying to slam Ikea. We all love shopping but you know, this is not just an Ikea. That's like the…or maybe some of you don't like shopping...but the Polo Park…Polo Park has a Sears in it. That doesn't make it the Polo Park development. We are…the Ikea is a tiny piece of this development, and I think a lot of citizens are excited about Ikea. I'm

excited about Ikea. But I think we have to do it right the first time, and we have to take some due diligence for that, or we should take it. I don't think we will obviously. I can tell that I don't have the support for the motion. But I don't think it's wrong or grand standing or anything else to try to express the views I'm expressing. I sincerely hold them and I think a lot of my constituents do too, and I think there hasn't been adequate analysis of the impact of this on the downtown.

There hasn't been adequate discussion of how to provide alternatives for the single use, single occupancy automobile trips that are going to be expanded. You know, what kind of a community climate change plan are we going to have if we just ignore that whole issue every time we plan anything? I'm sorry, I, you know,

Councillor Steeves' comments, there were so many flying about past decisions that are a little more complex which I don't really have time to answer, but I wasn't calling for a whole…I wanted to clarify one thing, that I wasn't calling for a whole new public consultation process. The fact is if we get a proper cost benefit analysis, which is what the motion calls for. It calls for a cost benefit analysis which includes the capital and operating costs of the development including the implications of accelerating an expansion of the capacity of the Regional Street System through southwest Winnipeg, and compare that with the incremental revenue the City will earn. That's a reasonable thing to ask, and to ask that the costing of the transit service that will be provided.

But…what was I going to say? The reason there has to be more public consultation is the Clerks advised me that if we provide new information we have to hold a public hearing. I wasn't saying that the public hearing was inadequate, and I wasn't criticizing the administration for the job they did in two months or whatever they had to put together a whole transportation plan for a whole city. Nobody can do it that fast and this has been rushed and that's why we don't have the adequate information. So, I wasn't calling to have everybody heard again. It wasn't my choice. That was the Clerks that advised that that would be required if we got more information and we don't have the information, Councillor Steeves.

The M.T.S. Centre, you know, I've mentioned this, it keeps getting throw up in every Council meeting and the fact is at community committee, Councillor Smith and I held special meetings to hear from people and we spent a lot of time hearing from people outside of the required process because we wanted to give people a chance to be heard on that issue, in case you're wondering what we did that was different for the M.T.S. Centre. And the M.T.S. Centre really didn't cost us very much. And I think most people are pretty happy with that development and we made that decision with proper public consultation.

But I mean, you know, people want to fling things around, honestly, I'm genuinely asking that we do proper due diligence and if we don't do that proper due diligence, and we go ahead and approve this without a proper transit plan, with all those things, then I'm not going to be able to support it and that doesn't mean I'm against Ikea. It means that…and I do…the fact that you're not allowed to sit on the fence, Councillor Steeves. You vote yes or no in this chamber and I don't think it's really fair to accuse me as somebody who sits on the fence. You know. That's a little bit of a stretch and I think you know that because I'm putting myself out on a limb, raising these issues and the reason I'm raising them is a lot of my constituents are concerned about the environment. I know it's not as sexy as an Ikea store but the environment does actually matter to a lot of my constituents. These issues matter to a lot of the constituents, and I think they want the City to do a proper due diligence, and nobody has answered the question, will this make more money than it costs us? Bottom line. Nobody has responded to that question. When you look at the actual impact of the regional street expansions that are going to be required, no one has still answered that. So Councillor Steeves, I will not be supporting this. I would love to see an Ikea and I'm sure we will see an Ikea because this Council…and we will see

this development. I wish we could see it in a better way, and other cities, I'd also like to point out, that other cities get those innovations from Ikea because they ask for them. And the ones that don't ask for them don't get them. They get nothing, and that's what we're getting because you guys aren't asking for nothing. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Councillor Clement. Do you want to close on your motion number 1?

Councillor Clement: Yes. I'd like to take a couple of moments now because this is a perfect example of how hard the administration have actually worked and continue to. We go through a ten hour meeting and they still come back and want to do a little bit of cleanup like this because they've been doing their job.

Decisions are sometimes difficult, Mr. Speaker, but you know, there is often discussion. I recall a discussion one time about building the underpass of Pembina Highway and Bishop Grandin, and what a terrible idea that was that some people thought. And frankly, without it, and without the impending connection that went over to Waverley and then beyond to Bishop Grandin and so on, that connected all of these communities, I dare say that south St. Vital could never have grown the way that it has because St. Mary's and St. Anne's frankly weren't big enough to carry all that traffic on its own. It just couldn't happen without Bishop Grandin, and without building that infrastructure, it wouldn't have grown to the size it is either. And it's all done, it has all been done in a very well-managed way and the people that have coordinated that from asphalt to finish have been our staff, which is why they bring motions like this to correct small issues. They've been crossing t's and dotting i's throughout. We have to make decisions and I'd never accuse Councillor Gerbasi of sitting on the fence. I think she is pretty clear. I just think she keeps falling off on the wrong side of the fence. But….you know, that's just the way it is. It's politics I guess. But I urge everybody to support this small amendment change and to move forward with this project.

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, one day hopefully in the near future, we'll see a Council that realizes we're in the same boat and that we should all be pulling in the same direction.

We're here to make this a better city for everyone to live, work and play in. That is my goal, and it certainly would be nice if something such as this, this type of development, would be accepted, embraced, and supported unanimously. Obviously, we've already heard that's not going to be the case.

I just want to correct a few small items, Mr. Speaker. Number 1, I heard the word "incentives" thrown around a couple of times. Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any incentives, okay. The developer came forward to front the money to build those improvements and they will get paid back those monies from the taxes, and if they don't get it done within the ten year build out, they won't even get their money back, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, over two and a half years ago, and this is for Councillor Gerbasi's knowledge, over two and a half years ago, I met with the Federal Government, the Canada Land Bank. At that point in time, we were talking about making land available for the expansion of Kenaston. There was no such thing as an Ikea or a development there whatsoever. That has been on the board for discussion for a long, long time. That's not new, Mr. Speaker, that's old. So it's just not fair to say that that's a cost of this development. It's totally not true. And you know what Mr. Speaker? Sometimes when they talk about incentives, I will tell you, other cities give developers incentives to develop brown field sites. Do you think there's a lineup of people wanting to develop that? It's been sitting there for how long? We're not even doing that. Someone's come forward, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by actually reading a letter that was sent to Councillor Gerbasi and was cc'd to me.

"As a resident in your Winnipeg ward, I want to inform you of my support for the Ikea development. Although I am not a fan of urban sprawl and would love to see more downtown development, (and congratulate the City on rapid transit), the Ikea proposal is exactly what our City needs--investment in a time of economic decline. I am concerned that a small number of individuals will fight this at City Hall for the sake of protest and their voices will be larger than the majority who support this project. If the City of Winnipeg prevents the Ikea development, we can forget any future developer's interests in coming to the City and this will herald a new period of decline. I know of many young professionals, doctors, dentists, engineers, et cetera, that are using this as a litmus test for the City. If Ikea is driven out of town by protest, you can expect an exodus of young professionals from Winnipeg to more progressive communities. These are the people you need in Winnipeg to maintain your tax base. If we leave, you exacerbate the problem of the City paying for services and infrastructure. I urge you to approve the Ikea development for the sake of Winnipeg's future. Whether one buys their furniture or not, the economic impact of an Ikea in Winnipeg is absolutely massive. The number of e-mails I received from friends in Saskatchewan and northern Ontario the day it was announced is testament to this. They will come and stay in hotels, eat at our restaurants and see our sites, i.e. Forks, Human Rights Museum. Don't let this opportunity pass Winnipeg by. P.S., I must state again, congratulations on rapid transit. I am absolutely thrilled it has come to Winnipeg." That's what our young people are saying and they're absolutely right. And Mr. Speaker, just to let you know, it was said before and I'll say it again. A project of this magnitude, every single department plays a role and it's vetted through them all. This has happened. The process was not changed. All the concerns have been dealt with from every department as was mentioned earlier. Fire, police, whatever the case may be, that's part of our process. I urge everyone, Mr. Speaker, to support this. And if you don't see the opportunity that exists here, I will gladly pay for the optometrist that we should all see. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We'll be voting in reverse order. Motion number 2 first and then motion number 1 and then the item.

On motion number 2 by Councillor Gerbasi, seconded by Councillor Smith, the referral motion. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith and Thomas.

.

Nays

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

Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, yeas 3 nays 13.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is lost. On motion number 1. Taken as read. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

On Item 1. All in favour? Recorded vote on Item 1. Report of March 18.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Clerk: Councillors Gerbasi, Smith.

Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, yeas 14, nays 2.

Mr. Speaker: Carried. Report "A", Mr. Mayor.

REPORT "A" OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MARCH 19, 2009

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, 3 and 4 please.

Mr. Speaker: 3 and 4. Just 3 and 4? So that will be Items 1, 2…you want 7? And 7.

So motions 1 to 8 except 3, 4 and 7 have been stood down and the rest, All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Number 3, Mr. Mayor.

Item No. 3 - Animal Services Special Operating Agency – 2009-2011 Business Plan (Selection Report) - Operating Charter amendments eFile GL-5.6.1

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I very much would like to hear Councillor Gerbasi's comments and then I would most definitely try and respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I pulled 3 and 4 off and I really have a concern about all 4 of the S.O.A.'s. There are two other S.O.A. selection reports that are later on in the agenda under the Alternative Service Delivery Committee, and the point I wanted, and I did come to E.P.C. and speak about this issue as well, but I didn't really get a sense of any response from that then, so I was hoping to have clarification on the floor of Council here but, when the reports came forward to the A.S.D. Committee, Councillor Swandel and Councillor Browaty were there and they added in two clauses that are extremely significant to all four of the S.O.A.'s. The first one I don't have a problem with at all. It's asking, number 4, asking that the Winnipeg Public Service report back to the A.S.D. Committee on the cost of having an operational review conducted by an outside firm. So it's simply having a review of the S.O.A. Fine. That makes sense. But the second one is a Charter amendment which requires two-thirds of Council and it says that with each of the different S.O.A.'s, this one I'm looking at is the Parking Authority, that the S.O.A. Charter be amended to include a board of directors comprising of a designate sitting member of the A.S.D. Committee, the Chief Administrative Officer and the Deputy Chief Administrative Officers. So essentially we created S.O.A.'s as arm's length agencies that are suppose to function in an entrepreneurial way separate from the City function and now we are basically creating a board of directors with the C.A.O. and his three deputies and a politician to completely oversee everything the S.O.A.'s do. This is a complete change in the whole principle of what the S.O.A.'s are supposed to do. They are no longer arm's length. They're basically being taken back as a City department, and this one little clause that was added in without explanation or discussion. I would like to see us have a Council seminar perhaps once these evaluations on the S.O.A.'s have come back. I think that would be a much more sensible approach to evaluate them first and provide information to all Councillors about what the problem is with the S.O.A.'s that we suddenly need to completely seize control back into, as if they're normal flying departments instead of Special Operating Agencies. And my particular concern has to do with the Parking Authority because I sit on the Board of the Downtown B.I.Z., and I represent a large part of the downtown and they will tell you, and I know they've met with Councillor Swandel, and they have concerns about something happening to the S.O.A. because they feel that the change to a Parking Authority from what we had before has been fantastic for parking in the downtown. It's made it much more streamline, much more easy to use, much more flexible and able to deal with the downtown parking issues. So, what I'm saying is I would really like Council to just hold their horses

a little bit here before they completely change the governance structure of the special operating agencies. We're putting the cart before the horse. Why don't we do the evaluation and then change the governance structure. Unless there's something I'm missing, you know, the S.O.A.'s have had some problems and some of that has been because we've charged them back too much revenue which we've taken into general revenue, which I applaud that has now stopped and that's been fixed, and I appreciate that and I think that's a good move in the recent year.

But I hope I've explained this clearly. I'm not going to repeat it for all of the S.O.A.'s. I'm just trying to make this point. Number 5 requires a two-thirds vote of Council. It's changing the Operating Charter. It's essentially a complete restructuring of what is supposed to be arm's length agencies. Without any explanation it was just added in politically at the A.S.D. Committee. It wasn't in the report that came from the Special Operating Agencies, and this board of directors, you know, the Parking Authority by the way also has an advisory group which is chaired by Stefano Grande of the Downtown B.I.Z., and they provide really good policy advice and then there's that interaction with the community just in an advisory way. I mean, that might be continuing but this Board of Directors which is essentially the C.A.O. and his deputies is going to run the whole show. We have C.O.O.'s, highly paid C.O.O.'s we put in place like David Hill who does a fantastic job. We had one on Fleet. Apparently they left suddenly. I'm not sure why, but you know, I just don't understand why we are just doing this without proper explanation for Councillors. If I had a proper explanation I might even be able to support it but this is not reasonable to just suddenly change a whole governance structure without providing the operational review, and without explaining why. So, that's my comments Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Essentially, Councillor Gerbasi raised my concern but I guess further to the point is that the C.O.O. of Parking Authority reports to the C.A.O. now, if you look at the organizational structure, so if you report to the C.A.O., they meet whenever the C.A.O. wants, the C.A.O. can bring whoever he feels needs to be there to the meeting, so I don't see this as a significant…I guess I'm wondering what the rationale is. There is going to be a political representation on that board of directors. I'm wondering how appropriate that is, given that this is a managerial board of directors and that we as politicians are in charge of governance and we do the governing, the administration do the managing.

I missed the last A.S.D. meeting because of family reasons, so I'm asking for an explanation either from Councillor Swandel who is the Chair or the Mayor, as to the rationale behind this change, and is it really a change given that the Parking Authority C.O.O. reports to the C.A.O.? So I just need some clarification on this change and whether or not it's a politician's place to be at that managerial board of directors.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate both Councillors Gerbasi and Vandal raising these concerns.

The genesis of this really came from, and it's different in every S.O.A., but each S.O.A. was reporting to a member of the Public Service, as you mentioned the Parking Authority reporting directly to the C.A.O. I think Fleet was reporting to the head or the Director of Public Works and Golf was reporting to the…or Fleet was reporting to the Chief Financial Officer. Golf I think was reporting to the Chief Financial Officer, and I can't remember…Animal Services was going to Community Services.

When the S.O.A.'s were created, it was politically driven. It was not something that came out of the Public Service. It was politically driven. The idea was to create some entities that would have some autonomy that they would be able

to operate, being bottom-line driven I think was the language that was in the original report.

What I was finding was happening was that the individuals within the organization weren't always bottom line driven. Their life experiences may not have put them in that realm before and that sometimes the trying to run like a business was conflicting with the Public Service thinking that some of the people that were overseeing them were creating.

The C.A.O., when I brought it up with the C.A.O., suggested that they use the C.A.O. and the Deputy C.A.O.'s like a board of directors, which is more of a corporate structure. So you have several minds there instead of just a single mind. And I thought it was a good idea because that is, you know, using a board structure is a good governance model for managing businesses. I thought it created a better opportunity, that it would be more ears hearing the concerns that were coming forward from the Chief Operating Officers of the S.O.A.'s as opposed to just a single ear being able to control everything that was coming through.

Through that process we went further and you know, because it was a politically driven process it seemed to make sense that there be some political representation on this board, because that's how the S.O.A.'s were created. It was created as a politically driven process. And to have that…the board is not making the decisions. That's not the intent. It was never the intent of the individuals in the organization to be making decisions for the special operating agencies. The Chief Operating Officers were to bring their business plans forward on an annual basis, have them approved, have their financials approved and have them move through the A.S.D. or come to A.S.D. and then move on through the process, and it would set up…the business plan would set up the operations for the next year. But, it seemed like other things within the bigger organization of the City of Winnipeg, and I think Councillor Gerbasi alluded to a bit of the financial stuff that we had going on that was making it difficult for the Chief Operating Officers to do some of their work. There's no…it is not the intent for this to be an operating, controlling body. It's to be an advisory body to help the C.O.O.'s or bring their information into the organization so that it can move forward, with the idea of what was originally intended when we created the S.O.A.'s; being bottom-line driven, getting their work done as opposed to trying to make their work fit with what's going on in the rest of the organization. That was the intent here. If this doesn't succeed today, we'll certainly go forward with the internal reviews and using an external body to do reviews of the business-driven approaches that these entities are using. There will be some summary of that as long as we're able to fund it properly or we've asked them to come back with some scope of what that would look like and what it would cost. As a result of that, we could certainly move into doing, going back and looking at some other governance model that would help to continue with Council's intent and at the same time, allow the overall organization to feel confident that we're on solid ground. It's mostly the financial stuff that comes into play here. It's not the day-to-day operation or policy on parking. It's the financial pieces that seem to be creating the most problem. And some of the collective agreement stuff, it's difficult because these people are out there trying to operate like a business, but they have…they're still within the collective agreements with our organizations within the City of Winnipeg, so some of that crosses back over into the C.A.O.'s world.

So the idea is just to have a board that will help to make sure that the business plan is being followed and that it is still being bottom-line driven and that the C.O.O.'s are able to operate with what the intent of Council was. So as I said, if it's not successful today, we'll certainly look at other options through this review process and each of the agencies that we've asked to do, to ensure they are meeting the intent of what we originally set out to do when we created the Alternate Service Delivery process and created the Charters for each of these special operating agencies, because they tend to get beat up on an annual basis,

although when you look at them very closely, they are being very successful for the City of Winnipeg and delivering…I know you're happy with what parking is doing. I think I'm very happy with what Fleet's doing as far as reducing the fleet size by over one-third of its size and doing proper life cycle management of our equipment and we're seeing some great benefits here within the City.

Animal Services, you know, we continue to be challenged with getting licences out there and getting the monies flowing to them so that they can enhance the service. We still have some problems in that area, but this is…the intent here is to continue with what Council intended as its policy and to enhance what we're already doing. It's not to move it off into another realm so I hope that clarifies and I'll listen to what the Mayor has to say but if it fails today we can certainly look at other options.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker?

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Would it be possible when we vote on this to separate out Clause 5 and just vote on that separately?

Mr. Speaker: We're voting on (inaudible). 3?

Councillor Gerbasi: No, I mean point 5 of the recommendations. The one that changes the Charter. Could we vote on that separately, then the rest of the report....

Mr. Speaker: Yes okay.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm concerned also with point 5. You know, hearing Councillor Swandel, he gave all the reasons why we shouldn't be supporting this. First of all, he said the board will not be dealing with operations of the agency. You know, it's very limited powers. Why have it? I haven't heard a good reason why we need this. It doesn't make any sense whatsoever. You know, it adds another layer and really, it doesn't, you know, we should have some faith in David Hill. He's done an extremely good job and you know, I just don't think you need a board that has, that's not going to be dealing with anything much as what Councillor Swandel has said. Not dealing with the day-to-day operations. Not policy driven. I mean, why have it?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I will not reiterate the comments of Councillors Gerbasi and Smith because I concur with them. What I will do is focus on number 5 and I was about to also request that it be voted on separately since it requires a two-thirds vote. And the rest of the clause does not.

I just wanted to say that I think that there's some problems with 5 in the wording. For one thing, if it's supposed to be an advisory group then it shouldn't be called a board of directors, because that is different. A different word is needed there because there would be a misunderstanding of what we're giving to it.

And the second thing is, is wanting a political person on it. If we're going to have a political person on it, then it might as well…those groups might as well operate it the way they operated before and report to the various standing committees that they voted on, either Protection and Community Services in the case of Animal Services, or Parking or to the Standing Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Whatever it happens to be, but that would be the appropriate venue rather than having one political person sit on that, but I thought we were trying to avoid that. And I think it's good to have them report when they're doing their budgeting and have a yearly report and do what we said we were going to do is take a step back. This seems to be taking two steps forward again and I'm concerned by that because it seems to be having more control, and if it is an advisory group then this is the wrong word. So I'm not for part 5 but

everything else within the clause seems quite reasonable. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors. Mr. Mayor do you want to close?

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all I thank Councillor Gerbasi for her comments. It appears that everybody is supportive of an operational review.

For clarification, let me just share this with you, that the board already exists, that's number 1. Number 2, what this was trying to do was basically entrench it in the Charter. There was an amendment made and I know that Councillor Thomas has some concern about an elected official on it, and that was…it was packaged together, but so everybody understands, this board already exists. It wasn't created by any of us. There are other people who have the power to do that and it's been done. So the board exists. It's now a matter of whether there's the addition of a member of the A.S.D. Committee or whether it gets entrenched in the Charter and that's what this discussion is about for clarification, so that everybody understands it. That's all I want to do right now.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors we'll take the vote. It's been asked that number 5 be voted on separately and then we'll just pass the other…the item with the others from 1 to 8.

It's been asked you want a recorded vote? Councillor? On number 5? Vote on number 5. That is you need, we need 11 votes. No we're dealing with Item number 3, the part 5 is we need 11 votes for two-thirds of Council to....pardon?

(inaudible speaking in the background).

Mr. Speaker: No, no, no. No. We have to deal with…you know with what's on the agenda. Item 3 then we'll deal with Item number 4, we'll deal with Item number 7.

Okay now. On number 5 of Item 3, report number 5, that is you need 11 votes. That is to…and then the charter. All in favour of...Item 3. Item 3. Item 3. The report of…item 3, clause 5.

All in favour, please rise.

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, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Thomas.

Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 4.

Mr. Speaker: Now on Item 3. On Item 3, the remainder, the remainder of Item 3, All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 4, Mr. Mayor.

Item No. 4 - Winnipeg Parking Authority Special Operating Agency – 2009 Business Plan (Selection Report) - Operating Charter amendments eFile GL-5.6.1

Mayor Katz: Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would defer to Councillor Gerbasi. I think we've heard it's probably the exact same issues but I'd love to hear it again, if you so desire.

Councillor Gerbasi: I just…we could just vote. I don't believe there's another issue. It's the same issue and it will be the same issue when we get to the other two S.O.A.'s later on in the A.S.D. agenda. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No Speakers? You want to vote now on Item 4? All in favour? Want to do the same thing with Item 5? On Item 4, line 5. On line 5, separate vote, recorded vote. All in favour, remember you need 11 votes.

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, Wyatt, and Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Thomas.

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12 Nays 4.

Mr. Speaker: It's carried.

Item 7. Councillor Wyatt you stood that down. Mr. Mayor do you want to introduce it?

Item No. 7 - 2009 Mill Rates for the Education Support Levy and Special Levy eFile FL-3

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I am eagerly anticipating Councillor Wyatt's comments and I will be happy to hear that and I can assure you once again, Mr. Speaker, that I will post bail if necessary for Councillor Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, since 2003, this being 2009, the 7th year, I've raised this issue. I've stood it down from the agenda and made some very important points with regards to what we're doing here today.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should be funding our schools, and our education system. I don't begrudge our school trustees who have a very difficult and tough job to do. There's no doubt in my mind that I'm sure they wish they had alternate sources of revenue as well when it comes to trying to balance their budgets, and I'm sure they find it difficult at times to balance their budgets as we can see from the increases we see before us today. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, school taxes have now risen as of this, with this being passed here, it will now reflect 53.9% of the entire property tax bill, Mr. Speaker, which is a historic high. We at one time were as low as 20%, Mr. Speaker, which would be considered normal and unfortunately it's gone the exact opposite direction.

The City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker is now as of yesterday, had 12 years of property tax freezes. We have eaten approximately $180 million, over $180 million worth of inflation absorbed, Mr. Speaker, money that compounded over that period of time that had we simply raised our taxes with inflation, that would have been the amount that the City would have had for its expenditures. That has been absorbed. Those costs have been absorbed by the City.

Instead we have also on the other side of the tax bill, the school taxes which continually rise. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt we speak very proudly of the fact that we have made Winnipeg one of the most competitive cities with regards to our taxes. The key word here is our taxes. Our. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there is only one taxpayer. On the other half of that tax bill is the education taxes and it's the education…I don't know if we have a quorum, Mr. Speaker. Do we? Okay. Thank you. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the education taxes represent now 53.9% of the taxes, and the taxpayers who are paying this tax bill are wondering how long are we going to continue to see this unsustainable trend? We as a Council voted in this room two years ago, calling on the Provincial Government if you will recall, that property taxes should be eliminated off the property tax bill. The A.M.M., the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, our municipal association has voted on this numerous times. Their existing policy today is that the Province should reduce the overall tax burden on the tax bill from property, education taxes back down to 20% of the overall tax bill. The A.M.M. also participated in a working group founded by the Provincial Government, working directly for the Provincial Government, comprised of members of the school trustees and of the education

and of the Province and of municipalities and came forward with concrete recommendations on how to reduce the education taxes, also down to 20% of the overall tax bill. None of those recommendations have been considered or adopted, Mr. Speaker.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is growing year after year after year, and if we had other alternative forms of revenue maybe it wouldn't be that big of a concern to us, but the reality is, whether we like it or not our property taxes are the major source of our revenues, the single major source of our revenue for the City of Winnipeg. We can speak volumes about how we've become competitive with regards to our property taxes at municipality, Mr. Speaker, but the reality is, when the home owner receives their tax bill in the mail, 53.9% of those taxes are now school taxes and virtually every division, virtually every division Mr. Speaker, every year goes up and up and up. Year after year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that we have been mandated to vote on this by Provincial legislation. I understand that and everybody here understands that and that's why we joke about the going to jail situation. Well the reality is, Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting once again that we send a message, that we have a symbolic vote and send a message to Broadway and today is ideal. Of all the years that I have had this on the discussion table for discussion over the last seven years, it's never fallen on the same day as the Provincial budget, and today the Provincial budget is being delivered in the legislature, and what a message it would send to Broadway if we were to stand up today and to say no, we've had enough. We've had enough. I'm mad as hell and I'm not going to take it any longer. We've had enough! We're tired of seeing the taxes going up and up and up, Mr. Speaker, and our fair share of the bill shrinking, municipal services constrained because of the very fact that property taxes have been pushed to the limits with regards to education. And again Mr. Speaker, I want to stress, we feel and we share the concerns of our colleagues, elected officials at the school board level, share their feeling. We know the tough job they have to do. We know that they haven't put themselves in this position. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this is an archaic system. What does property have to do with education? One hundred years ago, Mr. Speaker, parliament raised most of its revenues from stamps and tariffs. Does it today? No it doesn't, but yet we still go on the same system that we had over a hundred years ago with education, Mr. Speaker. It makes no sense. And we know that the Province has increased their Provincial tax credits. We know that and we thank them for that. But even when those credits are absorbed, Mr. Speaker, the reality is school taxes have still risen higher than the rate of inflation and they still will now move up again another notch to make up the highest level ever, 53.9% of the property tax bill.

So Mr. Speaker, I urge all Councillors in the name of ensuring our city is competitive for the future, of delivering a message that we need to have a reform, that we need to have a change, that the status quo is not acceptable. By voting for this today we're once again voting for the status quo. I am suggesting that the status quo is not acceptable. I think the majority of citizens in the City believe the status quo, when it comes to this matter, is not acceptable. I think we're on the same page as them by voting this down today. I would encourage all of your support on this matter. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor are you trying to tell us to vote against the legislation and vote against the law?

(inaudible speaking in the background).

Mr. Speaker: Don't push your luck. There is no further Speakers. Mr. Mayor do you want to close?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, Councillor Wyatt definitely spoke like a true populace. I can no way question any of his facts because they're all accurate. The one thing that I see different, Mr. Speaker, is I believe that the Province is listening. We know that they are taking note of this. We know that they are trying

to come up with alternatives which are being turned down by the school boards, and I believe that they are going to take some action. So you know what? Whether it's a combination of many things or whether it's Councillor Wyatt, I know he's been doing it since I've been here and I guess since he's been here, maybe it's finally hitting home and hopefully we will be seeing something in the near future.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I will not be… I will be supporting the motion but I certainly understand where Councillor Wyatt is coming from and you know what? I commend him for speaking his mind. That's not an easy thing to do especially on a matter like this. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. On Item 7, all in favour, recorded vote? Recorded vote. All in favour of Item 7, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Gerbasi, Orlikow, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Nordman and Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker: Russ, maybe you want to recount?

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, yeas 13 nays 2.

Mr. Speaker: Item 7 is carried.

Councillors, we dealt with number 3, we dealt with number 4, we had a vote on clause 5 and the rest on the item was approved, was carried by Council.

Now, EPC motions, notice of motion moved by Councillor Vandal, seconded by Councillor Swandel. The City of Winnipeg do all things to ban corporate organization and union financial donations.

No we're not. We will not. All in favour we adjourn until 1:30.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of March 25, 2009 at 1:34 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The first on the agenda will be an EPC notice of motion, moved by Councillor Vandal, seconded by Councillor Swandel, and this is the motion we'll be dealing with. Councillor Vandal is going to introduce it.

Well they should. They must be deaf or they don't hear us. Hey, you guys bring me one of those big fire bells.

Councillors, we'll start with the motion, notice of motion, moved by Councillor Vandal, Councillor Vandal do you want to start?

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Motion
Moved by Councillor Vandal,
Seconded by Councillor Swandel,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg should strive for the most transparent, equitable and fair system of municipal election financing;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg has already adopted a partial public financing of municipal campaigns system, through the "Rebate of Election Contributions" By-law;

AND WHEREAS banning union and corporate donations to municipal campaigns will avoid disbursing financial rebates to corporations and unions;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba have prohibited corporations, businesses

and unions from financially donating to their elections;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg allow only individuals to donate to municipal political candidates beginning in the 2010 municipal election;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg do all things necessary to ban corporate, organization and union financial donations to all municipal political candidates beginning in the 2010 municipal election.

In amendment
Moved by Councillor Vandal,
Seconded by Councillor Swandel,

That the first resolve be amended to replace the words "to donate" with the words "to make financial donations".

That the second resolve be amended to include the words "and in-kind" after the word "financial".

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, there is a motion in front of us, notice of motion, moved by myself, seconded by Councillor Swandel. And there is a slight wording amendment which you should have on your desks and I will go over that wording amendment and then speak to the reasons why I believe this motion should move forward, Mr. Speaker.

The first wording amendment is to make the first resolve be amended to replace the words "to donate" with the words "to make financial donations". That is under the first "therefore be it resolved".

Councillor Clement: Notice called on this motion two months ago or whatever and now this is an amendment to a notice of motion. I don't think you can do that can you?

Councillor Vandal: It's a friendly amendment.

Councillor Clement: I don't agree.

Councillor Vandal: In the second amendment, Mr. Speaker, is that the second resolve be amended to include the words "and in kind" after the words "financial". I ask for the indulgence, Mr. Speaker, of this committee to move forward with these wording changes, amendments, and then I can begin the discussion.

(inaudible speaking in the background).

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you wish, as you wish if I can move it now and then have it approved and then just have the discussion and move forward.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors on Motion Number 9, Councillor Vandal has moved an amendment. You have it with you. All in favour?

Councillor Steeves: …clear on this because I'm doing, I'm doing the same thing in a few minutes here. The…as I understand it, what he wants is to put the amendment on, he speaks to his amendment and his motion, and then everybody has a chance to say whatever they want to say or not say whatever they want to say, and then we vote first on the amendment and then on the motion, right? Yeah.

Mr. Speaker: Right. Councillors, speak to your Motion Number 9 on the amendment and to your clause, notice of motion.

Councillor Vandal: So we're going to deal with them after?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Vandal: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: We'll deal with Number 9 and then we'll deal with your motion.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This motion which is…I didn't hear that comment, but I'll catch up later, Mr. Speaker. This motion is a motion, is an idea whose time has come. Mr. Speaker, I think if there is a theme to the reasons why I think we should approve this today, it is because this policy places people, places citizens, our citizens, City

of Winnipeg citizens at the front of the political process. And in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, any policy which places the onus on people is a good public policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a cynical perception out there that politics in general and local politics in particular are not very worthy professions. And there is a general distrust of the process, and we've all heard it. They're all the same, Mr. Speaker. Why should I vote for them? What are they going to do for this community? They will say something before the election and do something completely different after the election.

There is also, Mr. Speaker, the cynical perception that politics, politicians are beholden to the financiers of the individual political campaigns. People who give finance the politicians' campaigns and we know here at City Hall, most of our big donations come from unions, there are eight large unions in the City of Winnipeg, development companies, home builders, engineering firms, engineering firms and that like, and there is the perception that when push comes to shove on development interests or labour interests at City Hall, those interests will trump citizen interests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also believe that this cynicism has something to do with the low voter turn outs in all of our elections but specifically, in municipal elections, the level of government closest to the people. I'll speak more about that later. But, one way to address this cynical attitude the public has towards politicians is to do something simple, something that's fair, something that, I think, is rooted in good principles and that's just amend the rules to allow only individuals to donate to political campaigns. People only, Mr. Speaker, and one set of rules for everybody.

We may choose to recognize this or we may not choose to recognize this but currently there is a system in Winnipeg where certain people can donate more money to politicians than other people. And I offer, Mr. Speaker, the President, an example, the President of a company who is a big supporter of Councillor Wyatt. Let's say Councillor Smith. That President of the company or be it the President of a union, may exert his influence or if he is the owner of a company, may cut a cheque for Councillor Smith for $750, go home that evening and decides that that's not enough. He's going to cut another cheque to, in this example, Councillor Smith, for another $750. That Winnipeg citizen has donated twice to the same politician and I think that is, that creates an unfair system because the majority of Winnipeggers, the majority of people that we represent, can only donate as individuals, Mr. Speaker. The principle here is one set of rules and the same set of rules for everybody.

I believe banning union and corporate donations will also save the City money in the long run. In '06, the City of Winnipeg adopted a partial public system of financing our campaigns. Under this system, everyone who donates or everybody, every union or corporation who donates to municipal campaigns has the right to receive a rebate on those donations. If you donate up to $300 you can get 75% rebate. You can donate up to $1,500, the rebate formula changes somewhat. It's somewhat complicated, but the rebates are there, they are more generous the more you donate.

In '06, the City of Winnipeg rebated approximately $350,000 to those who contributed to municipal campaigns. Of this, 240 was returned to individuals, 110 was rebated to businesses and unions, and this begs the central question, Mr. Speaker, should corporate and union financial contributors really receive rebates which are funded by our ratepayers, our property taxpayers and our business taxpayers? I know what my answer is, Mr. Speaker. I believe this is good public policy. It's certainly in line with what the Government of Canada has adopted in 2003, save some small amendments, and it's certainly in line with what the Government of Manitoba has adopted in the year 2000.

I also believe that this is a step in the right direction towards removing the cynicism

which is currently infesting our political system at all levels, and getting more people involved in the political process. What better way to build more citizen involvement in any of our campaigns than to rely less on big donors and rely more on smaller individual donors? And rest assured, Mr. Speaker, people do not give their money away. Nobody is going to cut a cheque to an individual candidate unless they feel they have a stake in the election, unless they feel that they have a good representative at their door. And what better method to begin a dialogue on the issues that are facing the City of Winnipeg and are facing our many varied communities throughout our City, and what better way to ultimately get somebody involved in an election and hopefully, getting that person actually voting in an election? I've always believed, Mr. Speaker, local politics should not be about who can buy the most air time on the radio or on television or who can pay for the most billboards. Politics, but especially local politics, should be about people, should be about ideas, who can work the hardest, the smartest in our diverse communities to represent those interests here at City Hall. It's about one set of rules for everybody, the same set of rules, and it's about putting people first in the election process, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I'll await comments and sum up later on.

Mr. Speaker: Any Speakers? Councillor Steeves, O'Shaughnessy. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'll disclose at the outset I'm a politician who has received contributions and assistance from both corporations and unions in my past, for whatever that's worth.

The motion before me, I'll be candid, I don't know if it'll be a personal advantage or disadvantage. I honestly don't. I have no idea. But based on what I see. I have some concerns about it in terms of how it may or may not affect me and my political future but I guess I can't make those paramount. I'll have to try to be as objective as possible and put the interests of pure democracy ahead of any personal interests, which I guess is the challenge for any sitting politician to try to do in the midst of changing the way campaigns are funded.

There are a lot of things I just don't know in terms of how this will affect either me personally or the election panorama as it exists today in Winnipeg or I guess as it might affect any existing electorate panoramic in any place. What will the result of doing this be exactly? And these are the things that I'll be listening closely for in summary, and this is frankly why I'm skeptical about my ability to support this, as I have a hard time imagining how anyone can say conclusively what difference this is going to make to the existing political landscape right now. Who is this going to advantage or disadvantage? That part I'm not, I'm just not certain of. There is no report here for us to rely on, obviously. We…it does mention the rebate of election contributions by-law and I recall that process and what we went through, Mr. Speaker, to get to that end result. It was a reasonably comprehensive process or so it seemed to me. I know there was a then committee struck that met on a reasonable basis and there was, I guess, some reporting done back and forth. I believe it was run by Richard Kachur out of our Clerk's office with a lot of information that came on the elections process and how the process might be affected. And ultimately, what we wound up with was the new process, which has only been in place for a single election, is that correct? Yeah, it's only been in place for the last election, so we've just tried this item out for the first time. Reports back seemed to be that it worked okay. I haven't heard any glaring criticisms about the new process and how it affected politicians either challenging or incumbent. Again, I'll await those comments from folks who are bringing this motion as to why exactly they feel that that current process has to be altered.

I'm trying to imagine this in the context of a city or a town or a village that is going through this. Now I take it you'll take away the power of unions and corporations to donate. That's the way I

read this. So what that means is you'll have to be an individual person who will be donating. Simple enough. Seems like a reasonable…seems like it's a reasonably easy thing to follow. I don't know what's going to happen as a result of that. Are we going to see either corporations and/or unions now, sort of looking for individuals to now fill the void that they once filled? Is that going to happen? I don't know. If it is going to happen, let's stop and consider that for a sec. Would we rather have a corporation saying, okay well now that I can't give 5,000 or now that I can't give $1,000, I now have to go to my company and set up ten or fifteen or 20 people to give cheques to an individual candidate because this is what my corporation thinks is best for them. Will the union be engaged in the same type of behaviour? Would that type of behaviour be allowed under this type of motion? Would that be okay? I don't know. Maybe it would be but these are the comments that I await. But I hope in the course of me discussing some of these things it's becoming clear that I'm a little bit uncomfortable with the unanswered questions, so maybe I can ask this: maybe someone who is moving this motion could walk me through their campaign and they could walk me through their fundraising list, and they could tell me how their specific donations are going to be affected. What changes do they foresee for them? And I don't say this in any attacking or critical sort of way, I'm genuinely interested, because if you look at my sheets, you're going to see things that, while perfectly legal, are probably going to fall into some of these categories, and I don't know what the volunteers who work for me are going to be doing to try to fill those gaps, and the last thing I think any of us want to create is some type of process that means to be more transparent, means to be more up front, means to be more open but yet at the same time, is actually driving the process underground.

Here's my observation, Mr. Speaker, from the Federal scene. We know that we've seen some changes in the ability of people, corporations, whomever, to donate. The sense that I've had over the course of the last year or two years, and again this could be just my perception, is that parties who are relying on that grassroots support and parties whom are relying on that grassroots donation base, seem to be suffering. They seem to be propped up to some extent and in my view, fairly, by a subsidy that has been granted on a per vote basis, and I don't even want to get into that because I know there will be different opinions. But, we've had cause now in the course in the last half year to consider what if then that disappeared. I know that's not even a part of what we're talking about here, but you can see the doors that this kind of opens.

And the final thing that I guess I would throw out there, is on the face of it, this would seem to limit the ability of candidates to raise money, period, regardless if you're a candidate who relies on the corporate sector or if you're a candidate who relies on the union sector. I mean, regardless, even if unions or corporations can do things to break down their donations, that is, I think, at its face more difficult, Mr. Speaker, and will probably result in less money. What then does that do to the individual candidate who is then more able to put forward more of their individual money? Because I understand there are no limits on that, or if there are any limits on how much of your own money you can put forward, they are less limited. Are we now going to be creating a situation where a person of more personal means is going to be more economically advantaged? These are some of the questions, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if they can all be answered but that's why I'm pretty skeptical.

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just wondering how far we have to go. When I was first elected to this Council, same time you were, sir, we had no election laws regarding contribution, and we had a Council, I don't want to go through a great long list, it was a 50 member Council but let me give names: Conservatives such as Abe Yanofsky, Liberals such as Morris Kaufmann, N.D.P.er's such as Lori

Cherniak, pretty respectable crew. If I pre-date that and I go back to my old…the last West Kildonan City Council with, Yanofsky was a Councillor. It featured people like…well the Mayor was Saul Miller. Another member with Yanofsky was Ben Hewak, Chief Justice, Province of Manitoba. Not bad. Not a bad crew. No election laws for contributions. Getting a little less, getting out of the cave and a little more recent, Bernie Wolfe, although he was there at that time, Al Ducharme were people I really enjoyed working with into the middle years, Jerry Ducharme, a Conservative, Greg Selinger, NDP, Gary Filmon went on a little ways. We didn't have any election contribution laws in those days. I want one person to get up and say this is a list of (inaudible). This is a list of people who took money on the side and lived high on the hog through illicit campaign donations.

But about that time the last of these people were leaving Council, perhaps then Councillor Jae Eadie and I sat down and set up the first campaign donation rules, and we limited donations to $250 anonymously and then, what was it, 750 maximum for Mayor, it was still 250, (inaudible) 1,500, and you know, for 20 years those laws didn't change. So the 250 that we thought was, you know, how deep are we going to burrow into this thing, became worth about a hundred by the time we updated the laws, which we left at 250. We couldn't put them more modern, heaven forbid. It was the same crew, this time led by Jae more than myself. And the latest batch, now we've got receipts on the public record with the City Clerk. Everyone who donated to you, even if it's $10, they have a signed receipt there. So there's nothing secret. If there is something else going on, all the laws in the world aren't going to help. They have nothing to do with it. If people are going to try and circumvent the rules and if people are going to be crooked, they're going to be crooked. I don't see anything needed. What are we going to do next? More than five employees, shareholders or owners of the same company or anyone directly related to them can't donate to the same election? You know, because you could have that nefarious owner of a business. His or her spouse, a couple of their kids, the foreman at the plant all donate 30 bucks and all of a sudden it's…so let's stop that. You can't be related to anyone else who donated to a given campaign, but then we have to extend that to the union. Wouldn't that throw this into a real mess for some people if you couldn't have more than five people from the same union make a donation or anyone related to them. Because I know where there's been technically a hundred names come in at a hundred bucks and it's a $10,000 donation from a union. So what? If people want to get around these things, they can. I think we have enough law here. I don't see the need to go any further. We have receipts on file for everyone who donates to every campaign. They're there. We have audited statements from every campaign. Why must we keep kicking ourselves in the forehead to show the world hey, we're not crooks. The people don't think you're a crook. They think the generic politician is obviously crooked, but try and find one in your ward who thinks Danny's crooked. Try and find one in your ward who thinks Lillian's. Try and find one in your ward that says Harvey is crooked. You're not going to find them except for people who can't stand you for other reasons. The people who vote for that other character. I think we're just kicking ourselves in the head for nothing and I'm not going to…and I can speak for the point…by the way I've never had a donation from a union. Isn't that amazing? And I'm from West Kildonan. We haven't had a right wing politician in the history of the place since, oh, Yanofsky and me, and never defeated either. Isn't that amazing? In this N.D.P. bastion, they vote for this right wing Liberal time after time for 30 years, but they're not going to get a chance to prove me wrong because I'm never running in another election and with all that and the chance that the media might say, you know, he's covering something up? Bull crackers. This is just another way of punishing ourselves unnecessarily, and I ain't gonna whip myself for this. No thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity. First of all, I very much

appreciate Councillor Vandal bringing this to everybody's attention and, Mr. Speaker, I very much believe in accountability and ensuring a fair and democratic process, I think we all do.

But the motion presented here today, in my opinion, fails to address many of the key issues at hand. By focusing solely on banning union and corporate donations, this motion unfairly limits two arbitrarily selected groups from participating fully in the democratic process. If the focus is on banning group participation, then why not also ban donations from coalitions. What about special interests and lobby groups? Or if the goal of this motion is to really get equity and fairness, why not just state that only individuals are allowed to contribute to political campaigns. And talk about loopholes. The original motion, Mr. Speaker, only referenced financial contributions, but as anyone who has ever run for office knows, in-kind donations are equally as important as cash. Donated office space, computers, sign and literature printing services, even endorsements by individuals and groups have a significant effect on any outcome. So why were these in-kind donations and services not included, and what about third party advertising, Mr. Speaker? If a group takes out advertising, either for or against a candidate, could that not have a significant impact on the outcome and affect the electoral process?

Councillor Clement: Mr. Mayor, could you slow down? Dan can't write that fast.

Mayor Katz: Oh, okay. We'll try. Sorry Dan.

Should third party advertising be regulated is the question, Mr. Speaker. This motion also…are you two done because as soon as you're done, I'll continue. This motion also does not consider the potential impact that such a motion could have on civic staff. Even if we get the legislative details right, how is the new election finance system to be monitored and enforced? I certainly do not support creating a new civic bureaucratic structure to police this initiative. Do the authors of this motion believe that an impartial third party such as Elections Manitoba may be able and willing to take over this task? But no matter who we choose to police the initiative, our words are only as effective as our means of enforcing them. This motion does not suggest what consequences should be proposed for Councillors and business or unions who are not in compliance. The devil is in the details, Mr. Speaker, and this motion is lacking.

And where was the public consultation on this proposal? The authors of the motion are looking to change the political landscape of Winnipeg without consulting a single citizen, let alone the businesses and unions who would be directly affected. Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the outset, I support a fair and democratic electoral process, but this motion does not advance that goal. In fact, it simply raises a host of unanswered questions and unfairly penalizes unions and businesses from engaging in the political process in the same manner as a coalition or special interest groups can do. Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, I cannot support this motion. And Mr. Speaker, these amendments that are just made today, these matters should not be dealt with on the fly. Floating amendments without the necessary due diligence, consultation and research is irresponsible and I do not support them either, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just make a few quick comments.

I seconded this motion because I do believe that it's in all of our best interests to see us get closer to the individual citizens that we represent. It is very easy for us to go and seek out organizations whether they be unions or corporations or special interest groups to help fund our campaigns. It sort of makes that election financing piece happen a little bit quicker and a little bit easier. I don't think any of us here are selling our souls for a 500 or $750 contribution to an election campaign.

You know, I can agree with some of what has been said, even listening to Councillor Vandal introduce the motion, the thought that the rebate program was there sort of made me go in a different direction and perhaps if you wanted to drive it closer to individuals that you limit the rebate program to just individuals and not allow corporations or unions or special interest groups to be eligible for the rebate programs. So there certainly are some other things that you can do here. I don't think there's a right or wrong to this. This is just a matter of bringing the electoral process far closer to the individuals that we represent. It's not intended to harm anybody. It's as much philosophical as it is mechanical, and you know the idea of bringing more individuals in and forcing us to go out and engage more individuals in the conversations that we're in and to join the election process whether it be by hosting some fundraising events where you have to draw more individuals into the process and interact with them. I don't see any harm in that.

As far as public consultation, I certainly did do some public consultation on this. I was on the phone pretty regularly trying to understand from both private, or corporate or union contributors and individuals that contributed to the two campaigns that I've been involved in, how this would impact on them, and in general with the rebate program in place, this really wouldn't have much of an impact on them. Those that were making a contribution on the corporate side could just as easily make it on the individual side because the contribution was there. And actually when I first ran in the by-election, my campaign was significantly financed by friends and family as opposed to those that you meet once or when you're in office and become more closely connected to those that want to be connected with you from their own special interest, whether it be labour organizations, corporations or other special interest groups.

I don't see that this really hurts our process. I think that the concept is good. People could argue that you need more detail here. I don't know how much more detail you need. It's pretty straightforward. An individual, if you've got 40,000 voters in your ward or whatever it is, you can go out and try and get less than a dollar from each of them which would get you to the maximum contribution limit in our wards.

It's interesting that in my ward I have four…not quite a total of four M.L.A.'s represented in the riding. Their contribution levels are at about $40,000 per riding whereas ours are just right around the $30,000 level for a civic ward. So it gives you an idea of, you know, the world of finances and playing with money in election campaigns. We don't raise a lot of money. We certainly, you know, we…the quicker you can raise it and be able to start communicating and participating in the campaign process, the better off you are, but I don't think this greatly hinders that in any way, shape or form. And as I said earlier, I don't think there is a right or a wrong here. I like this because it gets us closer to the individual and that's always good in politics.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not support the motion before us here today. I have a few brief comments and concerns about this initiative.

First off this really is not a new initiative. It's obviously been in place for the Provincial I think for a lot longer than the Federal just recently. And I think if you look at the Federal or the Provincial example, you know, I think really what it does is it allows the incumbent parties, the incumbent parties or decision makers to have an added advantage. And so first off I think that people that would try and get into the session, or into being an elected official, it would most definitely incorporate that. Probably a little bit to do with what Councillor Swandel said. You do start meeting people that are involved in different aspects and special interests. So I think it would most definitely give advantages to incumbent decision makers, governments at other levels of government.

Second, I think it would really be unfair and undemocratic to current business and unions that are out there. The last time I

checked, businesses for instance do pay property taxes, and they've got just as much right as anyone else, and they deserve to have their say on any other issues. So I think the motion would really take away their democratic rights to support any candidates that they see fit for whatever reasons they decide to support a candidate one way or the other.

Another reason I will not be supporting this motion is the public consultation piece. And, you know, I think there is…I know there's a lot of the opposition Councillors here, I hear quite a bit that there's not enough public consultation on major pieces of legislation and major pieces of initiatives that we're working on here, and as such, with something that's going to dramatically affect the financing of municipal elections, there needs to be some more consultation. I'm not sure how much consultation there is. I know Councillor Swandel made a few phone calls to a few corporate people I'd imagine and unions, but beyond that I think we need to do more consultation with them to see the impacts of it.

And finally, the final point of the motion is that I think really, there is a slippery slope and you would start to see some money coming in, in the back door if you will. So, what it would encourage…the motion would do is encourage corporations and unions to hand out money. It could allow them to hand out money to employees which would violate the election laws that are in place right now. So for those reasons, I will not be supporting it here today. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting the motion today. I think that it's something that's been done a long time ago at other levels of government, particularly the Province, for a lot of good reasons. I'm not sure what the concern is about the hardship that's going to somehow be caused to unions and corporations. I mean it doesn't really hurt them and it doesn't penalize them in any way. Each of those members of a union or corporation, well they actually are special interest groups. The word only seems to be used when you're trying to impugn a negative connotation, but, you know, they are a special interest group. But each of those members of a union or corporation or an owner of a company also has a vote as a citizen of Winnipeg and can also contribute as an individual. So I fail to see how…I'm not sure that those people should have two votes or two, twice as much of an ability to contribute to a candidate as an average, grassroots, regular citizen.

So, I do think it's democratic. It's undemocratic the way we do it now, that these groups have basically two votes instead of one at least. So I don't really think it's an issue. It makes it more democratic.

I also think it's important that people that are elected are representing the individual citizens in their ward that support them as opposed to, you know, there's development companies and other people. I'm not saying people just do what they're told because someone votes for them, but there shouldn't be any even appearance of that, there shouldn't be any questions about that as Councillor Vandal stated. Politicians are down at the bottom. I went from being a nurse to a politician. I was…95% of people thought what I did was great before. Now I'm in the bottom, I'm down somewhere below lawyers right now. Sorry, Gord.

But I mean the point is we don't have the respect of the public as I think politicians deserve but it's a perception, and by taking a step like this, you help alleviate some of that perception that there is no question. It's just individual citizens contributing to each of our campaigns. We're all in the same boat whether you have a lot of corporate support or a lot of union support, it's not a left/right issue which is why I thought there would be support from people of all political sides on this because it's not a left or right issue. Some people here receive more support from corporate and some more from unions. So it's not really a political issue, it's more of an issue of fairness or grassroots democracy. So I would have thought that there would be more support for that here. I know if my donations come

mostly from individual citizens, I feel that's who should be supporting me. That was the main point I wanted to make.

The other thing is there is a mention of coalitions. That word keeps coming up. I'm not sure what coalitions they're talking about. The only one that I know doesn't have any money whatsoever, so I'm not sure what kind of coalitions are giving everybody money, but I think the main…we all know that in the past there have been large donations from businesses and from unions and that's why that's where the focus is here. I think we all know that. And I think that it puts us all on a level playing field.

There was one other point that was raised, that this will somehow provide an incumbent advantage. I'm really not sure how that works either, because a lot of times, the business wants to support the one that they think is going to win, the incumbent. So I'm not sure that our system now doesn't have more of an incumbent advantage than this system would have, and I don't think we have any evidence to support that this gives more of an incumbent advantage. That would be a legitimate concern if it did, but I haven't really heard a good argument for that.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not really sure what precipitated this motion and I'm sure that Councillor Vandal had all of the best reasons for putting it forward or thought he did.

I don't honestly see any problem in the current situation, to be frank. I'm not sure what ghost is out there that somebody is trying to remedy with this. And as far as public perception goes, I'm living in a bit of a mini crisis right now. I've got a pretty serious problem in my area with flooding as a result of that February storm. I'm not having any problem with public perception when I'm returning roughly a hundred phone calls a day. I'm not having any problem with public perception when I'm driving around in a half tonne at midnight where they're steaming, trying to keep people's stress levels down. None whatsoever.

I know about grassroots. When I run campaigns, and I've had a few like other people in this room. My campaigns are grass roots. That's who runs my campaigns. It's all local grassroots people. Every single person that's on my campaign team is from that ilk. I don't think I've ever had a donation from a union that I can think of, but I can tell you that I have an awful lot of support from people that belong to unions. We're at a different level of government, frankly, than everybody else is at. We are unique in that piece. I know. I know what colour my signs are. I know that I have signs up where people are definite Liberals in other elections. I have campaign signs up in yards where people are N.D.P. as well. And of course I certainly have them where they're Conservatives. It's not about that at this level of government. It's about doing right and wrong. So I take it a little bit offensively when somebody thinks that because a business might give you some money, that somehow that's going to give them an advantage, because that's not how they see it. I've had money from businesses as I've run. No doubt about it. But I can't think of one, over the years, not one that's ever come to me and said "Bill, you know, we gave you some cash and we've got a project we want you to help us with." Not one. They want a level playing field. They want to be able to know they can send something into this Chamber and it's going to get a fair hearing from the people who sit here, not somebody that's going to vote against it because it's not philosophically correct in their political bent or the other way for that matter. They want to know that they've got a level playing field here. That's all that this is about, and I've never had anybody, not one time. I've also never had anybody, I don't know what you call that, double paying or double dipping, whatever you want to call it. I've never had a businessman who sent me a cheque from his business and then wrote a personal cheque. I've never had that happen either. Once they give you money, they give you money. I guess they could, I

suppose that's a possibility, but, and I guess they could even get away with that I suppose, given the existing legislation, so if somebody wanted to amend something like that, that's a little different, I suppose. But trying to tell a businessman, by the way, businesses in this town pay roughly 30% of the taxes. They pay all of the business taxes, and I think that they deserve to have some say. I don't have a problem with the unions doing it either. And I just finished saying, I've got support from all kinds of people that are…just because somebody belongs to a union because they have to, in many cases. When you become a firefighter they don't ask you to become a union member, it's automatic. When you start working at Public Works it's the same thing. Doesn't matter. If you're an auto worker you belong to the union. You can't work there if you don't. So you can't assume they're all N.D.P. or all Liberals or all Conservatives and they're all not. And I would venture to say that there are firefighters who vote for every one of us. There's policeman who vote for every one of us, and there's certainly Public Works officials and employees that vote for all of us. I know that. I know that that's the case. And I know that we've got a bunch of firefighters up there and I enjoy their support. I just…I'm glad they'd never tell anybody they're supporting me because that always seems to be a problem. Had to have a little fun, Jim.

But seriously, it's like there's nothing broke here, Dan. I just don't see it. I just don't believe that there's any kind of an issue with this and, you know…the other thing, we've got huge wards. You know, we were talking about a by-election, a Provincial by-election last night and 37% of people came out and I think about 4,500 people voted. There was a by-election last week and 22% came out and that was more people, 22% was more total votes than 37% was. Why is that? Because our wards are double or more the size of all of our friends. I'm not sure why there's 35 M.L.A.'s in Winnipeg and 15 City Councillors. I've never been able to figure that out, but that's what it is, so we've got huge wards and I know for a fact in my ward last time, one piece of literature mailed to every residence was over $8,500 by the time it was printed, put through the post office, and delivered to their door. $8,500 for one piece. And you know what? A lot of those pieces of literature get treated the same as that big bag that comes every week full of coupons for everything from soup to nuts. It's unfortunate that people don't read them maybe, but they don't read them from other levels of government either half the time. The difference is we have to pay for ours.

So, it takes a lot of money to run a campaign, and if you can get that from the grassroots that's great. It's not that simple for most folks and the existing system, I gotta tell you, I don't actually like it. You know, the only reason I supported it was because I kept being told the incumbents have a huge advantage. Well sure they do because people know who they are. They've been dealing with the local community clubs because they have to. They've been dealing with the local football program. They've been dealing with the local seniors group. Everybody knows who they are because they've had to work with those people. That's their job. That's what we do. So why wouldn't you have an advantage if you were doing your job? But I'll tell you what. If you don't do your job, you're gone real quick around here, and I've seen people that have been here for ten years and gone. I saw one that was here for 26 years and was gone in the last election. It happens. There's no magic to this. If you don't do your job, you're out of here. All these phony changes.

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

Councillor Clement: …are not needed. They don't do anything. I'm not sure who this was supposed to create a problem for. I don't even know if it will, I just don't think it's right. I just don't think it's right. If there's a union that wants to give you a bunch of money to run for your seat in St. Boniface or if they want to give you a bunch of money to run for Mayor, I could care less, because it's not them who gets to vote for you anyways, it's the public,

and that's who we're beholding to is our constituents. That's what this is all about in terms of what we do and it's not about where the money comes from. And if a business person can buy you for the kind of money that we're talking about, then you're not worth much, frankly. That's the way I look at that, because I think everybody in this room has far more integrity than that, and I think that they do at most levels. And that's what this is about as well. And that's a huge word, is integrity, and this kind of nonsense because a business person's going to give you some money, or a union's going to give you money to run in an election campaign is going to cause some kind of a huge problem and only…what did you want to call it, a public person, a normal person. I forget how the Mayor put it, can vote for you. Who the hell are all these people? Somebody that owns a car dealership and they live in your ward. They write you a cheque. They're not a businessman anymore? Come on. That's nonsense. If they own a pizza parlour in your area and they live in your area and they want to write you a cheque. All of a sudden they're not a businessman anymore because they wrote you a personal cheque? That's nonsense, and they can all to it. That wouldn't change anything, and that's why I don't believe that this is all that meaningful. I don't know what started it. I'm not sure where it came from. It looks like something that Greg Selinger would have drafted frankly, because that's where it came from at the Province. I suspect that that type of logic has something to do with it but I don't really know. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I won't vote for this or any of the amendments associated with it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise not to support the resolution as well. I think the mover and the seconder had good intentions but I see it is full of good intentions full of faults. I think the reality is, Mr. Speaker, we have corporations and we have unions. If we want to really address this issue to the heart of it, I would suggest that we just simply pass a by-law that we abolish corporations and unions. Because that's really what the heart of this is it. Abolish all corporations and abolish all unions. Let us create…you know, we want to create a utopia by the sounds of it. So abolish all corporations and abolish all unions and we'll create that utopia. It's not realistic. I'm having fun, Mr. Speaker, I realize that's not realistic.

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, we can't create a utopia but, Mr. Speaker, we can create a just society. We can create a just society, Mr. Speaker, and we create a just society by recognizing realities, by recognizing human behaviour and by putting in checks and balances, applied equally to all, to ensure that there is fairness in the democratic process, Mr. Speaker. And we have worked as a Council over the years, slowly, and it has evolved to the point where it is today, with a number of serious checks and balances in place. We limit, Mr. Speaker, right now, we limit how much each candidate can spend on their election, total election globally, whether you're running for Mayor or for Council. Right now, Mr. Speaker, we limit how much you can receive from one individual donor, corporate donor or union donor, maximum per donor, we limit that.

Number 3, we ensure transparency. We demand transparency. If it's over $250, the names have to be disclosed of the individual, union and corporation. Anybody can go down to the Clerk's office and see who donated to who, right now. It's public and number 4, it's audited Mr. Speaker.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the latest reform, electoral reform you can call it, we introduced rebates, and the concept behind rebates was to ensure and to try to assist those who wanted to get involved in the democratic process to be able to raise money, Mr. Speaker, so they could compete against the incumbents. So, Mr. Speaker, we've done a lot to try to ensure that the reality out there, which often isn't very pretty, has the checks and balances in place because at the end of the day we have to, in my view, protect democracy and enhance democracy.

Councillor Steeves talked earlier about what could potentially happen and the idea of companies setting up an entity that money would potentially go to individuals. I can tell you what that's called Councillor Steeves. That's called a form of money laundering. It's not to wash money for the sake of getting money dirty to clean, Mr. Speaker. It's not to hide money for taxes. It's to put into place an informal system outside of the law that will allow money to flow to election entities. And that, Mr. Speaker, from what I've heard through hearsay, and I have no proof, I wish I did, is what's to a certain extent happening Federally and even Provincially and it's a matter of time Mr. Speaker, and we heard about the issue with regards to cynicism and public cynicism, and public cynicism of public office; as a matter of fact it was only ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, when we heard member the Conservative Party involved in a vote rigging scandal in this Province if we can all recall. It's not that long ago, Mr. Speaker. I believe it's a matter of time before we see a scandal Provincially and Federally. It's a matter of time, because the realities out there and human behaviour are just that. We have to ensure that there's laws in place to channel that, to control it and to ensure there's checks and balances, and I think that will be a shame when that happens, Mr. Speaker, because I think that just will feed that cynicism, the very cynicism Councillor Vandal speaks about.

And the other part of the Federal and Provincial scenario, which is, this is just the first step of Mr. Speaker, is the public subsidy. Are we going to then next after this say every Councillor who receives so many votes will now receive a subsidy back in return for the money they've raised per vote? Is that the next step? Because that's what exists Federally and Provincially, and I don't think the majority of the public is that excited about it, what's taking place there either.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we could demand more transparency. I am all in favour of that. I would even be willing to even look at the spending limits to say that maybe we have to review that. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the higher level of transparency and the highest scrutiny on spending limits the better, but the reality is whether we like it or not, unions are here in our society, they are a fundamental part of a democratic, modern society. A society without unions, show me a country and nation without unions and I'll show you a country that has a hugely poor population and a huge divide between the middle class and the rest of the population.

And corporations Mr. Speaker, we have accepted the fact that we live in a mixed economy with public sector and private sector, that there is a role for companies and that there is a role for the public sector as well. That's the strength of our country, Mr. Speaker. It's one of the reasons why I think we haven't seen the same kind of problems and the financial problems across the world in this country as we're seeing in other parts of the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support safe guards. I support stronger transparency. I don't…I think this is somewhat of a Trojan horse, that if we go down this path, I think the good intentions, you know, sometimes the road to heck is paved with good intentions the old saying goes. I think this is one of those examples, Mr. Speaker. I think it's just simply going to…even though the intentions are good, and I appreciate the motion and the ideas coming forward and I really enjoyed the debate and the discussion, and I want to thank Councillor Vandal and Councillor Swandel for the opportunity to have this discussion because quite often we don't, and maybe we need to look at improving the reforms that we've had in the past, so I want to thank them for that discussion and I think the intentions are good, but I think the outcome will be extremely negative. That's my gut sense on this, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I won't be supporting it today. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further Speakers? Councillor Vandal, closing.

Councillor Vandal: Okay, Mr. Speaker. What can I say? I jotted down some notes.

Mayor Katz talked about why not have only individuals as donators. Well if you check the first “therefore be it resolved that the City of Winnipeg allow only individuals to donate municipal political campaigns.” It's right there. Talked about how about organizations and prohibiting coalitions from contributing? The second "further be it resolved” clearly states that “the City of Winnipeg do all things necessary to ban corporate, organization and union financial donations.” It's there. The Mayor had concerns about the civic staff policing that and frankly I don't understand what those concerns are. Either you're an individual person or you're not and essentially we have the staff doing the job now, they did a great job in last week's election. The workload certainly wouldn't change. Ideally we would get hundreds more citizens donating money but those systems are all in place so frankly, I don't understand that.

Councillor Fielding talked about the democratic rights of businesses would be harmed. I think the owners of those businesses have democratic rights. I don't think the corporations per se are imbued with democratic rights forever and ever. I think corporations and unions certainly serve a purpose in our society. We can't outlaw them, but I don't think that purpose was to essentially finance politicians.

It's been a good debate. Councillor Steeves asked what would the results of this be? I would hope the results would be that we would get more people involved in civic elections. I would hope that every one of us would rely more on smaller donations coming from individuals who are actually becoming engaged in the political process. I likely would see a result of collective individually and collectively spending less money on political campaigns and being less reliant on the radio ads and TV ads and bill boards and as far as I’ve ran in three elections, I think it's important. I'll run under any rules that we make where that the Province, through the Charter actually dictates for us. And yes, I have received lots of, or my fair share of business dollars and my fair share of union dollars. No firefighter dollars lately, but I’m willing to change. I think if the rules change, I think I and everyone else in these chambers will play by the rules that we have to compete with.

So essentially, this is about, I believe, modernizing the way we finance elections. It's been done at the Province. It’s been done at the Feds, Federal level. It’s been done in Quebec. Other cities are looking at it. It's principle-based. It’s all about people. Certainly people vote, only people vote, thank god, and I think we’ve got to go to a system where only people can finance campaigns. We're not talking about excluding anybody. Anybody can donate to any candidate. The tent is very big. The net we're casting is very, very wide. Nobody is excluded. I think this is only part of a modernization and part of good governance, and one set of rules for everybody. One set of rules for everybody. That's clearly where I was going when I moved this. I want to thank Councillor Swandel for seconding the motion. I know where this vote is going, but I think it was a good discussion and we'll see what happens. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors on the motion Number 9. Before we go into the main motion, Motion Number 9. All in favour? Opposed? Lost.

Who is calling? This is under Motion Number 9. It's just on the amendment. Just the amendment. Okay who is calling for a recorded vote? A recorded vote on motion number 9 on the amendment by Councillor Vandal that they be amended to replace the words “to donate”, the second be amended to include the words “and in-kind” on this motion.

Those in favour of this motion, please rise....

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, O'Shaughnessy, Swandel, Vandal, apologies, Thomas.

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: It's lost.

On the Notice of Motion, Moved by Councillor Vandal, all those in favour do you want a recorded vote? Councillor Vandal has called for a recorded vote. All in favour of Notice of Motion by Councillor Vandal/Swandel please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Swandel, Thomas, Vandal.

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: It's lost. On E.P.C. motions. There's one motion of Executive Policy Committee. Motion Number 3. Moved by Councillor Steeves, seconded by Councillor Swandel. We need to suspend the rules. Councillor Steeves would you like to introduce it?

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Steeves,
Seconded by Councillor Swandel,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has experienced significant rain which has resulted in significant damage to real and personal property within the City;

AND WHEREAS in order for the Manitoba Emergency Management Organization to consider any requests for disaster assistance, a resolution must be passed by the municipality;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to provide disaster financial assistance in accordance with their established policy.

Mr. Speaker: To suspend the rules? Sorry. Councillor members -- in favour of this? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. It's carried. Consideration of by-laws, second reading only.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – SECOND READING ONLY

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that By-law No. 2/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 2/2009.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move the following by-laws be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed. By-law No. 147/2008, By-law No. 148/2008.

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

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 40/2009, 41/2009, 42/2009. Hang on. Can't do that.

Mr. Speaker: Keep going.

Mayor Katz: 43/2009, 56/2009, 60/2009, 61/2009, 64/2009, 66/2009, 67/2009, and 68/2009.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 40/2009, 41/2009, 42/2009, 43/2009, 56/2009, 60/2009, 61/2009, 64/2009, 66/2009, 67/2009, 68/2009.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that by-laws numbered 40/2009 to 43/2009, both inclusive, 56/2009, 60/2009, 61/2009, 64/2009, 66/2009 to 68/2009, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 40/2009, 43/2009, both inclusive, 56/2009, 60/2009, 61/2009, 64/2009, 66/2009 to 68/2009, both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 40/2009 to 43/2009, both inclusive, 56/2009, 60/2009, 61/2009, 64/2009, and 66/2009 to 68/2009, both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Mr. Speaker: Addendum by-laws, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended that By-law No. 69/2009 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 69/2009.

Mayor Katz: I move that By-law No. 69/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 69/2009.

Mayor Katz: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 69/2009 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question period. Councillor Wyatt, your first question.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Mayor, last night it sounds like Councillor Clement was in his ward quite late. I was also responding to calls from about 12:30 to 3:00 with water in South Transcona. I can tell you that the crews that we have out there working right now are getting tireder and tireder by the day. There is a sense of a lack of equipment for the steamers. We've got roads which are covered with water. The situation might get better now with regards to the weather getting colder and the snow but once it starts melting again we're going to be back to square one and there's some roads which are really bad. Could I…I know you can't really say what you can do right now, but can we…can you do everything you can I guess to assist…if we can get more crews or more machines out there to make this work because we're really…a lot of neighbourhoods are really facing it right now and a lot of residents are quite concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Wyatt for that question and I think what we have to do everything in our power to address those issues. It's my understanding that the committed Councillor Clement was there till Midnight,

but the doubly committed Councillor Wyatt was there until 2:00 a.m. in the morning trying to resolve issues. I think everybody knows that we have 14 crews out there. They know, they've been going around the clock, 7/24. We have the steamers out there, and it is accurate that I believe that one, they were having problems with one unit. But I think, Mr. Speaker, when people are going through these types of times and the potential of flooding basements, et cetera, flooding garages, whatever the case may be, you know, for us talking about it just isn't enough. I mean, they're looking for action, and we all know that we live in a climate where sometimes Mother Nature can deal us pretty nasty cards. And unfortunately we have to deal with that, and with the current weather that we've had with the melting and then the freezing and then the melting again, it hasn't been an easy road for many people, including the members of Public Works. What I can tell Councillor Wyatt is that we already are in discussion with the Department and the parties that be to see what further measures we can do and whether there are options of getting more people on the crews, whether there is any additional equipment available. We do have a bit of a reprieve right now with the freeze but we all know that's going to change very shortly, and I can assure you that yours truly as well as the CAO and the Department are looking at those opportunities right now.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question, Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: I just want to thank you for that, Mr. Mayor, and let you know that the…some companies…there are at least two companies, one I know in my end of town, Border Chemical has a machine that they've donated to assist. If there's other companies that can be reached out to, I hope that could be pursued. If we can get other equipment other than our own equipment available that would be terrific.

Mayor Katz: Was that a question or a comment?

Mr. Speaker: A comment with a question in between. Councillor Vandal your first question.

Councillor Vandal: Councillor Thomas was before me.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. This question for the Mayor is because I am in possession of a Notice that went to the property owners along the south side of Hespeler Avenue asking them for about a 1.2-meters of property along the south side of Hespeler Avenue, and I have not been informed about a need for this property, and it was not explained to the residents why this property is needed, and it says that it has to do with the Disraeli Bridge, but how Hespeler is needed for the Disraeli Bridge is baffling to me. Can you commit to having an information session in the meeting, and I'd certainly like to be invited too, to explain to the residents why their property is being taken?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I…first of all I appreciate the question from Councillor Thomas. I actually was informed of this. The media asked me a question about it. Actually it was expropriation, and of course I responded to the media that we negotiate…expropriation is something that's the last I would ever consider. We always try to negotiate and see if we can work something out. Unfortunately at this particular point in time, I cannot tell Councillor Thomas exactly why that land is available, but I can assure Councillor Thomas that I will speak to the CAO and the Department and get a specific answer and make sure that she gets a briefing which she then can share with the citizens and give them an answer. I'm more than happy to do that.

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

Councillor Thomas: As long as I'm assured of getting a briefing and having it explained to me and for me, the puzzling nature of it was that the bridge at Redwood is still two lanes. There's four lanes leading up to it, so it was very confusing for me as to why this property was required. So I will respect the

Mayor's assurances that he will get a briefing and I'll get a briefing and my residents will get a briefing and that's my understanding of what you were saying.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas, the Mayor has indicated he is going to talk to the CAO and you will be informed.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal your first Question.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, to the Mayor, I understand that you will be in Ottawa lobbying for certain shovel-ready projects for funding from Ottawa and the Province. Can you share with this Council which projects are on the list for your advocacy?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Vandal, thank you for the question. Actually we've already started the lobbying. Last week, Mr. Speaker, I actually already had a meeting with Minister Baird. He was actually kind enough to come here to Winnipeg and so we started that, and I think I've already mentioned publicly, the projects that are on the list, Mr. Speaker. Obviously we have the water treatment plants, we have the rapid transit, there is…actually you know what, Councillor Vandal to be honest with you, everything is on there. So if you want to ask me specifically, there was no specific number that was made available to us. In other words, how much money would be available that we could access, so we basically put everything on there. Active transportation, intersections, decaying roads, Kenaston, Gunn Road, they're on there. But, if there is something specific that you would like to ask me if that is on there, I would be happy to respond to that. But I can tell you, it was an all-inclusive list that was given to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Vandal: There have been some discussions of a Downtown people mover that is on that list. I'm wondering if you can confirm that and if you can, can you explain to us, if you can confirm it, what exactly that is?

Mayor Katz: No. I think what you're referring to is an automated people mover. It's actually a form of ultra light rail which I think I've spoken about in the past. What is on there specifically is rapid transit. That's what's on there. There's no reference to anything other than rapid transit. But we are exploring ultra light rail and that's the same as the automated people mover.

Mr. Speaker: Your third and final question, Councillor.

Councillor Vandal: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. I know that the…changing subjects here…the GCWCC Plan 2025 is now complete, and I'm wondering, Mayor Katz, if you could arrange for a Council seminar on the results of that plan so that we can all be privy to what the recommendations are?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker to Councillor Vandal, I have not seen the proposal, but it's absolutely correct. It is forthcoming and I can tell you we're already working on having a Council seminar so everybody can have their input, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement your first question.

Councillor Clement: Yeah, Mr. Mayor, I was wondering if you could help us a little bit. We are having a little crisis out my way right now but one of the issues which isn't something that's very normal, but I'm getting asked quite often during the day about sand bags. Generally sand bags are made available for people who live along the river bank. I saw an article in the paper today that was quoting one of our Water and Waste people, suggesting that people could call them and they would deliver sand bags. Many people are quite willing to pick them up, but nobody knows where they are. We had a bunch out at the District 6 yards but as soon as there was a problem in St. Norbert which kind of surfaced yesterday a little faster than normal, people were

coming in there and whippin' them out of there, and other people from my ward were going and they weren't there any more. In fact other people from St. Norbert were coming and they weren't there. Can we…is there a possibility that we can get some sand bags moved over to District 6 so that people can get their hands on them, or is it possible that we can deliver sand bags to residential properties in our areas that are having overland flooding problems. Because it's not just along the rivers where we're having a problem right now. We've got water lapping against houses all over the place in our wards, and....well not all of them, but we certainly do. I know Russ has got some problems. I saw a picture in St. Boniface this morning where somebody was in a canoe on some street. Well I'm glad it was, Dan. I'm glad it was. Many of mine have been too, but there's a whole bunch more out there, and we're really having a real problem, but the bottom line is they can't get sand bags because the pile that was there has disappeared and is not being replenished and I don't know where they're at. So if your office could find a way or could we publish a number in the paper, something where people can call to get them. Something like that, that would be helpful. I don't know what you're thinking.

Mr. Speaker: That's a Question.

Councillor Clement: I guess there is a question in there somewhere yes.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to inquire and make sure that that information is available. I might even consult with the Chair of Infrastructure and Public Works. I'm sure I'd get some valuable information from him as well to contribute to this. In all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware, I wasn't aware that…I wasn't aware that people were actually going to pick up sand bags and they weren't available. My understanding is that we have plenty of sand bags and if they're not in the right location we will most definitely make that information available. It's my understanding it should be on the web site but Councillor Clement we'll be happy to get that and make sure, and maybe what we can do is release that information to the media and hopefully they can make that public. I think that's the least we can do but the sand bags should definitely be there, and if they have to access them we have to notify them by all means.

Mr. Speaker: Your second Question Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: It's not really a question Mr. Speaker, but…

Mr. Speaker: It has to be.

Councillor Clement: Are you aware, Mr. Mayor, that the web site already has that Information on it? In fact it's right on Councillor Browaty's computer, except it's telling them that they can go there between certain hours of the day to get them but I can assure you a, the hours aren't good enough and b, there's no sand bags there even though the…and you can be Chairman of Public Works all you want but unless somebody let's you know where this clandestine place where they're making the sand bags you can't get your hands on them. And I don't know where that is. I actually have called Bruce McPhail, but I haven't had a call back to find out where they are.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, what I will do is before Council is over. It appears what may have happened is that they may have run out at location and I'm sure they basically have replenished it, but I'm sure before the meeting is over we will get Councillor Clement that information.

Mr. Speaker: It's being taken care of right now. I see the CAO just left. Councillor Smith your first Question.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor, Mr. Mayor.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor!

Mayor Katz: Yes Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Last October…

Councillor Swandel: Put your question to the Speaker please.

Councillor Smith: Last October, I asked you a question about the police, the Public Safety Building and you said we'd have an answer by December. Where are we at this now? What's going to be happening to that building?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Actually, Mr. Speaker, it was the last Council meeting that Councillor Smith asked me about it and I told him I believed we were very close and I can tell him emphatically today, I believe that within one week or less we will all be getting some information regarding the Public Safety Building and what some of the options are and what we're looking at. So if Councillor Smith can be patient for 7 more days, I think he will be a very happy individual.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thanks. I'm going to be quick because we need to get out of here because there are flooding issues not just over land but we're having some issues with the river, some ice jamming causing river levels to come up.

Number 1, the sand bag thing. I dealt with that last night. There wasn't any but they worked around the clock. There's a lot of sand bags available between the hours of 10 and 8. People can go there and pick them up. But my particular question is, every year that we have flooding issues I have to deal with the same information problem. We have data coming at us on the river in 3 different streams. From the City of Winnipeg, well, 3 different ways. The City of Winnipeg, the Province. The City of Winnipeg reports it in metric. The Province reports it in imperial, and we also use for some reason, something called James Street data. I brought this up in 2006, and I believe even in 2005. Just right after I was elected we were running into a flood. You would show up at houses. There will be tags on the side of house that have previously been flooded. Bronze tags that give elevations in imperial. The City shows up, puts in survey markers that are elevations in metric. Somehow we have to be able to communicate this information either always having all 3 listed or only using one because it gets very confusing to individuals. There's also the risk of doing improper calculations in trying to convert these numbers. I'm wondering if the Mayor will take this on and ensure that as these flood issues continue to come upon us that we communicate clearly to people in some simple single form or showing all 3 at all times, what exactly it is that we are talking about when we're giving elevations.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through to you Councillor Swandel, I very much appreciate the point that he has made. I think it's very valid and I would be most happy to undertake to make sure that we basically abide by the "kiss" principle. Keep it simple and make sure that everybody understands it very clearly. So I'll take that under advisement and I will get back to him with hopefully a process that will make everybody happy and make sure that everybody understands and it's extremely simple.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillors? Council, do you see what's happening outside? We should be out there. Serious. Okay now next on the agenda is Property, I mean Committee on Property and Development, Standing Policy Committee, Report of March 3rd 2009. Councillor Fielding.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE
ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MARCH 3, 2009**

Councillor Fielding: Sure thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll advise that Item No. 2 has been laid over by Executive Policy Committee for the April 8th, 2009. I'd also like to introduce report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item No. 1 and 3 through 13.

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

Mr. Speaker: Motions. Motion number 4.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Fielding,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS

(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 180/2008, The City of Winnipeg authorized the expropriation of the lands described therein and made a Declaration of Expropriation dated the 17th day of December, 2008; and

(b) The Lieutenant Governor in Council has deemed it necessary or expedient in the public interest to direct the confirming authority to make its order confirming the Declaration of Expropriation without an inquiry being conducted under Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated the 17th day of December, 2008, made pursuant to By-law No. 180/2008 and expropriating the following lands:

Firstly: The lands taken for Works and shown as Parcels A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J, K, L and M on Plan Deposit 1448/2008 WLTO, prepared by Albert Gerhard Degner, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor, hereto attached, and

Secondly: A right-of-way for all purposes as appurtenant to firstly: Lot 2 and Lots 27 to 36, Block 13, Plan 208 WLTO (W Div) exc out of said Lots 2, 35 and 36 all those portions taken for Pembina Highway in RL 31 to 35 Parish of St Boniface and secondly: all that portion of RL 32 of the Parish of St Boniface lying between the Eastern limit of said Lot 2 and the Western limit of said Lot 36 and bounded on the South by the straight production Ely of the southern limit of said Lot 2 and on the Northwest by the Southeastern limit of Pembina Highway, over and upon all those portions of Lots 25 and 26, in said Block 13, bounded as follows: on the Southeast by the northwestern limit of the land taken for Railway Right-of-Way Plan 357 WLTO on the West by the Western limit of said Lot 26 on the South by a straight line drawn from the Southwest angle of said Lot 26 to a point in the said Northwestern limit distant Northerly thereon 21 feet from the Southern limit of said Lot 26 on the North by a straight line drawn from a point in the Western limit of said Lot 26 distant Northerly thereon 40 feet from the Southwest corner of said Lot 26 to the intersection of the Eastern limit of said Lot 25 with the said Northwestern limit, is hereby confirmed.

The aforesaid lands are expropriated free of encumbrances.

The aforesaid lands except mines, minerals and named substances which are excepted from or not included in the Certificate of Title of the registered owner of the surface under The Real Property Act or are not owned by the owner of the surface under The Registry Act, and except reservations in favour of the Crown as excepted from the Title of the owner of the surface, or to which Title is subject by implication under the provisions of The Real Property Act.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Fielding,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS
(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 181/2008, The City of Winnipeg authorized the expropriation of the temporary interest in land described therein and made a Declaration of Expropriation dated the 17th day of December, 2008; and

(b) The Lieutenant Governor in Council has deemed it necessary or expedient in the public interest to direct the confirming authority to make its order confirming the Declaration of Expropriation without an inquiry being conducted under Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated the 17th day of December, 2008, made pursuant to By-law No. 181/2008 and expropriating the following temporary interest in land:

The Easement taken for Work Space as the same is shown bordered on Plan Deposition 1504/2008 WLTO, prepared by Albert Gerhard Degner, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

is hereby confirmed.

The aforesaid interest in land is expropriated free of encumbrances.

The aforesaid interest in land excepts mines, minerals and named substances which are excepted from or not included in the Certificate of Title of the registered owner of the surface under The Real Property Act or are not owned by the owner of the surface under The Registry Act, and excepts reservations in favour of the Crown as excepted from the Title of the owner of the surface, or to which Title is subject by implication under the provisions of The Real Property Act.

Councillor Fielding: These are two housekeeping motions. Just to keep everyone aware on December 17th, 2008, Council approved expropriation of land for the Stage 1 of the southwest rapid transit corridor.

The Expropriation Act requires that Council confirm these decisions. So these motions are a confirmation of Council's intent to expropriate the land, so pretty much a housekeeping. With that I'll move expropriation motion No. 4

Councillor Fielding: Yes. By-law No. 180/2008 to acquire the lands for the purpose of construction of Phase 1 of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor in the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker: We deal with Motion No. 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Fielding: Second one is By-law No. 181/2009, Expropriation motion to acquire the temporary easement of a purpose of work space for the construction of Phase 1 or Stage 1 of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor Project in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Housekeeping Motion. Motion Number 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

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

Councillor Fielding: I move By-law No.

Mr. Speaker: By-laws go ahead.

Councillor Fielding: I move that By-law No. 35/2009 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 35/2009.

Councillor Fielding: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 36/2009, 37/2009, 38/2009, 39/2009, 44/2009, 45/2009, 46/2009, 47/2009, 48/2009, 49/2009, 50, 51 and 57/2009.

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

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 36/2009, 37/2009, 38/2009, 39/2009, 44/2009, 45/2009, 46/2009, 47/2009, 48/2009, 49/2009, 50/2009, 51/2009, and 57/2009.

Councillor Fielding: I'll move that By-laws Numbered 36/2009 to 39/2009, both inclusive, 44/2009 to 51/2009, both inclusive, and 57/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 36/2009 to 39/2009, both inclusive, 44/2009 to 51/2009, both inclusive, and 57/2009.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-laws Numbered 36/2009 to 39/2009, both inclusive, 44/2009 to 51/2009, both inclusive, and 57/2009 be read a third

time at the same time passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. Councillors I believe the Chief Administrator was out to get some answers. Do you want…it's okay? Okay, good.

Mayor Katz: (inaudible) report. We don't have it right now.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services report of March 9, 2009. Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MARCH 9, 2009

Councillor Steeves: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. With respect to that meeting of March 9, I'll move items 1 and items 3 through 9.

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

Councillor Steeves: And with respect to number 2, there is some amendments so I'll say some brief words about this and then we'll move through if that works for you, Mr. Speaker. This is the issue of the roadside memorials. It's been in front of Council for some time. It was taken off last Council's agenda at the request of with one Councillor by consent. We agreed to put this over for a month to have a chance for people to make more representations with respect to how they felt about this report. I can tell you that I've had a chance to go through this last month and speak to certain Councillors. Some have not approached me but some have, Councillors and Mayor, and I've had a chance to speak to folks and we're going to lay out a little way of proceeding here today whereby hopefully we'll wind up with something that represents the will of Council, at least in the majority sense.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, who is make that noise up there?

Councillor Steeves: That was me Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Someone is interrupting you, Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Oh. Okay. Sorry. The issue of the roadside memorials is again a difficult one. I won't dwell on that issue but you heard the delegation this morning talk about the challenges that she personally went through. I want to commend Council and thank them for their sensitivity in dealing with this issue throughout. It's been said before but bears mentioning again, this is a difficult matter and it bears the scrutiny, I think, and the sensitivity that all of us have shown it. Thank you for that.

The issue of roadside memorials, I think, traditionally in our society came to light primarily by virtue of their appearance in ditches, primarily upon, at the sides of public highways and that's where I guess they gained more attention. People would drive by obviously and see them and to a certain extent, I don't know if proliferated is the right word. It's kind of an unfortunate word if that is the right word, but there was more and more. That is one issue that I think I would leave aside for the purposes of this discussion because I do want to focus on our municipality. I'm not for a moment suggesting that the Winnipeg solution is a solution that would work with any other municipalities and it might not particularly work for any rural municipality. They're very, very different things.

You'll all have your own experience with roadside memorials, Mr. Speaker, in your respective wards and I think to some extent, you've probably been called upon in your past to get involved with the roadside memorial, some to a greater or some to a lesser extent and maybe some who have never been called upon to deal with the issue.

Dealing with the issue from a Councillor's perspective can range anywhere from sort of simple calls about how memorials are kept up, simple calls for information as to what they're pertaining to and the like, and they can be those general types

of inquiries which I think are easily enough handled.

The issue I think that's come to light and the issue that I think this Council has to be prepared to deal with is the issue of public memorials that can exist in front of either private residences or in some cases obviously, private businesses, and we do know that this has happened in our city. We're all familiar with the one incident in my ward that came to light whereby, the fact that a public memorial existed in and of itself became a little bit of an issue and I'll give you some brief facts so you can be reminded of them although I'm certain you probably have some information already. A terrible incident along a major thoroughfare in St. Vital wherein two people from a company, not our workers, were killed in a pedestrian/auto accident. Now, like any tragedy of course, this elicited a lot of emotional response, quite rightly. The community I think as a whole was to a certain extent devastated and it was a very, very difficult matter for everybody to deal with. At the site, there was a memorial erected as per I guess what has become the standard. Now this particular location happened to be along St. Mary's but of course in front of private residences, and specifically in front of one private residence. Of course I want to be careful to say that the policy that we're hoping to bring forward today has nothing to do with any one incident and I have not even spoken to any single individual about any single incident. But over time, what occurred was for the first period of time there was really no issue with respect to the memorial and I think people had, I think, the requisite respect and there was no issue in the community.

Time passed, however, Mr. Speaker, and a year went by and then a year and a half went by, and the memorial remained. Now, after a time there began to be asked questions in the community, what might be the expectation as to this memorial and how long it might stay? And I thought they were reasoned inquiries from people who were simply looking for the best in the community, what might be the best way forward on this very, very difficult issue. Fair enough. No resolution was arrived at. Part of the challenge specifically, Mr. Speaker, was that there was no regulation and there were no rules or there were no ideas or there was no policy that anybody really felt comfortable relying on. You all know what happened. After a time, for reasons that no one knows, and nobody knows who the individuals were, over night the memorial simply disappeared. This of course caused all sorts of accusations in the community, the pointing of fingers and people were concerned.

Post-that, kind of a sign was erected. It was sort of calling out the thieves of this memorial, and this is what transpired back and forth. At that stage, I felt that we had an obligation as a Council to get involved and to put forward, I guess, our ideas as to how this situation might be resolved. And that's what's before you today, Mr. Speaker. Some idea as to how these types of situations might be resolved. I want you to ask yourselves that specific question because the report is fairly clear on what it outlines. It talks about the size of the memorial which I haven't heard anyone say they have any concerns with. It talks about what is appropriate and what may not be deemed appropriate and I think most people have a general understanding of what that might be. But the real issue, I suppose, that's arisen is the issue of how long we should state that roadside memorials are allowed to exist in our community.

It is, I think, unanimous in the City of Winnipeg that everybody agrees on two things with very, very few exceptions and there are some exceptions but very few. First, people should have the right to erect a roadside memorial. Everybody agrees with that. And secondly, people agree that it should be time limited. That it shouldn't be allowed to exist in perpetuity especially in front of a private residence. You have in front of you three different ideas on that. The first is a six-month time limit if I can use that term. That is what I am going to be supporting because I think that is what's reasonable, based on my experience. But to be perfectly candid, I am aware that there are members of this Council, potentially members of this community as well, who don't agree with that which is why there is

an amendment that will follow, which time limits the memorials at one year.

This will be a vote of conscience as far as I am concerned. I will certainly ask people to simply vote in the way which they believe. It is one of those things where you simply have to make up your own mind. I just simply put my feelings out there because this is what I think is appropriate.

There is a third amendment which I've drafted because I think it represented something of a consensus on Council, and that consensus was that there should be an opportunity for families if they desire, after the period for the memorial has elapsed, there should be an opportunity for people to put something a little more lasting which is why in the third amendment asks our Public Service to develop a discreet band that could be placed around a light standard or some reasonable alternative as near as possible to the site in question. That could have the person's name and the date of their deceased and act as a permanent marker if you will, Mr. Speaker, if that is what the family desires.

So that is the motion that I would put before you that I think represents as near as possible a range that Council can take and people can simply vote their conscience, based on what they believe is the best thing to do in these circumstances. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors I have some information from the Chief Administrator in respect to the problems that are occurring right now in the City with the shortage of bags, and as you can see what's happening right now, I believe, Mr. Mayor, the Chief Administrator has given you some information.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In light of Councillor Clement's question, I am pleased to report that as of right now, all three of our yards, Waverley, Pacific and Ravelston all have sand bags available and they are available between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Hopefully that addresses it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you to the CAO for his immediate action on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: And thank the Chief Administrator for getting us the information so promptly.

Councillor Steeves there are three motions, motions number 6, 7 and 8. We'll deal with the motions now. Councillor Pagtakhan seconded by myself, you want to speak to motion number 6?

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan,
Seconded by Councillor Lazarenko,

That Recommendation 1.A of Item 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 9, 2009 be amended to change the time limit for the placement of roadside memorials from 120 days to 365 days.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the whole issue, I just want to say that I feel comfortable putting forward this motion for one year. I think if we can get a consensus on this issue I'm more comfortable supporting a one-year rather than a six-month although I can live with six months. I think that also, I'll speak to motion number 8. I support Motion No. 8 moved by Councillor Steeves and seconded by Councillor Nordman, and I'll just leave it at that. Thanks Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: But your first choice is 365 days. You're a mover of that. Okay that's motion number 6. Motion number 7, Councillor Steeves, seconded by Councillor Nordman.

Mr. Speaker: Do you want to introduce it? And motion number 8, Councillor Steeves and Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Steeves: Same thing Mr. Speaker. I put it all on the table I think.

Mr. Speaker: Okay good.

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Steeves,
Seconded by Councillor Nordman,

That Recommendation 1.A of Item 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 9, 2009 be amended to change the time limit for the placement of roadside memorials from 120 days to 180 days.

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Steeves,
Seconded by Councillor Nordman,

That Recommendation 1 of Item 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 9, 2009 be amended to include the following:

1.B. That the Public Service be directed to design and develop a discreet band that can be marked with the persons name and date of passing. This band, which would remain in perpetuity, is to be attached to a light standard or reasonable alternative as near to the site as possible, if requested by the family of the deceased person after the period of the roadside memorial has passed.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, we now have a list of Speakers that will be speaking to the motions, to the motions here and also to the item which is Item number 2. The first is Councillor Nordman, you have the floor.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a member of the Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services, we have been the ones that have, over time, many months now, been dealing with this and you know, on a personal level, I have had discussions with a lot of folks and we've monitored what's been in the letters to the editor and different publications, and from a personal standpoint I started off at 60 days was a reasonable time frame for the memorials to be up, moved to 90 days as a compromise and moved again to 120 days in our most recent meeting and today I'm here to support 180 days or six months. I have as much empathy and sympathy as the next guy. I would understand completely the sadness that comes along with losing a loved one or an acquaintance in a, particularly a motor-vehicle accident but in one case here in Winnipeg there was an industrial accident by the Maryland Bridge. And understanding that, I think you know, citizens of Winnipeg are quite happy to allot some time. I'm afraid I can't support one year and I'm sort of speaking to all three numbers here. I feel personally and the people that I've spoken with, moving to 180 days, six months, is a fair…fair and reasonable time. I just want to think about the individual who is that home owner, whether it's on St. Mary's Road or in Westwood, that may be the unfortunate keeper of that memorial on his front yard. And just for the sake of argument, if it happened in April, an entire summer would be gone and having had the responsibility of having to maintain your yard with that still there. I just think a full year is beyond reason and six months is what I'm prepared to support. I'm happy that we've made the offer, giving the City and the families the opportunity to put the discrete band on the light standard. I think that, on an ongoing basis, is certainly something that's very, that I'm very amenable to and I'm happy to endorse as I have with the second of my motion, so I will be supporting motions 7 and 8 but I will not support motion 6.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Mr. Speaker, this whole issue is a very sensitive one, and you know, the committee had two external advisers, two people they consulted with, and one of them is Dr. Richard Tay at the University of Calgary. And I want you all to be aware that the City of Calgary, the City Council there, have passed something for roadside memorials for one year. You know, and that…and this expert is from that locale and that's probably who they relied on as well. So I think no matter what time you have, it's not going to be acceptable to many people. But at the same time, if you have a permanent signage or something there, that will make people

feel good and I think we all can agree on that. Thank you.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. Next up we have Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. I know this is a very touchy issue, especially when you're dealing with family members who have lost a loved one through carelessness such as drunk drivers, stolen vehicles and they want to send a message in recognition to what they've lost and never to be forgotten as long as they live.

I have a case in my area, the accident happened about two and a half years ago. It was by a stolen vehicle, a drunk driver. An innocent lady was driving on her way to work when she was hit and she was killed. The family have put a memorial right at the intersection where the accident happened on the boulevard. There was nobody who was opposed. I had a call from one lady who lived about two houses away, had said that should be removed. I asked her why. Is it a burden for you, is it because of a problem with the traffic flow? It's a small little monument. No, I just think this is not the right place. I asked her, I said well, why don't you go and talk to the people who put it up there. I can't. Why? Hey, I'm not going to be getting myself involved. But you want me to get involved with that. I said no, I will not do it because I don't think it's anyone's right to judge and tell people how long they can mourn when they lose a loved one. You have to go through it to understand.

Another case in the past, and I'm not talking about an accident where someone was speeding and someone gets killed. I'm talking about carelessness especially when someone dies through something that's not their fault. They just happened to be at the wrong place at the wrong time. And in our democratic society, you take any place, you go down the highway and you'll see flowers put on the side where an accident had happened. And it's not to say people that were killed because carelessness, that's a different matter but someone who is innocent, completely, to lose a loved one. You know what happens in the case where we had not too long ago where there was a police officer who was presumed to be drunk, hit a lady and she died. There was an inquiry lasted for about a year and a half or more. That family has been devastated for life. Can you imagine someone would be going and telling them you can't put a monument or anything with a flower where their mother was killed. I'd like to see who, within our politicians, the elected people that say get that out of there or I'd like to see who would be able to go and say from the administrative side. They can go talk with people and say look, this is a burden, this is not right, you know that it's obstructing traffic, but mostly these memorials it's nothing. I mean it's a small, small little…they put a group of flowers or a small plaque in memory, and I'm going to tell you something. When I drive down Arlington and Cathedral, every time I go through there, when I see that flower, it puts me back about two and a half years ago to that horrific accident that happened and the jerk that did hit that lady took off. Police did catch him. But what happens with our justice system. They serve time before they go through the court of law, before all the procedure. All that is counted as them serving time in jail. Two for one is right Mr. Mayor. Now can you imagine what that family is going through, and some of them go back and they sit for about two years. They're out. They go back. Steal another car, cause another accident. And I think it's high time. I know the justice system. I know we've got the laws. we do have regulations without us dealing with this now there are rules and regulations what you can do on the boulevard and what you cannot.

When we're dealing with the question of people have to do their own maintaining and cutting their own boulevard. A gentleman on Burrows Avenue, east side of Main Street planted potatoes and tomatoes on the boulevard. The City came to say you can't have it here, he says "why". "Because you don't own this." "But you're telling me that I have to maintain it. Now where does it say I can't plant a flower or a potato or tomato and not saying it's mine?" So this is based

pretty well on the same way Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, that the question is, it's a moral issue. How would you be able to take this to the court of law? Who would be able to take it and tell the people "you remove that memorial, those flowers you put there because you lost your mother or your father." How would you be able to challenge that in a court of law? I don't think it can be done. People just go back and they'll put it on and say that's my right. This is where I lost my loved one and I want it there for a period of time and I'm a seconder, Councillor Pagtakhan is the mover and I seconder giving them 365 days. I even feel that should not be in there. But you can do two months, three months, four months because before you start, the family will be grieving before it goes to the court of law, before it goes to the process. It may take four or five months. By that time the family is still grieving. They're waiting to see what happens through the court judgment to say "I have to go there. We have to remove all that because the City has said it's only 120 days." Well I can tell you right now, I think if I was one that was so unfortunate, that would be the last bloody number I'd be looking at, 120 days or 365 days. That'd be the last thing that would be on my mind. I'd be waiting first to see that justice is done and second, give me the opportunity that I can grieve with my family a loved one that we have lost, and hope that the good Lord, that I would never have to experience it. Hope to the good Lord that none of us will ever have to experience this, but these things do happen, especially what has been happening with all these stolen vehicles. Those that steal the vehicles don't have any respect for life…nothing. They're out there for their glory, to get out there and tramp on the gas and get the police to chase them and then they can brag that they got away.

No Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would say that please, Councillors, this is a moral issue and it's something that you can't…I wouldn't want to debate this on someone's life, you know. Give the people a chance. No one is abusing it. If someone has been driving drunk, whatever, gets into an accident, that's a different matter, but here when something horrific happens such as the case where here there was that lady was hit by a person who was a known car thief and intoxicated and most likely with drugs, that's something that people are trying to express their sorrow. They can't do it through the newspaper. They can't do it through the media, but they can do it by having that on the site where they lost a loved one and like I say, go down number 8, go down number 9, 7 highway, to the states, go to Europe and you'll see them, a nice pot of flowers on the side right where a person had lost their lives and some of them will have them there for a year, two years and then it's gone.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker....

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor (inaudible) moves extension of time. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Lazarenko: Members of Council, please take this and keep this in your heart because it's too important to deal with something to say that while, oh no, no, hey, just a minute. We passed a by-law here. The City of Winnipeg Council passed a by-law 120 days. You remove that. I'd like to see who is the person who would be able to go and tell that to a person who lost a loved one. I don't know where this thing really matured to…where did it come from? Someone must have lodged a complaint. I don't know if it's St. Vital. I know St. Vital had a problem one time. Something about a flag pole or somebody put a crucifix, 40, 50 feet up in the air and the neighbours were all huffing and puffing they didn't want it there, and the guy said "It's my right, I can do that" but this is a little different you know. This in itself, please, Councillors, 365 days, I think that's about right for people to grieve and knowing full well and they will abide by it and to see that, and if they feel…I don't think anybody wants to put a plaque in the ground in some boulevard because who is going to see it, but that in itself, at least…so use your conscience, Councillors.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lazarenko. Next up is Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This was never an issue of time. This was brought forward because of issues when these things get so large and start to have an impact on some of the residents living in close proximity to them. The idea of 365 days shouldn't be an issue for any of us. If people are following the rest of the by-law, which is about size and scope of what these things should look like, the time is not an issue.

The idea that after one year people can go and deal with those sites and at that time erect a nice band forever memorializing that particular individual at that location. That seems to be that all the work here is done. Whether anything else with this does is when things do get out of control at some of these sites, it allows our people to have some kind of structure to go to help them in dealing with these very difficult situations, because you're dealing with grieving individuals and to have some sort of guidelines that our employees can work with in helping to resolve these matters is all that was intended here and is all that is needed here. 365 days is quite all right.

While I have the floor for a couple of seconds here, I must leave. There are some flood issues going on in my ward and I'm going to ask Councillor Clement perhaps to move the last two items on Alternate Service Delivery, but I have to leave at the end of this vote.

Those are my comments. I would hope that we would all get back to the genesis of this which is not about time but it's about being able to have some control over what these things are looking like and how they're impacting on the people around them.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Swandel. Next up is Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I lost my mother two years ago. I'm not through grieving. I lost my father five years ago. I'm not through grieving. I am very uncomfortable about a motion that regulates the grieving process. We regulate traffic, vehicular, pedestrian traffic, we regulate whether something is an obstruction or not. I'm very uncomfortable about regulating a person's right to grieve, whether it be 120, 180 or 365 days. I don't feel comfortable about having the time limit here at all. I thought when this went back to committee that that's what people would be working on. I am surprised that it didn't come from the committee itself but it came from an additional motion with regard to motion 8, the idea of developing a discrete band to be put up. I thought that would be something that the committee would work on and come up with, with something like that to make sure that people are honoured. We do, whether however an individual dies, we do allow honouring in all sorts of ways. People put up trees with plaques. People put up benches and in some place that was a favourite area for a person to stroll, and there is a memorial that's put up there. All I think that we should be doing is regulating whether or not this interferes with obstructing traffic. I really don't think we should tell a person after 120 days or 180 days or 365 days, you've had enough grieving time and get that memorial out of here. I'm very uncomfortable with any of that. I cannot in any way support "a" on that. I would like to have seen a regulation on memorials. It talks about roadside memorials and number 1 talks about regulating them but it's not a regulation. If you cease to allow them after 120 days, you have banned them. I would rather have liked to see something that talked with regulating the memorials from the time that they get put up, because I don't think it's appropriate for a memorial to block off a lane of traffic. I don't think it's appropriate for a memorial to block off a sidewalk. Those are the kind of things that I would have liked to have seen the committee look at and this was the kind of thing that I'd hoped they would come up with and I definitely will be supporting motion 8 but I'm very uncomfortable with either the 120 or 180 days. I respect that Calgary's gone for a year. I don't understand why we would do anything less than that. 365 days is a year. 180 days is not a year.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel, I don't think Councillor Thomas need a tutor.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas are you through?

Councillor Thomas: Yeah. As I was saying, Calgary has regulated for a year. I don't see how we can do anything less, so 120 or 180 days as motion 7 says, are certainly out of my purview. But I'm very uncomfortable in regulating length of time of grieving period. But I certainly can't see doing any less than Calgary and I'm very uncomfortable even with a year, because I don't think that's where we should be going. We should be regulating not banning. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When this issue started out we were talking about three months, and I think we were in a very different position. Councillor Smith and I felt we shouldn't have any time restriction really at all or very longer, much longer one. And I think this is an example of people coming together and working together and trying to come up with something that the majority of Council can support, which, sometimes people claim I don't always do, but I think it's just that in this, you know, sometimes this is certainly not an issue of politics or anything like. It's what you think is right. It's a spiritual issue in fact, and I think there was an effort made by Councillor Smith and myself. We shared the view of Councillor Thomas that, you know, it's really hard to put a time line on it and we were very reluctant to do that, but we came to this compromise of one year and talked to a lot of our colleagues and we also talked to the people who had come to speak to the Committee and the people who had come to speak to Council, and they were in agreement with one year. The person who came to Council said one year with this band idea or some kind of on going recognition was acceptable to the people who had gone through the tragic incidents themselves. So I think when you look at that, it's not ideal I think for everybody. Everybody isn't going to be 100% happy and get exactly what they want, but I think it's a lot more compassionate. It's consistent with what Calgary is doing and so I urge everyone to support, to come together and support the one year motion.

The only point I haven't really heard mentioned and I might have missed is that there is a real positive impact of having a reminder to people that acts of terrible tragedies can happen and so that people will drive safer. There's research that shows it creates more safety on our streets and discourages drunk driving and things like that too. So I think it's a very positive…it also covers off the issues Councillor Thomas is concerned about in terms of the size or the interfering with public works issues because that's also part of the by-law. No one was really disputing that part. That's why we haven't been talking about it much. It's really just the time line, and I think we've come to a compromise that the majority I hope will support of the 365 days. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further Speakers. We'll deal with the Motions number 6, 7 and 8. Motion number 8 in reverse order and this is the motion by Councillor Steeves and Councillor Nordman, recommending that the Public Service be directed to design and develop a discreet band that can be marked with a person's name and date of passing. This band, which would remain in perpetuity, to be attached to a light. This is closing motion, Councillor Steeves on your motion number 8. Would you elaborate? Pardon?

Councillor Steeves: On the band?

Mr. Speaker: Number 8.

Councillor Steeves: Okay, on the closing part, do I close for all three motions and the report?

Mr. Speaker: We're dealing with motion 8.

Councillor Steeves: My question is, I know I close on…my preference would be just to close the one time. It makes sort of a…

Mr. Speaker: I'm asking you because this is your motion. Motion number 8 is yours. Do you want to speak to it briefly?

Councillor Steeves: My question is one of procedure. I know there's three amendments that we have to vote on and there is also a report. I'm also aware I probably have the right to speak in closing to the different amendments.

Mr. Speaker: You will.

Councillor Steeves: But I only want to speak once. So…

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Steeves: So I just…I just…I just want to make sure that…would you like me to close.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves, we're dealing with motions. Motion number 8 first, number 7 and then number 6. Do you want to speak in closing to your motion number 6. I'm not talking to (inaudible). You'll speak to Item 2 yet because you'll be closing. Do you want to speak….

Councillor Steeves: On the band? I would just simply…I don't believe there's any difficulty on this issue. If I'm just speaking to closing on the discreet band I think I'll just sort of close out debate because I think there is a consensus here.

Mr. Speaker: We have to vote on number 8. Number 8 says that you're asking that the design and develop a discreet band that can be marked with a person's name and date of passing.

Councillor Steeves: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: On number 8. On motion number 8, all in favour? Contrary? None. Motion number 7, Councillor Steeves seconded by Nordman. Memorial from 120 to 180 days for a memorial. Is that clear?

Councillor Steeves: That's clear. Clear to me.

Mr. Speaker: Motion number 7.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote has called for. Those. Do you want to close it Gord before we.

Councillor Steeves: I'm asking when do I close Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Not now!

Councillor Steeves: Okay, that's what I'm saying!

Mr. Speaker: Now. I told you before.

Councillor Steeves: Listen. For heavens sakes. I will be very brief. I will be very brief and I thank Council again for their participation on this and we're having some discussions here and obviously it's late in the day and people are losing some energy and I understand that.

I'm going to make one comment, that I was a little disappointed by one of my colleagues from Elmwood East Kildonan who seemingly had some difficulty with this whole issue, and the time limit. The part that disappoints me, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, and I won't dwell on this, was, but only to say that at the last Council meeting I put this matter over at her request. It was her motion to refer this. And now all sorts of comments coming forward about how the Committee didn't do this and how the Committee didn't do that. Well I should say for the purposes of the record, I have not heard from this Councillor within the course of the month. And the reason I put it over was precisely because she requested that we do gather some information from people and most people around Council table did come forward and talk to me. I'm a little frustrated by that process and I think rightly so. I deserved a little bit better, I think.

The issue here is not sort of a nebulous one that doesn't affect real people. Everyone is very, very cognizant I think of the people who are most affected by these tragedies. The people who are most affected, of course, are the people who lose loved ones, and we want to be sensitive to that.

I'm going to read you one e-mail and I have received dozens from people across the country, and in fact, from as far away as Argentina on this issue. It's clear to me that municipalities are struggling with this issue and how they're going to regulate it. You've become aware now that between our beginning this process and today, the City of Calgary has now gone completely through their process and passed a by-law regulating the exact same thing.

I'll read this e-mail and I'll say at the outset I completely understand, again, that these terrible tragedies leave behind families who are irreparably devastated and nothing I would ever suggest would ever pretend to try to truncate the grieving process that those people have to go through. But I'll say this, Mr. Speaker. I don't think a roadside memorial will ever take away the pain of losing a loved one. But I just want to add another perspective to the mix.

"First, I want to remain 100% anonymous. Regarding roadside memorials, people may need some closure and time but there should be limits. I do not live in the City, but I am a rural firefighter and I have been to some horrific traffic accidents. Where people want to remember, I too am forced to remember. Every time I pass a roadside memorial in my area, and it does not matter how many years it has been there, I can tell you everything that happened on the scene, what went right, what went wrong, the condition of the body or bodies, the sights, sounds, smells, all trigger every time I drive pass a roadside cross. It's a silent haunting. You don't discuss it with your spouse because you want to protect them from what you do and what you see. You don't discuss with fellow members because it just isn't done after the initial debriefing. You just learn to try and live with it. So in closing, all I'm saying is it's not only the family that remembers."

Mr. Speaker: Motion number 7 from 120 days to 180 days. Call the question now. All in favour? I don't think so. Those opposed.

Mr. Speaker: You want a recorded vote? On motion number 7 from 120 days to 180 days. Those in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Nordman, Steeves

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 5, Nays 9

Mr. Speaker: The motion is lost.

Motion number 6, Councillor Pagtakhan briefly do you want to speak to it before I call for the vote? Call the question? A recorded vote has been called. This is from, going to 365, from 120 days to 365 days. Those in favour of motion number 6 please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

None.

Mr. Speaker: Let it be recorded that this is unanimous. The decision has been made. It's no use for me calling for those opposed. It's done, so 365 days now.

Councillor Steeves on Item number 2 as amended. Would you like to speak to close and we can vote on number, Item number 2. Question? Councillors on Item

number 2, as amended. All in favour? Those opposed? None. Carried.

Motions none. By-laws Councillor Steeves.

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

Councillor Steeves: I move the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 52/2009 and By-law No. 65/2009.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 52/2009 and By-law No. 65/2009.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-laws No. 52/2009 and 65/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 52/2009 and 65/2009.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 52/2009 and 65/2009 be read a third time and same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Mr. Speaker: Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works report of March 10 of 2009. Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED MARCH 10, 2009

Mr. Speaker: Anybody have questions for Councillor Steeves? No questions go ahead Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Mr. Speaker, the first thing I'd like to do is ask that Item number 2 be referred back to the Public Works Committee. There is some further information on that clause and I would like to refer it.

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

Councillor Clement: Then I would like to move from the minutes of the March 10th agenda, items number 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7. That's right.

Mr. Speaker: Which one do you want? Four?

Councillor Clement: Everything but number 3.

Mr. Speaker: Number 4 has been stood down.

Councillor Clement: No. It was?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, Councillor Pagtakhan. Number 4.

Councillor Clement: I moved it. What do you want?

Councillor Pagtakhan: I want to speak to it.

Councillor Clement: It's moved. What's your problem?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Clerk. Marc. So, Marc my computer is acting up. So it's 1, 5, 6 and 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Clement: Okay.

Item No. 3 - Winnipeg Park Police File PR-7

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Who's going to move it?

Mr. Speaker: Are you moving it?

Councillor Gerbasi: You're standing. Are you going to speak to it now?

Councillor Clement: Well I'll speak to it but I'm not moving it so, I shouldn't…

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I'm a Councillor I know that. Oh, I'm a Councillor. Okay, the Mayor has moved Item 3. Now he can speak. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Yes. We had this at our Public Works Committee and our committee voted unanimously to leave the Park Police status quo, and when it went to Executive Policy Committee that wasn't the thought pattern and so that's why I didn't want to move the Executive Policy Committee recommendation.

This particular issue deals with multiplicities of parks but in particular, it deals with Assiniboine Park which is partially within my ward, and a tremendous number of residents who live in my area use that particular park. I'm sure they use some of the other ones from time to time as well. Over time they've gotten used to the Park Police being there in their current status. The…although I recognize that they are technically not police officers, they do dress like them, they do take some of the police training, and to a lay person in the park, they very clearly appear to be police officers. And I believe that because of the fact that they are dressed like that, that at least some of the criminal element respects that and we have a lot less of a problem in our major park and some of the others.

Now, I recognize that everybody won't necessarily agree with that, but I believe that and most of the residents who have contacted me about it that live in my ward, believe that.

And the other problem I had with this, and I've raised it at EPC, is that some people will talk about the hundred thousand dollars savings I guess. That wasn't why I got involved in this one way or the other. A year ago, when we were dealing with the Current Budget, Public Works was asked for a $3 million reduction in their expenditure lines and one of the numbers that they put on their sheet was $100,000 savings for this particular initiative. I know for a fact that virtually everything on that list was a change in service as this was, and Executive Policy Committee basically dismissed it completely and asked them for a different report. Somehow, everything else that was on that sheet disappeared, but not this item. There was never a mandate from Council. Council had never dealt with it. Public Works had never dealt with it. There was absolutely zero political discussion whatsoever about this issue. It was just simply an issue that had been raised by the Director of Public Works.

Now, I know that subsequent to that there were meetings that Public Works held in conjunction with a member of the police department. I know at the end of that process that the Chief got a report as well, and I know that he supports this and I know that the former Director of Public Works, Bill Larkin, certainly supported this, coming forward for a change. And I recognize what the change is. I know it's not a complete dissemination of the patrol. It's cutting it in half and putting some youth ambassadors within the park to make up the difference and supposedly have more visibility, but, those youth ambassadors or youth ambassador patrols are not going to have the same ability. The seven officers that are still there are still going to still have the ability to ticket, but when you look at the shifts when they're on and off and the number of days that they're working, particularly in the summer time, there are going to be times, I think, when it's going to be very difficult for them to do that with seven people as opposed to the current 14. And that's just the way it is because there are long shifts and long hours and many days involved. So, I didn't think that it was a very good program personally, and I wasn't here. I was away when the motion came to the floor and got referred to our committee but I was at the committee and we dealt with it. We had what I thought was a fairly reasonable discussion about it and we landed where we landed. I appreciate that members of Executive Policy Committee and my colleagues on the committee don't agree with my position and that's fine. We live in a democracy and we have the right to vote the way we please on issues and that's fine. But, I just honestly don't believe that this is a positive change. I'm not trying to hang on to it because it's close to my backyard. It's not really about that. I honestly don't believe that it's the right

thing to do and I think that, though I can't prove it, I believe that as a result of changing the uniforms and them not looking like police officers and not having that other training basic as it might be, that we're going to have less ability to control at least some of that criminal element that I honestly believe we currently are.

And, so I'm not going to say anymore. I'm starting to repeat myself a little bit I guess, but I just don't, didn't like this one much and said so and that's why it's here. So, and I'm thankful for this much in this process. At least today, whether it's approved or whether it's not and it's left status quo, at least it is in the Council Chamber for a final statement because it's the only time it's been here for any type of discussion and it should have been done like that, in my view, the first time around and it wasn't. It's unfortunate the way it came, but it's here now so people can have their say and they can vote the way they feel comfortable with and we'll move on. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: You know, I don't think I've ever done this before but I'm just going to say what he said.

Mr. Speaker: Ditto?

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, the person is never Bill.

Mr. Speaker: With the comma's and periods and the t's to be crossed. Any further Speakers? If not, Councillor Vandal?

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, if you put the whole issue, police verses patrol to the side, you're not going to find a bigger ambassador or a bigger advocate for ambassadors than I. I think we need them downtown or in the park. But we need them in addition to the officers that are there. We don't need them instead of. So I'm going to support the chairperson and see where it goes. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further Speakers? On Item number 3 recorded vote you asked for. Councillor Gerbasi asked for a recorded vote on Item number 3, Winnipeg Park Police. All in favour of the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee, please stand.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Wyatt.

Nays

Councillors Clement, Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

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

Mr. Speaker: It's lost. Tie vote. Item number 4. Councillor Orlikow that's what happens when you get a tie vote, it's lost.

Item No. 4 - Renaming of Garbage Day eFile WT-1

Mr. Speaker: Boy, this is the renaming of garbage, the big "g". Renaming the "g" company. Who is going to introduce it? Councillor Clement, are you going to introduce number 4, Renaming Garbage to Recycle Day.

Councillor Clement: I moved it already. I wasn't going to speak to it but I'm pretty sure…there he is. He's everywhere when I have a meeting.

Councillor Gerbasi: I have a point of order Bill. I'm sorry.

Councillor Clement: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: What is it?

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm just wondering what happens when the motion on the park police is lost, the EPC recommendation, so what happens in terms of the issue.

Mr. Speaker: Nothing. It's status quo. It died.

Councillor Gerbasi: So does that mean…

Mr. Speaker: They stay the way they are.

Councillor Gerbasi: The current system is in place, not…okay.

Mr. Speaker: That's what you want.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes, that's what we wanted but I wasn't sure.

Mr. Speaker: Council concurred with you. You got that. Okay continue with Item 4, Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: The renaming of garbage day, we're now going to evidently call it Recycling Day, and to be honest, I didn't think this was a huge issue, but we certainly had a fun discussion at EPC. A gentleman, Mr. Woodcock up here in the back who brought this forward actually sang to us and we had a few light hearted moments after that, and there were a couple of people actually wondered if they were suppose to sing too at EPC the other day, to get their issues across. But, anyway, we only got the one song.

In any case I don't know whether this is going to spur more people to recycle or not. People know when it's garbage day that it's recycling day. They're going to know when it's recycling day that it's garbage day. I don't know whether the media is going to just name one of them, but I guess I never really knew that we had an official name for this day. I guess we must have because it was called garbage day. Now we're going to have an official day, it's called recycling day instead. So for all of those people who love green initiatives, I guess this is going to be one that's going to be going up on the board for that and the renaming of this day is in front of us, and Councillor Pagtakhan, I know, wants to speak to this which is why I'm introducing it because I was just going to let it go. But, it's a fairly significant issue in his ward because he is trying to get more and more people recycling over there in the north end, so I'm sure he is going to tell us all about that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal?

Councillor Vandal: Pardon me?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I never raised my hand, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith you're next and then Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Smith: Yes. You know, this is a very important issue. You know, I don't know why EPC hasn't hit on this earlier. But of course, I understand that they think a lot about major issues and this is too complex for them to come up with. But, you know, I would hope that we would all be very supportive and tell EPC we want them to do more than just renaming the day. You know, more can be done, and this is a small thing that, you know, should have been done years and years ago. It should have been the main issue of debate today and you know I just can't understand why we've given it such a low priority.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to thank Councillor Clement, the Chair of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works for his support on this issue and I'm glad he has warmed up to it and thank Councillor Smith as well.

This is, you know, it's a fairly small issue. It's a fairly small request that I believe can be managed within the department, and what I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that this may not have a huge impact on all of us who, long time Winnipeggers, but let me just put a little perspective on this. In 2005 there were 8,000 new Canadians to this Province. 6,000 of those resided in our city. In 2006, 10,000 new Canadians, 7,600 resided in the City of Winnipeg, and in 2007, almost 11,000 new Canadians came in and over almost 8,500 came to the City of Winnipeg.

Now, these citizens who come in here, you know, they'll do whatever they can to come to the fold of Winnipeg life and Winnipeg culture and Canadian culture, and they hope to be Canadian citizens and proud citizens of our city. I think it's important upon us as a municipality and as a capital city of Manitoba, to really lead the way when it comes to green initiatives like this, and I think that, you know, it's a small thing but if we start referring to our garbage day as recycling day, this is what they're going to embrace, and I think that's pretty significant. If we can capture that demographic, Mr. Speaker, then I think that we're miles ahead of the game already. And I think this will also have a significant impact on youth as they move into apartments and have their own place and purchase their own homes. People will start thinking about recycling even more and I think that this is nothing but a good thing and I want to thank Mr. Don Woodstock. We had a chat one time and he mentioned it to me and we sort of moved on it and so this is where we're at. But I think if you sort of quantify some of the small steps and the small victories here, I think they can really add up to a whole lot that will really spell, I think, nothing but good things for green initiatives and recycling and diverting less solid waste to our landfills and that can only be a good thing. So I hope that we can think about this a little bit more and hopefully have some consensus here today on Council on this particular issue. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Council can do some interesting things. At 11:50 we declared it noon and we all headed off to lunch. We have all this white stuff out there. If I call it sand will it become beach day outside? I don't think so. I don't see what difference this is going to make. I don't think it's the best use of our time but I'll support it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Councillor Browaty, I'd like to take your train of thought. I think property tax should be changed to sustainability tax. I think we should have a new name for that. I think photo radar tickets, we should call them probably tax grab tickets, or maybe for some of the room we could call them safety ticket. I'm not too sure which. This is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker to be discussing this today. When we get over 50% of our garbage recycled or out of the landfill, then let's talk about renaming garbage day. But not until then, Mr. Speaker. We're at about 30% right now. The City of Edmonton is over 60%. I believe in action, I believe in results, I believe that let us show that we are actually reducing our waste not just by doing something symbolic by a feel good and warm and fuzzy by a name change Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to be supporting this today. This is a waste of time and a waste of energy and this is ridiculous for us to even be wasting our time talking about this. If we're going to talk about this, bring forward a motion that talks about how we're going to reduce the landfill, the garbage going in our landfills and how we're going to get recycling happening more and how we're going to get garbage out of our landfills. Let's talk about that Mr. Speaker, not about days being changed, names being changed on days. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: You know, not quite so fast, Mr. Speaker. We've made light of this a little bit but maybe a little reflection is in order on what we do as a society here. Now it's perfectly legitimate, I guess, for people to stand up and say this is a ridiculous idea if that's honestly the way they feel, and it's perfectly legitimate for people to say it doesn't matter what people say because it doesn't make a difference, but I'm going to argue that that's not actually true. About six months ago, I was at an event, and at this event, it doesn't matter where it was, it doesn't matter who it was, but it was an event where somebody was up at the podium, a great person, a nice person, a person that everybody liked, but a person of considerable age actually, an older person in our community. And in the crowd was a person of disability. And in their remarks, when referring to this person who had the disability, and the

person speaking at the podium was thanking this person, and they were saying very nice things about this person and they were wanting to hold this person up as an example for other people to emulate. The old person referred to the person of disability as "a cripple", and he didn't do it deliberately and he didn't do it to be mean, and he didn't do it to be disrespectful. In fact, he meant just the opposite. He meant just the opposite, Mr. Speaker. Now, no one in this chamber would ever dream of referring to a person of disability with that term, just not in our vernacular. It's not deemed appropriate. Why? The answer is fairly simple. Because at some stage we decided that we're going to change the way we speak. We're going to change the way that we refer. Why? Because people of disability think it makes a difference to them. They know how they feel when they're referred to. Think of people of certain ethnicities. Over the course of the last few decades, think of what was okay to call a person of certain ethnicities 50 years ago. It was perfectly fine to say this, that or the other thing and I won't even repeat those words, Mr. Speaker. But if you were to grab those Hansards we talked about earlier, and you were to look back 50 years if they even exist, I don't know, but can you imagine what was said back then? It's changed. Why has it changed? Because at some stage people said the first step is we're going to change the way we talk. We're going to change the way we refer. We're going to change the way that we address. We are going to change.

Thirty years ago, nobody talked about impaired driving. There wasn't even a penalty. It was legal, essentially, to drive impaired or if it wasn't legal, no one ever got charged for it. People started talking about it. They gave it names. They referred to it. It does make a difference.

One thing we shouldn't do in this is we shouldn't stand up and say that something is ridiculous when we don't really understand what's behind it.

Mr. Speaker: No further Speakers. Councillor Clement do you want to close? One question Councillors. What are we going to call our Brady garbage dump now? Okay, the motion. There is a clause, this is Item number 4. All in favour? Recorded vote has been called for. Please stand. All in favour of renaming the garbage day to recycle day. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Steeves.

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The item is carried. Consideration of motions. By-laws. Councillor Clement

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

Councillor Clement: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, and I will not be reading By-law No. 55 because it was associated with clause 2 that was referred back to committee. So I'm going to move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-laws No. 53 and 54/2009, as amended. Pardon me. I'll move 53/2009 and 54/2009 as amended.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 53/2009 and 54/2009.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 53/2009 and 54/2009, as amended, be read a second time.

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

Councillor Clement: By-law No. 53/2009 and 54/2009, as amended.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 53/2009 and 54/2009, as amended, 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. None. Standing Policy Committee on Finance, no report. There is no motions. No by-laws. Any question period of Finance? None. Standing Policy Committee of Downtown Development, no report. No motions. Consideration of by-laws, none. Question period. Any questions? No questions? We're getting to the end. Alternative Service Delivery Committee report of March of 6 of 2009. I understand Councillor Clement, you're going to take the place of Councillor Swandel to introduce it.

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE DATED MARCH 6, 2009

Councillor Clement: Yes. I'll…well I'll move them anyway. Report of March 6, Items 1 and 2, and I'll move 1 and 2 as consent.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker. Could we again pull off Clauses 5 in both of those clauses on the Special Operating Agencies as…Okay, whichever. It's 6? It's Clause 6 in those two reports? The one that talks about the board of directors as we voted earlier. And vote on those separately or at least be recorded in opposition whatever you want to do.

Councillor Clement: 6 on the first one and I think it's 4 on the second one.

Councillor Gerbasi: You can record me in opposition to those two clauses then.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi wants to be recorded in opposition, and Councillor Thomas. So Councillor Clement moves Items 1 and 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Now we come to the fine part. The best day of the meeting. Who is going to have the honour of moving adjournment? Councillor Orlikow is going to move that we adjourn. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll call. Stay in your seats. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 4:17 p.m.