COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, May 27, 2009

The Council met at 9:32 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Thomas.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We have our Pages here today, Rory Mitchell of Kelvin High School who resides in the Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward. Welcome.

Council I would like to introduce…we have a new Sergeant-at-Arms, Mr. Bill Durward. Welcome to City Hall, Mr. Durward (applause) Guests and announcements. As speaker I recognize Mayor Katz, please.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As many are aware, the year 2009 marks the centennial anniversary of the establishment of Winnipeg's Chinatown. It is certainly an honour for our City to have this opportunity to celebrate the milestone anniversary and the rich deep-rooted history of Chinese Canadians in our City.

The Winnipeg Chinese Cultural and Community Centre has been instrumental in organizing the ongoing events to commemorate Chinatown's 100th anniversary, and I would like to acknowledge some of their members who are joining us in the gallery today: Dr. Joseph Du, President, Mr. Philip Lee, 1st Vice President, Mr. Philip Chang, 2nd Vice President, Dr. Patrick Choy, 3rd Vice President, Mr. Terry Prychitko, Treasurer, and Ms Eva Luk, Secretary. I would like to thank each of these individuals, Mr. Speaker, for their continued community support and dedication in helping preserve and promote Chinese culture in Winnipeg. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite all of my colleagues here on Council, as well as the public, to join us in the Mayor's foyer at noon for a presentation ceremony to acknowledge the centennial anniversary of Winnipeg's Chinatown and celebrate Chinese heritage in Winnipeg that significantly contributes to our City's vibrant and unique diversity. And also, Mr. Speaker, there will be a nice lunch provided as well. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Congratulations. (applause) Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

We have two leave of absence motions. The first motion is by Councillor Nordman and Browaty. Leave for absence for Councillor Fielding due to absence from the city on city business. I should have been asking you to read it.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Nordman,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

That Councillor Fielding be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to his absence from the City on City Business.

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

Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan,
Seconded by Councillor Lazarenko,

That Councillor O'Shaughnessy be granted a leave of absence from the Council Meeting of May 27, 2009, due to a personal family matter.

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

MINUTES

Councillor Smith moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on April 29, 2009 be taken as read and confirmed.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Delegations. We have one delegation. Ty Tran, in support of Item 8 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated May 20, 2009. Mr. Tran you have ten minutes.

Ty Tran: Good morning Councillors and Honourable Mayor Sam Katz. Many thanks for allowing me to come here today to be the voice of 17,000 Winnipeggers who signed a petition in support of a possible world class indoor water park five years ago. To say the supporters of the water park were disappointed is an understatement. So many people had expressed a strong enthusiastic desire to have such a facility in Winnipeg. How sad a city our size does not have an opportunity to enjoy such a venue year round when other smaller cities have such a facility. Winnipeggers deserve a haven not only for all ages but also accessible to all. Regardless of the outcome I promised 17,000 supporters that Winnipeg would have the opportunity to experience a world-class indoor water park. To keep the dream alive, I have recently contacted the world's largest regional theme park company with 20 parks across the United States, Mexico and Canada, and soon will be expanding beyond North America with destinations in Dubai and Qatar. They feel there is definite potential for future indoor theme water park development opportunity in the City of Winnipeg. Let's not let this opportunity pass us by. Let's invest in Winnipeg to make an even more vibrant place to live and play. Once again, on behalf of 17,000 supporters, I thank you for your time allowing me to stand before you to express my passion and dream and to have a world class entertainment establishment in the form of an indoor-theme water park.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Tran. Any questions? Mr. Tran thank you for your presentation. You will be able to hand that petition into the clerk. Do you want to us have your petition? Just give it to the clerk. Thank you.

Executive Policy Committee, May 6th 2009, no report. Report of May 13th of 2009. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MAY 13, 2009

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

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Report of May 20th of 2009, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MAY 20, 2009

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 8.

Councillor Gerbasi: A motion on number 8.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: An amendment?

Mr. Speaker: It will be stood down, yeah.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I will move Consent for 1 to 7.

Mr. Speaker: 1 to 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And a motion number 8, amendment to number 8. Mr. Mayor? Madam Clerk…just hold it….Madam Clerk, read it.

Item No. 8 – Re-Issue of Expression of Interest for Water Park File PR-2(31)

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I believe everyone is aware at this stage of the game that this Council did support an expression of interest for a water park. We had at least three that I recall come forward, and we selected one. It was with Canad Inns at Polo Park. Due to circumstances that I don't think we're all clear about, Canad Inns was not in a position to proceed, and we decided it was time to move forward, Mr. Speaker.

So the intention is to re-issue an expression of interest. We believe there will be a great deal of interest in this and in the end it will result in a first class indoor water park located in the City of Winnipeg, and I know there are some here who would like to see it downtown, which I think would be positive if that were to happen as well. And I'm certainly hoping, Mr. Speaker, that this is something that everyone supports. As you can appreciate, Ty Tran already has told us that there are at least 17,000 people who signed a petition saying it's time our city gets a water park. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, it's quite evident that there are other communities not too far from Winnipeg that have an indoor water park. I think it's long overdue. I think this is a great step to basically provide the motivation to get the facility built. We're looking at approximately 70,000 square feet. It would be first class and at this stage of the game, I guess the one silver lining in the cloud of the first E.O.I. is we now have a public access agreement whereby the public will have access to this facility, and I believe it was approximately $700,000 over ten years. So, a lot of the work that had to be done is now done and hopefully we can move this forward and I'll be happy to listen to other Councillors' comments Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith you have a motion. Motion on Item 8. Would you like to introduce it?

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Smith,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has a large number of public pools and water facilities which serve the needs of the citizens of Winnipeg in regards to recreation, swimming instruction and other related areas;

AND WHEREAS The Public Use Facilities Study (PUFS) produced an inventory of these facilities identifying 11 outdoor pools, 13 indoor pools and 95 wading pools;

AND WHEREAS PUFS also identified the preservation needs for these existing facilities including a requirement of $9.633 million to preserve outdoor pools, $50 million to preserve indoor pools and $4.2 million to preserve wading pools;

AND WHEREAS the Pan Am pool, Winnipeg's largest and most famous water facility, was identified by PUFS as requiring $20 million for preservation needs;

AND WHEREAS the cancellation of the existing grant to Canad Inns would provide the City with $7 million of unallocated budget dollars;

AND WHEREAS the citizens of Winnipeg will be better served by preservation of the multitude of existing water facilities rather than the construction of one new facility;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Recommendation #3 of Item No. 8 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated May 20, 2009 be deleted in its entirety;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the following new Recommendations be added after Recommendation #2: That the seven million dollars that had been allocated to the Canad Inns conditional grant be allocated towards the preservation needs of existing indoor and outdoor water facilities;

That the Winnipeg Public Service report back to Council on the infrastructure funding priorities for the seven million dollars with regards to the existing water facilities.

Councillor Smith: Yes. First of all, let me quote Plan Winnipeg. To be a vibrant and healthy city which places highest priority on the quality of life for all its citizens. It is an inherent belief, public belief that recreation services contribute directly to quality of life. Research has demonstrated these services are essential to personal health and well being. Helps reduce self destructive and anti-social behaviour. Can these be achieved with one stand-alone, water park facility? Are we not better served as a City to provide our citizens with many

outdoor pools, indoor pools and wading pools and spray pads? These aquatic facilities are in every one of our wards and our citizens use them. The majority of them need preservation work. And what will be the cost for our families to use a water park? Will it be affordable? Seven million will not be sufficient spread over a number of years to reduce the cost of admissions. We have hot sweltering summers and many of our residents do not have cabins at a lake. They continue to need neighbourhood aquatic facilities to cool off and have summer fun. Why are some of us are willing to spend seven million on a water park when the public use facilities study lists the preservation needs as follows: over nine and a half million to preserve outdoor pools. Fifty million to preserve indoor pools. And over four million to preserve wading pools, and we want to build spray pads to replace some of the wading pools. Would not the seven million be better spent doing that in our neighbourhoods than a single water park for our City? I know a water park…a brand new water facility is enticing, but preserving most of our water facilities in our neighbourhoods is crucial for a better life for all of our families. You know, it just doesn't make sense to let our present facilities run down and deteriorate and not maintain them. So, you know, that seven million would be far better spent in doing that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Any further speakers? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question of spending $7 million on a privately owned water park has been a challenging and troubling issue for many people. Being a Winter city, people do desire having the opportunity to have Winter, indoor water activities in the Winter. But the approach of providing public funds to a private operator to build recreational facilities creates concerns around the issues of accessibility and accessibility… affordability and accessibility, even with the access agreement that we've heard about. If scarce public dollars are being spent on recreation infrastructure, those facilities ought to be something that all our citizens can access without financial hardships. From the estimates discussed in the last debate, on the public access agreement, the entrance fees, even with the subsidies, would be out of range for large families of low income and even moderate income. Clearly, the public access subsidies talked about in the last debate did not provide the reassurances needed to justify supporting the proposal which was the reason a number of us were not able to support it at that time.

Another troubling factor is that the money has been languishing unspent for five years and has much less purchasing power each passing day. As you know, the seven million was intended for publicly-owned services, originally for rapid transit in 2004. It was then moved over to enhance facilities at Kildonan Park. Five years has passed, and this money is still sitting in an account unspent as far as we understand. As time has marched on, this money is essentially worth less and less in terms of what it can accomplish for recreation facilities and I know we can't change the past, but I think we need to acknowledge it.

We all know that the size of our recreation…we all know about the size of our recreation infrastructure deficit, in particular, pools such as the Pan Am Pool, which I believe needs $20 million; the Sherbrook Pool which people are talking about we can't afford, which many citizens in a number of wards use; wading pools, outdoor pools are desperately in need of more investment.

The main reason I was unable to support the previous proposal was the issue of affordability to the public. The second issue was that there was minimal public benefit in terms of neighbourhood revitalization or downtown renewal. Again there is no requirement for this to be built downtown. Obviously I would be happier to see that happen. If it does happen and this does proceed, I would be happy to see it in the downtown in the sense that at least it would provide something to contribute to downtown revitalization, but if you are going to spend public money, you have to demonstrate public good. Many other places have provided private water…have had private water parks built

and paid for solely by the private sector. Others have built fully public facilities accessible to everyone, and if we want a facility that's truly accessible to all it might need to be a public facility. Other municipalities have put water play features in their own indoor facilities. Perhaps we should be looking further into that option. Giving funds to a private recreational facility with limited public access should not be our top priority at a time where existing recreational facilities are starving for reinvestment. People are afraid that in the future we could see the closures of facility such as the Sherbrook Pool and other outdoor pools such as neighbourhood wading pools. It seems wiser to invest this money in enhancing our existing City facilities, so I will be supporting Councillor Smith's and Wyatt's motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further speeches? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Just quickly. I just saw this motion this morning. It doesn't seem to make any sense to me at all, when you look at the logic for the motion. If we're really going to get into what we're going to do with our other facilities, there's quite a few of them. When you look at the cost of subsidizing per use, they should just be closed down rather than put money into them. One facility in particular the City of Winnipeg subsidized to the tune of $42 per individual user. What would this process set out to do was to take $7 million and leverage it using an opportunity where a private sector operation would come in, and due to economies of scale and benefits to both parties, this would be an efficient use of taxpayer dollars and bring something to the City of Winnipeg that today, we just don't have. If you want to talk about spending the money in an equitable fashion, I would suggest to the movers of this motion that perhaps the money should be spent in Charleswood where there are no water facilities to speak of, or perhaps in the St. Norbert ward where on one side of the river we have only one spray pad, no wading pools, no outdoor pools, and we have one indoor swimming facility. On the other side of the river, we have one spray pad. That's it. So if you're looking for equity in these dollars, then maybe they should be going out to the suburbs. So rather than into revitalizing inner city facilities, that there's already more per capita of these facilities than there is throughout the rest of the City, and when you combine that with the fact that the facilities…where we build new facilities that we're still unable, due to I guess political reasons to close aging facilities that are costing us ridiculous amounts of money. $42 per person subsidized to use a facility, an indoor swimming facility in the City of Winnipeg, and we have the audacity to bring a motion like this to the table? You know, let's spend our money wisely. Let's leverage our $7 million. Let's bring a state of the art, modern facility to the City of Winnipeg for all to use. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. It's my pleasure actually to support the motion because I do believe it does get into the role of the City is to invest wisely, and to invest into private/public relationships by putting seven million up front. I think that's unwise. I think that it's unwise on a business case model. I believe that if a group is able to bring a nice water park here, they should be able to do that without our seven million. If they have a business plan that actually is sustainable, we can actually look at down the line, adding subsidies to help low income kids from schools or what not be able to get in there. The City can still do that on the back end. We can even help these private entrepreneurs out by looking at some tax deferral program, especially if they set up in a place that we believe would be more appropriate than, for example, where the Canad Inns was.

I believe that the $7 million would be good to invest in certain areas especially in our existing infrastructure where we're having these large subsidies that we talk about. These inner city we'll call them, facilities, are very important to the communities. These people do not have the mobility as much as other people do to get around, and it's ridiculous for us to keep paying that type of subsidy per person. We need to invest into these properties so that kind

of subsidy, I believe I mentioned was $42, doesn't happen. Now I know there's one particular pool that's still waiting for their Phase 2 part, which will actually decrease the amount of cost that it is costing us to subsidize these people and maintain that building. So on a business point of view, you don't just…either you close it, which I think is a terrible idea closing some of these inner city places. The General Council's report has shown the amount of the lack of resources in many of these communities, so we need to be investing, and we need to be investing in areas where it's costing us a lot of money such as some of these pools where we can invest in the infrastructure, we can invest in the mechanical system so you don't have to keep paying all these subsidies all the time, and there are some grants out there that we can work with the Federal Government as well, and this is an opportunity to do that.

So I believe it is reinvesting into areas, building on our existing infrastructure, rather than trying to create new infrastructure. I believe that we can still help out the water park people through different mechanisms, but providing $7 million up front is not the proper way. So I do support the motion of reinvesting in our present infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I thought I saw Councillor Thomas with her hand up before me, but if it's okay with her. You have to keep watching, Mr. Speaker.

The…I don't like the motion from Councillor Smith and Councillor Wyatt at all. I think it's symbolic completely of everything that is wrong with the way that some people think around this table. And I don't say that in an overly critical manner, but we continually go back to this, Mr. Speaker, and I think it hurts our reputation as a city. If you think of some of the great things that have been accomplished in this city, some of the great things that will be accomplished in this city, there are things that, by definition of scope, comparatively, go way beyond things like this. If you think this is a risk, think of some of the other things people have done in this city.

If we're going to extend our self as a city, if we're going to become better than what we are, we're going to have to do things that are new. We need something like this. It's very seldom I can say that, but we need something like this. Winnipeg's reputation is not a reputation of being a city that has a wonderful night life. I think we have some wonderful night life, but it's not our reputation. Winnipeg is not a city that has a great reputation of having wonderful weather all year round. That is not our reputation. It's not the reputation of a lot of cities in Canada. What we are is a city that, for seven months of the year, people need opportunities to do things that are interesting, entertaining and fun. There is no shame in saying that. That's what makes a city great. Giving people things to do is what makes a city great. Have you ever thought to ask people what they want to do? Do they want to go to the Sherbrook Pool or would they like to go to a water park? I don't know. Is that a fair question to ask, Mr. Speaker? Who knows? People are entitled to their own opinion but we just had a delegation who claims to have 17,000 people that have gone out of their way to say yes, this is important to us. That has to be worth something.

If ever people go to other cities and come back to Winnipeg, and as Councillors you've heard this a million times, they talk about the great recreational amenities that other cities have that we don't have. Before we built the indoor soccer complex at the University of Manitoba, how many times did each one of us hear from our constituents that we didn't have a facility like that? Well, it took us years to get it done. It took us years of talking about the pros and the cons and people did want to do it and people didn't want to do it, it was too expensive, it was too this, it was too that, where the heck is it going to go, blah, blah, blah, blah blah, and it went on. But now that we have it, would anybody really want to turn back the clock and not have it? Would you feel good about the City if we did that?

You're aware that for several years now, we have been undergoing a process of intense rationalization of our existing facilities, and every single person sitting

around this table and in that chair has voted to support that process of rationalization. And generally, for better or for worse, every single Councillor and mayor who is sitting here has said, that we believe that we have to rationalize square footage. People today are demanding things that are more complex, that are a little more expensive, and they are not asking us, by virtue of consumer demand, to build smaller things over and over and over again in more and more different little parts of the City. What people are telling us they want, for whatever it's worth to you, is they want regional facilities. Look at the P.U.F.S. or the (inaudible), or all the hundreds of thousands of dollars that we spent on these studies. They have told us the same thing over and over and over again, my friends. We cannot keep going back to this discussion. I'm getting a little tired of standing up here, Mr. Speaker, and reminding people that we have made these decisions already. We have, generally, too many small facilities that are not being supported. What we're trying to do is embark on processes of building better, bigger, regional facilities that are not only going to serve the citizens that we have an obligation to serve, but who knows, might even attract the odd person from Saskatoon or Regina or Calgary or Edmonton or Grand Forks or Fargo. Have you heard of anybody that's gone down to that grand…the water park in Grand Forks and espoused how great they think it is? Has anybody told you about the Steinbach Aquatic Centre and how wonderful they think that facility is? Thousands of people on a weekly basis are doing this and they're leaving Winnipeg to access these facilities, and these numbers are not exaggerated. I don't want to be too strong in my language but, Mr. Speaker, you would have to really be working hard to close your eyes to some strong realities here, to suggest that something like this is not something that the City of Winnipeg needs. If we could do this and build a facility that would properly serve citizens in this area, this would be one of the greatest legacies we could leave to our citizens. We have to be careful about a couple of things and fair comment. There should have been some type of penalty clause in this deal we just sort of backed out of, but we'll leave that aside for now. We have to make sure this thing is regionally, financially accessible to people. We have to do that. And we can do that. Surely to goodness, between the 16 of us we have the ability to ensure that that happens. We have to make sure that it is big enough to serve the citizens that are going to be demanding to come into this facility, and there will be a lot of them, I can assure you. All you need do is go to the very relatively small facility in Steinbach any given Saturday to see that's the case. If you're plugging around there in their little river, you'll meet a lot more Winnipeggers than Steinbachians, or whatever the term is.

We should be supporting this and we should be moving ahead. This is not an ostentatious use of taxpayers' money. If you have kids, and I know many of you do like me do, they will tell you that this is something that they want. This is truly something that families in this city want. I can say very few things with 100% certainty, but I will say it again and I will conclude. This is something that families in Winnipeg want.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I will be supporting the motion coming up. I have to say, I have problems with some of the "whereas's". I was not a supporter of P.U.F.S. I think there are many problems with P.U.F.S., all of which I won't go into today but they are in the "whereas's". The resolve that the $7 million…that the Winnipeg Public Service report back on Council on the infrastructure funding priorities with regard to the $7 million, and I will tell you why I'm supporting this. We should not be buying a new lace tablecloth when our roof is leaking, and there's quite a few basic projects that need to be done around this city that have been put on the back burner. The money itself for the water park was taken from $9 million worth of upgrades to Kildonan Park. I had a problem with that from the beginning and was on record for that. The…over two-thirds of the money for the Kildonan Park upgrades gone for private water park. We have facilities within Kildonan Park that desperately needs upgrading. Our access to wheelchair

accessible washrooms is poor. In the facility that's right next to the swimming facility, the swimming facility desperately needs upgrading, as do a number of existing facilities around the community, and to put money into a new facility when existing facilities are in such desperate need of repair is folly. Yes it's pretty and so is a new tablecloth. Very pretty, very glitzy. There are some people who will be very impressed with that. But, not when there is basic services that are being forgotten. That's very simple for me and why I cannot support the clause but will support the motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to say that I will not be supporting Councillor Smith and Councillor Wyatt's motion here. $7 million that we're talking about here is going to trigger a much bigger investment. If you go back and look at the original E.O.I., there's a lot of things that were very specific in that report - the number of slides, the lengths of the slides, the fact that it needed a wave pool. This is going to be a much bigger investment.

We talk about all these other projects on civic infrastructure that do have some requirements. Perhaps Councillor Swandel was on the right path. If some of these older facilities no longer make sense and they can't be upgraded in a reasonable fashion, maybe they shouldn't exist anymore. Maybe we do need to look at other ways of delivering public good.

Councillor Gerbasi talked about public good and how they can only be delivered in public facilities. Look at all of the other public goods we have in our City that are delivered by private sources. We have the MTS Centre, phenomenally popular, phenomenally well received by our community. Is it owned by the government? No, it's not. You've got the CanWest Global Ball Park, a great facility, a lot of fun, I was there on the weekend. Privately delivered. Great service, a fun place to go. Curling clubs, things like that that are not necessarily delivered by the City or by government but they are a public good. A water park, I think, is something that Winnipeg really does need. Ty Tran has been sitting in wading pools way too long waiting. It's time we had a proper, full-blown water park and I think this is a good opportunity to get it.

In terms of the whole notion of affordability, we've even addressed that. The notion that, you know, there will be a public accessibility clause as part of it, I think, is very responsible and a good way of addressing those concerns. Sure, I mean when it first opens it's going to be very popular and some kids will be there almost every weekend with birthday parties, but for other families it can be a special treat. Take a look at the Red River Exhibition. It's not a cheap place to go, but you see people from all levels of income spectrum going there on an annual basis, and, you know what, it's not in the inner-city anymore. It's out, way out, past even St. Charles I think now. But the fact is, I mean, when it's a special occasion people can get to these amenities and they are well received.

Again I hear as Councillor Steeves is mentioning, phenomenal reports back about facilities whether it's in Dauphin, Steinbach or Grand Forks. These are excellent amenities. They are a public good, but they don't necessarily have to be public delivered.

So, I will not be supporting Councillor Smith and Councillor Wyatt's motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you Mr. Speaker. You know, this city is way more than an old hockey team, an old rock and roll band and an old folk singer from Kelvin High School. You know, this project's about the future. We can celebrate those things in the past but, you know, are we looking ahead? Are we looking to market our city in a way that is enticing to people beyond the Perimeter Highway, and in fact the Red River exhibition is in the City of Winnipeg. But, Councillor Steeves did mention the soccer complex at the University of Manitoba. As I understand it, it had a number of false starts before it actually

was produced and I think that's maybe what we're experiencing here with the water park.

So I won't be supporting Councillor Wyatt's motion and Councillor Smith's motion. And I really think as Councillor Swandel has said, this is our way of leveraging a much bigger project that will provide the city and surrounding area, our cousins in the capital region a fantastic facility for years to come. Let's think about the future.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak against the clause and support the amendment which I hope will pass because clearly I think it's a positive step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, our existing infrastructure deficit for pools, arenas, parks, rec facilities is now estimated at 277 million over the next ten years, which works out to about 27, 28 million a year over the next ten years if we wanted to pay that down. Of that, Mr. Speaker, 40 million is attributed to indoor pools. So $40 million is the infrastructure deficit as we know it right now, in 2009 dollars for indoor pools. Another six million, Mr. Speaker, for outdoor pools so a total of $46 million is the infrastructure deficit accumulated over the next ten years, and the ten years because the thought is that it can't be paid off immediately. You're going to need that time. But indeed, in this case actually, there might be a possibility that we could actually eliminate the entire infrastructure deficit of our indoor and outdoor pools, the total being $46 million or a total of $4.6 million a year over ten years.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, I have argued publicly in this chamber and outside of this chamber that we should probably be increasing our property taxes. Our entire infrastructure deficit right now is $3.7 billion over the next ten years. That's $370 million a year. I supported the E.O.I. in the last…the last time it came forward and I spoke very positively about Canad Inns and I still speak very highly of that organization. They've done a lot for our city both as an employer and also as a contributor to philanthropy, and I would say Mr. Speaker that was unfortunate that they were not able to make it work. But clearly as I said in my speech in the Council Chamber when we accepted the E.O.I., they build water parks and they've built them and it has been quoted by other speakers. They've built them everywhere…in other locations in this Province and also in other…in the United States, and they know how to operate them as well. But for whatever reason they couldn't make this work.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time that we gave the private sector their chance and we gave the private sector an opportunity. I think clearly now, they couldn't do it, so what's wrong with saying let's give the public sector an opportunity to make something work? I think the existing amendment is an opportunity to do possibly that. We could choose to re-invest directly into the existing facilities. As I've mentioned, $46 million is the infrastructure deficit. Three weeks ago I was at the Pan Am Pool and took a tour of it, and as well as other facilities in the new role that the Mayor has appointed me. There are three boilers down in the Pan Am Pool, massive boilers that date back to the original date of construction. They are 42 years old. These boilers can go any day and it will cost millions to replace them Mr. Speaker, and they're not energy efficient on top of that. I can tell you that.

Mr. Speaker, under the Mayor's leadership and thanks to the Mayor, we re-invested $43 million into recreational facilities around this City. I think that was a very good start but I do believe more could be done. Leveraging money, absolutely. I agree with that a hundred percent. But we could leverage money publicly, Mr. Speaker. We have a Federal stimulus package before us today that we've never really seen before. $7 million, I believe, could easily leverage money from the Provincial and Federal Governments, and it's been proven to work, Mr. Speaker. We don't have to go as far as Steinbach. We can go the other direction if we want. We can go to Portage la Prairie. Portage la Prairie right now, Mr. Speaker, is in the process of

building a $40 million facility. The City of Portage la Prairie, 13,000 people I might add, Mr. Speaker, 13,000 people building a $40 million facility. They have come up with $16 million from the City, $8 million from the R.M., 8.3 million from the Province and the Feds, and they're raising $3.4 million privately. And the second phase is another $4 million indoor hockey rink. They're building indoor hockey rinks, they're building indoor pools, they're building indoor spray park for $40 million, Mr. Speaker. We could be doing the same thing. Could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, that if we took a pool like the Sherbrook Pool and we combine it with a new publicly-owned aquatic facility beside the Sherbrook Pool, attached to the Sherbrook Pool. It would be huge for the City. It's close to the downtown. It'd be a shot in the arm for the City, Mr. Speaker. Close to the University of Winnipeg. Forty-two dollars, the cost of $40 a person to subsidize the Sherbrook Pool. I can tell you why it's $42 Mr. Speaker. Because there's no programming going on in the Sherbrook Pool. We've cut the program. Why have we cut the programming?

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Well, you can call it what you like. The Sherbrook Pool is right up there as well. Probably even higher. Well maybe a little bit less, but not a lot more. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the Sherbrook Pool programming, if there was programming in the pool, it would be a huge success. Programming in any pool out there would be a huge success. You can go to the old Exhibition Pool site and you can see programming being done by W.A.S.A.K. where kids come from all over the city, aboriginal kids, swimming and swimming programs, filling that pool and why? Because they are running programming in the pools Mr. Speaker. There's probably more kids swimming there from Transcona than there are kids swimming in the Transcona Pool. Why? Because of programming, yet we've cut our programming Mr. Speaker. And why have we cut our programming? Because, probably because we've had 12 years of tax freezes and tax cuts. This is the reality Mr. Speaker. We could invest again if we so choose, back into publicly-owned facilities.

The Steinbach Pool that has been held up as an example. A publicly-owned facility. It took the community the better part of 15 years to raise the money to build the Steinbach facility but they built it. Publicly-owned, Mr. Speaker. I believe that we could do something dramatic and unique. We have a Convention Centre that has to be expanded. If we don't expand the Convention Centre, we know we're going to fall into…from tier 2 convention centre facilities to tier 3. What if we built a publicly-owned aquatic facility as part of that Convention Centre and made the expansion work, right in the heart of the downtown? Another example of what could happen, Mr. Speaker. There is...you know…we can definitely, Mr. Speaker, reach a goal if we so choose to reach that goal and if we believe that publicly-owned facilities are important. $7 million, Mr. Speaker, is a lot of money. $7 million could actually leverage enough money to wipe out our entire infrastructure deficit with regards to indoor and outdoor pools, Mr. Speaker, with the Provincial and Federal Governments if we wanted to do that.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have to start to re-invest into our public facilities. This is public money. I think at this point we gave the private sector an opportunity and a chance. I think the time, Mr. Speaker, is to give the public sector an opportunity and start reinvesting in our facilities across this city, and our infrastructure across the City. Thank you

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting the clause and I won't be supporting the motion by Councillor Smith and Councillor Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker this is about creating a destination centre in Winnipeg, the centre of Canada. We are building brand new facilities in our city, Mr. Speaker, in Councillor Smith's ward. The Cindy Klassen Centre has just refurbished their pool and built a brand new facility called the Cindy Klassen Centre. In my end of

town, we're going to be building, with the help of G.C.W.C.C. and the City of Winnipeg and the community itself Mr. Speaker, we're going to be building a brand new regional facility at Old Exhibition Park. We're also putting a couple million bucks, Mr. Speaker, in the north end of the City, and I'm proud to say with the help of the community and G.C.W.C.C. as well. We're also building a brand new Sinclair Park Community Centre.

When I look at this motion, I mean a great deal of it is about preserving, we are preserving our facilities. We're not going to let parts of the City decay and not have the children and families who enjoy our wading pools and our recreation facilities, those things aren't going to go by the wayside Mr. Speaker. They're not going to close unless…they're not going to close, Mr. Speaker. What can I say, they're not going to close. So I just want to say this is about building a world class destination centre and I want to thank Ty Tran for all the work that he's done to assemble 17,000 signatures, and probably behind every single one of those people that have signed it, there's probably nine or ten more signatures or people that wish we would have a world class destination centre.

And Councillor Steeves, really, what he said sort of made me get up and speak, because families are really going to be patronizing this place. And can you hear it now? All the kids shouting, screaming for joy, going down these water slides, water park. Can you just imagine? I mean, can you imagine Councillor Wyatt going down the slide and the huge wave that would be, how many people would think.... how many people…(laughter)…you know. Sorry, Mr. Speaker. You know, I just thought you know…I brought my kids here a couple of years ago and you know my dear friend, Councillor Smith here, they thought he was Santa Claus in the hallway. Can you imagine all the kids that would think that Santa Claus is in the house of this water park if we built this facility?

Mr. Speaker, I fully support this. I think this is a good move. I think that when the news hits the community about this water park facility by the Canad Inns last year in Councillor Smith's ward in Polo Park, there was a huge (inaudible). A lot of people were excited. There was a great deal of anticipation, and as you can imagine there was a great deal of disappointment when it wasn't going to go forward. But I hope…I have high hopes that this will happen and I certainly do hope there's a lot of waiting in the central part of the City and the downtown and I certainly will be looking forward to a proponent and supporting that proponent if they have central and downtown location. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Yes. I believe Councillor Wyatt's predecessor, Rick Boychuk, tried the water slide trick and it didn't work well for him.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to be supporting this initiative because we're using scarce public dollars to finance a private facility, which is largely going to be unaffordable for average working families. And I believe that we have to look at our own challenges and begin by looking at our own community and recreational facilities. Today we finally approved the recommendations from the 2025 report and I don't know if there's any surprises in there. I don't know why it took three or four years but we know that it was led by the G.W.C.C. It's here. I voted for it and I support it and we could look at a list of about 11 projects that need our valuable public resources and I know two of them very well - the Winakwa Community Centre and the Southdale Community Centre. They are both tremendous initiatives. They're both led by a volunteer board of directors and they both need some public funding to actually serve their community. Winakwa Community Centre is very close to…it's in Windsor Park and it's in the…there's a wading pool around the Winakwa Community Centre, in fact I learned yesterday that the wading pool which is used a lot by area residents, is going to be shut down for two days this summer, so a seven-day wading pool is now going to only be open either four or five days

over the summer, and I think that's something that's going to hurt the community. It's not a rich neighbourhood. People who use that wading pool don't have cottages. They need it. I don't know how we in good conscious can move forward to award $7 million of taxpayer money to a private facility when we're shutting down hours for wading pools.

The common denominator is that all the projects that we have approved in the 2025 report have no funding. And all of the projects, I'm sure, could use some, if not all of the $7 million to actually get them off the ground. And so I would rather see us as a city use our $7 million on other projects, and for that matter, think of what $7 million can actually do to the Assiniboine Park Zoo which we've been talking about for a long time. Think of what seven million could do to the park generally with restoring amenities that are there or perhaps new amenities.

I agree with Councillor Thomas, this money originated or was originally slated for Kildonan Park which is in need of some refurbishment, and we could do great things there, and in fact heck, while we're at it, this money was actually five years ago rapid transit money, and rapid transit was ready to go in the ground and whereas we should be at the University of Manitoba now, using this fund. We should have a line from the U of M to the downtown. We're still actually sitting here and debating the whole initiative of how we spend this money which was rapid transit money five years ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, half a decade later we have a litany of community centre projects which are approved but not funded. We have needs in our major parks, Kildonan Park and Assiniboine Park. We have…we're still chasing the mirage of a water park and I agree with Councillor Wyatt. We went out there. We had the expression of interest. I don't know why Canad Inns didn't go forward on it but the private people have had their chance and instead of funding a private facility with scarce public dollars which is going to be largely unaffordable for working families, I think we should invest it in our own facilities. And ironically, one more comment on rapid transit. Ironically, we are hosting an open house on essentially the same rapid transit system this evening, I believe, which the majority of this Council cancelled five years ago, using this money.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time we move forward. I think it's time we start funding real projects using our real public dollars and I will be supporting the amendment. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers. I'll ask Councillor Smith to close on his motion, followed by the Mayor to close on the clause. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, I want a new water park just as much as all the people that signed the petition. But, why not let the private sector do it if there is such a demand for a water park? And people are saying this motion is just for the inner city. Look, you all have wading pools and some of them might have to be closed because we can't afford them all. But we can't let the deterioration of our own resources, our own recreational facilities fall down to where we don't have a facility that's worth attending. Working class families, they need to be able to go…they don't have cottages. You know, I don't understand why you all think that we must give to the private sector $7 million and we're not even clear what we're going to get for that. We have no idea what the cost will be. Look, use some common sense. Preserve much of what we have, and let the private sector build a new water park.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all Mr. Speaker, let me preface this. I love Councillor Smith like an older brother but he doesn't get it. And I feel bad that there are many others on the floor of Council today who don't get it. Okay. It wasn't that long ago, Mr. Speaker, five years ago when we looked around, when our recreational facilities were falling apart. We had no policy whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. So we made a decision to take that money and spend it on our recreational facilities and what do

we have today as a result of that? It's all been mentioned. Sinclair Park, Old Ex, Bronx Community, Norberry-Glenlee, Cindy Klassen, spray pads all over the City, skateboard parks all over the City. That wouldn't have happened without what we did. And Mr. Speaker, Councillor Smith didn't support that either, but now he cares about what's falling apart. The problem is you don't solve a problem by making the same mistake over and over and over again and that's what's happening here, Mr. Speaker. In the past, recreational facilities were put up on a whim. They were done when there was an election. One MLA would want this, one MP would want that. They'd build them beside each other a block away, and no one ever cared about the maintenance, and guess what? Without maintenance they fall apart. They're an absolute disgrace and you know what? We've made major inroads, and I thank the G.C.W.C.C. for their leadership, and we took $10 million of that and put it in a fund and that's why we have everything that I read off today and because of the volunteers that come forward to do something constructive and we're not going to make the same mistakes. That's what was spent so much time on preparing a report, so we don't make the same mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, Kildonan Park for the record, the pool, contrary to what people say, is getting a complete face lift. There will be a new playground. There will be a wading pool. That's all happening, Mr. Speaker. I'd love to know the Councillors, first of all, as Councillor Smith has said, he supported, he supported last go around, the E.O.I. for the water park. I don't know why he changed his mind, but he did and the realities are, isn't it time that our city has something wonderful, something special? I believe it was Councillor Steeves that talked about if this city never came to the plate, there would not be an indoor soccer complex today. I was absolutely disgraced that we never had an indoor soccer complex but every other city had one. You had to go to Saskatoon and Regina and see they're building it but not our city. What are we, living in the dark ages? Don't we care? Don't we want to see progress? We have that. You know it's amazing how I hear people say the private sector had their chance. Mr. Speaker, I lived through it as well as you did. I was a public citizen. You were an elected official. How many different private sectors came forward to build an arena for our city? Do you want me to list them all? We don't have enough time. The fact is the fifth go around finally found something and you know what? The same speakers who said they had their chance, they supported it. Councillor Vandal supported the arena. Councillor Smith, Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Thomas. Excuse me, the private sector had their chance but someone came up with a different idea and it made sense. Let's not make those kind of silly statements Mr. Speaker, and please, let's not call this a new table cloth. Give me a break Mr. Speaker. And for the record, Mr. Speaker, this money has not been languishing in some account. Regardless how many times I say it and hopefully this time Councillor Gerbasi will listen and so will Councillor Vandal. The money we got from the Province was spread over ten years. Ten years, Mr. Speaker. We're not even halfway through those ten years, which is why our projects were spread over a long period of time.

You know, you keep on hearing things on the floor of Council, there is no truth to this. If we don't move forward and I remember Ty Tran, the first time he was here, talking about this. He wants to be young enough to experience this. I want to see Councillor Wyatt there with his son Thomas and all the other families in our city. I want people to come to the City and leave and say you gotta go to Winnipeg. Look what they've got there. An indoor soccer complex, an outdoor soccer complex, a great arena, a football stadium, a ballpark, spray pads, I could go on and on about the things we need to have in our city. I believe everybody here cares. They just don't show it. But don't pretend you're going to take $7 million and leverage it to get more funds. Not gonna happen, Mr. Speaker. Why not? Because Councillor Wyatt will tell you, we have a $1.6, 2.1 billion dollar infrastructure deficit. We have a list of stuff that we want done. We're all trying to leverage dollars already. You can't re-

leverage and re-leverage and re-leverage. There's no money left. We're already trying to do that. Let's try and use this wisely. Let's get something done positive for the City. Let people talk about this across Canada. Let's make Winnipeggers proud and you know what? We're not forgetting the existing facilities, Mr. Speaker. We're working hard. That's why we've got all those spray pads and that's why we have all those skateboard parks. That's why we have all these new recreational facilities and improved, such as the Cindy Klassen Rec Centre. And Mr. Speaker, let's not forget the most important thing of all, our future. And what is our future? Our children. And if you don't care about the children, God help us all. This is what this is about. Children and families. And you know what? If you're concerned about people having access, then let's work harder to make sure they have access. You know, we're not going to address the poverty issue today, Mr. Speaker, but I can tell you it takes all levels of government along with the private sector to address that problem. Let's deal with what is reality, and today's reality is, we have the potential opportunity for something spectacular, something special, something long overdue. Just like a new arena that you all supported. Just like an indoor soccer complex that you all supported. Let's do the right thing today, Mr. Speaker. It's time we move on. And for people who want to change their mind for whatever reason, you're going in the wrong direction. You're doing the same things that broke our system. You're building facilities with no plan how to maintain them. None whatsoever Mr. Speaker, and I will not be part of that. It's my goal to move us forward, to make sure that this is a city where young people with their families want to live and stay and prosper and brag about their home. And that's why I will support…I will not support Councillor Smith's motion, but I certainly will support the expression of interest, Mr. Speaker, Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We'll be voting on the Motion No. 1, that's Smith and Wyatt's amendment to Item 8. Recorded vote has been called for on Motion 1 on Smith and Wyatt's motion. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Steeves and Swandel.

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion is lost.

On Item 8, all in favour. Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Thomas, Vandal and Wyatt.

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

Mr. Speaker: It's Carried.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 27, 2009**

Mr. Speaker: Walk on report of May 27, 2009, Mr. Mayor I believe you have to present to Council Items 1, 2 and 3. Would the Clerk please introduce them. The first one.

Item No. 1 – Our Winnipeg Initiative – Federation of Canadian Municipalities Green Municipal Fund Grant Sustainable Community Plan File EP-1.1(PW)

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker it is my understanding I would move that the rule be suspended and the report of Executive Policy Committee dated May 27th be considered.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. On…okay moving Clause 1. All in favour? Contrary. Carried. Item 2. Madam Clerk.

Item No. 2 – Winnipeg Soccer Federation Inc. – Loan Guarantee File FC-2.2

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm obviously going to move Clause 2 but just to give you a little bit of background because I know this just came on. We have a phenomenal opportunity to take an existing facility and basically extend its lifespan and have more, I guess, soccer games being played there by making it an outdoor facility with artificial turf. Once again, long overdue. I believe the soccer community is very enthusiastic about it. Hopefully this is the beginning of many more to come. It's also an opportunity where monies are being leveraged from the other levels of government and that certainly is one of the conditions and it meets the criteria for us to basically provide a loan. I certainly hope that Council will support this motion.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 3.

Item No. 3 – Winnipeg Police Association – Memorandum of Agreement File GU-4.3.9

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: I move this Mr. Speaker. I think everybody knows what this is. I'm hope they've had an opportunity to read it. We do have consensus that basically has been ratified and hopefully we can move on.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank all of those who participated in this clause that's before us and this agreement. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE NOTICE OF MOTION

Motion No. 2
Moved by Wyatt,
Seconded by Smith,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg's existing regional road and bridge infrastructure funding deficit is now estimated at $115 million annually over the next ten years, in order to maintain an appropriate level of condition;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg's new strategic regional road and bridge infrastructure funding deficit is now estimated at $173 million annually over the next ten years, in order to maintain an appropriate level of condition;

AND WHEREAS when combined, in order to maintain an appropriate level of condition for existing and new strategic regional road and bridge infrastructure, an additional $288 million is required annually over the next ten years;

AND WHEREAS the projected capital budget for 2010 will see funding for regional streets fall from a high of $23 million in 2007 to a low of $6.2 million, due to lack of overall funding for all areas of infrastructure renewal;

AND WHEREAS a drop in funding in the City of Winnipeg Capital Regional Street Rehabilitation Budget is unacceptable and may seriously jeopardize the economic well being and standard of living of all Manitobans;

AND WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba announced on May 25th, 2009, that the annual provincial budget for highway and bridge renewal has more than doubled since 2006, allowing the

Province to project that in the first three years of their 'historic' highway plan alone, an estimated $1.3 billion will be invested;

AND WHEREAS in actual terms, the 2009 Provincial highway renewal budget has increased from $423 million to $545 million, which represents an over 30 per cent increase from 2008, and more than triple the level of investments made in 1999;

AND WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba is responsible for Provincial highways that are located in every other municipality in Manitoba;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council call on the Province of Manitoba to fully fund the entire existing regional road and bridge system, as well as any future new strategic road and bridge infrastructure, in the City of Winnipeg, to an appropriate level of condition;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT should the Province of Manitoba refuse to fully fund Winnipeg's regional road and bridge system, that the City of Winnipeg formally request an amendment to the City of Winnipeg Charter Act in order to transfer, for the nominal cost of $1.00, all regional roads and bridges located inside the City of Winnipeg to the Province of Manitoba on the condition that they will now be charged for the full care, custody, and control of the said infrastructure to an appropriate condition level.

Mr. Speaker: We have one motion, and this motion is a notice of motion that will go to the June meeting...

(inaudible speaking in the background)

…to deal with it now? On motion 2. Okay you heard that? All in favour? You need two-thirds of the vote. All in favour of dealing with that motion. Opposed? Nay. Lost. It's gone to the June meeting, Notice of Motion.

Councillors just a minute. We have in the galleries, a Carol Haug with her students "Taking Charge", designed to support single women on social assistance. Welcome to the chambers. (applause).

Mr. Speaker: they were late comers so we've done that. By-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The second and third reading.

Mayor Katz: I move that the following By-laws be read a second time. By-law No. 184/2008 and By-law No. 31/2009.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 184/2008, By-law No. 31/2009.

Mayor Katz: I move that By-laws No. 184/2008 and By-law No. 31/2009 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Consideration of By-laws third reading. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I move that By-law No. 2/2009 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. By-laws, Mr. Mayor. Madam Clerk.

Mayor Katz: I move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 81/2009, 82/2009, 83/2009.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 81/2009, By-law No. 82/2009, By-law No. 83/2009.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws Numbered 81/2009 to 83/2009, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 81/2009 to 83/2009.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker I move that the rule be suspended and that By-laws Numbered 81/2009 to 83/2009, 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. I don't think we want to go into this direction now. Question period. Councillor Browaty first, and Councillor Swandel second.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Browaty: The Province has cancelled several hundred photo radar tickets from construction zones that were under appeal due to a technicality. Meanwhile thousands of other Manitobans that pay their tickets promptly are, after an apparent flip-flop by the Provincial Government, not receiving a refund, and the Province is blaming the City of Winnipeg. At any time have you or the City of Winnipeg Public Service told the Provincial Government that we would not, or could not, refund the tickets?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: It's a little bit more complicated answer so I'll try and give the…I'll try to answer the question as best as I can.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, back in February I went on the record with the media and made it very clear that, one, if there is no construction going on, there should be no photo radar. Two, if there are no issues of safety to the public, there should be no photo radar, and I think I've repeated that over and over and over again. I have had communication with Minister Chomiak, who I believe is right now in a very, very difficult position. I don't think it's easy when you're getting attacked from not one side but four sides, and we had a conversation when he basically stated to me that he was going to drop the appeal by the Province, which is obviously their decision, we don't have any say in that, and refund approximately 800 plus tickets. I thanked him for that, and he reiterated very strongly that that was the end of it.

As we all know, there has been further dialogue on this topic. And there has been immense pressure and, unfortunately, that there were comments made about reviewing and potential refunds and I think that's what got everything going, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you, it was, I believe last week, where there were comments made in the "ledge" and it was in Hansard where it was stated that I told the Minister that we would not make refunds. After that took place, approximately two days, the Minister called and apologized to me. His words were not accurate. He knows exactly what I've said over and over again and I've accepted that and that basically is the end of that. We know that the City will follow with whatever decision is made. By the same token, as an elected official, right now I would not want to be in the Minister's shoes. It's very difficult going through that day in, day out, and I would hope that most of us here would understand that situation and certainly have some compassion. But the specific answer to the question is, no, I never ever, ever said that, nor would I ever say that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty your second question.

Councillor Browaty: It has been suggested that if a refund were issued, the lost revenue would be taken out of the Winnipeg Police Service. Would there be a decrease in Policing Services if the Provincial Government ordered us to give a refund for photo radar tickets in these construction zones?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, if you look at the budget, there is a line item budget that these revenues go specifically to our Winnipeg Police Service. So I don't want to conclude what might happen but that's

where this revenue goes to, and you know, if it wasn't there, obviously we would have to address that issue. I'm certainly not going to address it at this particular point in time until something does happen. But I will say this. That Chief McCaskill has said over and over again, that he is totally supportive of photo radar and believes it's safer for our citizens.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question, Councillor Browaty? Councillor Swandel your first question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, I would like to ask a question about funding Federal stimulus infrastructure, stimulus dollar spending. All around us we're seeing hundreds of millions of dollars being spent in neighbouring Provinces and even right in neighbouring municipalities around the City of Winnipeg, but yet we've heard nothing of the City of Winnipeg. We also have the Building Canada fund which, I believe, is supposed to be some kind of agreement in place but it's difficult to surmise what is new dollars in Building Canada and what we're still spending from old dollars. I'm wondering if the Mayor can bring us up to speed on whether or not there is stimulus spending going to be happening inside the City of Winnipeg for our infrastructure priorities, given that 2009 is slipping away and that a lot of design work needs to be done if we're going to be implementing projects in 10 and 11. We need to know these numbers and, of course, we also need to know that there is a Provincial contribution available for them as well. Can you bring us up to speed on what's happening with those stimulus dollars and if there are any new Building Canada dollars as well available to the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Through you Mr. Speaker to Councillor Swandel, I've asked that same question, so I will try and address it.

First of all, I think as everybody knows with the stimulus dollars that are out there, we have submitted a very long list of infrastructure projects ranging anywhere from, I guess, water, the water treatment plants, to rapid transit, to roads and bridges, on and on and on and on. It's an extremely long list, Mr. Speaker. And I can tell you, we're hoping to hear something in the very near future, and when I say "near future" that could be any time now. I know that on some of the information that the public service submitted that there have been some further information that has been requested and that has been sent. So, I'm hoping that we will start hearing some good news in the very near future.

When it comes to Building Canada fund, I can tell you that it was, I guess, 48 hours ago when I spoke to Minister Toews, the President of Treasury, and asked him specifically if he could tell us, tell me, how much money is in this stimulus package because we're kind of shooting blind here, not knowing, as well as what monies are available in the Building Canada fund. For those of you who may recall, when the floodway was done, some of that, approximately $70 million, did go out of Building Canada fund for the floodway, so I'm guessing, and I want to have it confirmed, that we still have 70 or 80 million dollars left in there which I hope to hear very shortly, as well as get an accurate amount on exactly what funds are available to the City of Winnipeg in the stimulus package. I'm hoping to hear that this week.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor. Just further, there is a need for a Provincial contribution in any of these programs, the stimulus one being new. I'm assuming there are some ongoing talks with the Province as to whether or not they will make their one-third dollars available or if there are one-third dollars available. Could the Mayor bring us up to speed on where those costs are and when, and if that is perhaps part of what is slowing the process because we have not truly identified the Provincial dollars.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain that, one, all of these projects would be, you know, the one-third, one-third, one-third. I can tell you that one, on some projects I know that the Province is fully supportive. I also know that the City of Winnipeg is a creature of the Province, and the Federal Government deals directly with the Province on these items, so obviously there is dialogue going on, and you know I'm hoping that very shortly this is brought to fruition and we'll be able to make some positive announcements for the City of Winnipeg. But I have not heard anything negative saying that there are projects that they will not be part of, whether the funding is one-third or whatever the case may be. I haven't heard that at this stage of the game.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Given that the CentrePort Canada Act stipulates that a plan be developed by the planning authorities in the area, that is the City of Winnipeg and the R.M. of Rosser, to state where infrastructure is to be placed and seeing that there are huge announcements of infrastructure dollars happening in that area and no planning has being done to this date, can you tell us if any of the dollars that have been announced there are going to come out of the City of Winnipeg's allocation of Building Canada or stimulus dollars?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Swandel. That was a concern that I had and I asked that same question when that announcement was made. I was told there was funding from, I believe, the Asian Pacific and that this would have no negative impact on that. Have I substantiated that 100% to my satisfaction? Not at this particular point in time. But on the CentrePort issue, we certainly have made it loud and clear, yours truly, along with our CAO, that in order for that to move through, we have to resolve the jurisdictional issue which I believe at this point in time, hopefully, is moving in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi. Your first motion.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't first for once.

In November of 2008, Council passed a motion to spend $1.25 million exploring the idea of a corporate utility model for our Water and Waste Department. Clearly there is a large amount of public interest in this issue and concern about the direction Council is going with the proposed changes to governance and management of our Water and Waste Department. When it comes to Plan Winnipeg, the review the Mayor appears to have embraced the idea of extensive public consultation which is excellent, and I'm just wondering if in regards to this new corporate utility model, will the Mayor commit that there will be adequate time allowed for the public and non-EPC members to review and have input into the process and what will the public process look like around this major change to governance of a City department?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to Councillor Gerbasi, I know this is an issue that Councillor Gerbasi has been very involved with. I also know that she has asked several questions of the Administration. I believe to this date they have basically responded to her and given her the answers to any of her specific questions and also opened their doors at any time she wants to get together with them. I could read it but it would be a waste of our time because I think Councillor Gerbasi is aware of it and so am I. That's number 1.

Number 2, is that I believe that it's always important for us to have consultation and I certainly am open to that, especially on an issue such as this. We have discussed this. The only concern that I have on this issue, quite often, Mr. Speaker, is it appears there is still a great amount of fear mongering going on, and people who may not be supportive of this, basically not telling it the way it is, and just for the record, this will always be an asset of the

City of Winnipeg, and yes, the public consultation.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes, I have received some information from the Administration but I wanted to get your commitment, Mr. Mayor, to have not the usual process where a report comes and a week later it's voted on at a Council meeting. Will there be significant…will you push our Administration…under your leadership, will you ensure that there is adequate time, make a personal commitment to allow adequate public input so that if there are misconceptions, that would give you the opportunity to clarify those and it would give the public the opportunity to analyze the complex findings that come forward with this type of change in governance structure.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I've changed my mind. I am going to read some of this right now. Number 1, just so it's on the record. And this was a copy sent to Councillor Gerbasi, although she must be on friendly terms with them because they called her Councillor Jenny.

"1. A team of City staff and consultants are working on duties set out in the Council resolution of November 19th, 2008, regarding this matter. The project team is comprised of me, that's Brian Gray, Moira Geer and Henry Hunter. We are collaborating with several officials from the Water and Waste Department as well as Corporate Finance. Our research and analysis product is shared as they become available, with an advisory team consisting of more Water and Waste Department staff, W.A.P.S.O., C.U.P.E. and Provincial Government officials. Outside assistance is being provided to the team by experts in the fields of law, finance, communications and business planning.

2. Analysis and first draft findings from the project research is being prepared now for review by the above noted advisory team later this week, and in turn will be shared with the public prior to being finalized for review and sign off by the CAO after which a report can be submitted for Council consideration. Public information will be shared with interested citizens in the very near future and the feedback arising from public discussions to take place in June will be available to the Public Service and of course Council through your direct liaison with interested citizens in advance of this matter being heard on the floor of Council.

4. The strategic partner procurement process for our sewage treatment project is well under way, and the first step of a request for expressions of interest has been completed. We received a great deal of interest and have stated to participants our presumption that the City will wish to retain all operations and maintenance work as well as ownership of all assets in any potential future strategic partnership that is entered into. All interested parties have also been told that the City will not consider any private investment or control whatsoever in our drinking water system. The next phase of this procurement process is in the final stages of preparation now. "

Mr. Speaker: Your final question, Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. The last answer that I was given from the staff, I would just like to confirm that this is accurate, because one of the biggest concerns about the motion Council passed was that we were looking at a private partner for the design, build and also operation of our water treatment facilities. Am I reading this, hearing what this says correctly, that the proponents have been told that we will not consider, that possibly operate part, that is now off the table? If that's now off the table I think a lot of people would like to hear that from your lips, Mr. Mayor.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to let that pass through my lips because I've said it many times before. We were looking for a "strategic partner" was the

word that was always said in the motion and I'll read it once again. "All interested parties have been told that the City will not consider any private investment or control whatsoever in our drinking water system." That was number 1, and I think what Councillor Gerbasi has interpreted, it would be the same understanding so I think they made it very clear what we're working on right now.

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

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to make sure I understand the Mayor's position on photo radar. I know that when you answered Councillor Browaty's question, am I right to say that you don't think any Winnipegger who is traveling a normal speed when no construction workers were present, should not have been ticketed?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was very clear but I have made my opinion abundantly clear and I'm happy to do it one more time, is that one, I am of the opinion that if there is no construction going on, there should be no photo radar present. I hope that clarifies that.

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

Councillor Vandal: That's it.

Mr. Speaker: That's it. Councillor Nordman. Your first question.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you Mr. Mayor, or Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor. First I'd just like to offer my congratulations on he and his office's support of the production held this past Saturday of the musical "Strike". It was a fabulous day and fabulous production and congratulations to Danny Schur and his whole cast. I enjoyed it so much that I dreamt of joining the N.D.P. but then I woke up.

Mr. Mayor, the question that I do have is regarding…and it was initiated because of a news release that I caught on to about the town of Halton Hills in southern Ontario bringing a motion forward at the upcoming F.C.M. Conference regarding infrastructure projects in the United States that, in fact, are not available for Canadian companies to bid on at this point in time. Any of the U.S. infrastructure promotions request that the individuals…municipalities in the U.S., use U.S. suppliers. I guess those of you who are attending F.C.M. will have the chance to take a look at this in a bigger perspective and listen to the dialogue that goes on there with it. It spun my thoughts to ask the question openly and through you, maybe to our Chief Administrative Officer, that do we have a Buy Winnipeg, Buy Manitoba, Buy Canada First policy within the City of Winnipeg? And I don't suspect you may have that answer but at some point I'd like to have that responded to. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: First of all, Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Nordman, I want to echo his sentiments regarding the musical "Strike" and the work of Danny Schur and for those of you, and I saw several Councillors out there and it was a wonderful site. You know, there are valuable lessons to be learned from history and hopefully we are learning every day and not making the same mistakes twice. He did a marvelous job.

Number 2 on the question, I am not aware of such a policy. I am certainly more than happy to investigate it further and get back to Councillor Nordman. There have been situations in the past where I know local companies have partnered with companies not even in North America but other places to get the expertise so they could basically bid on a job, so I don't know whether you're referring to exclusively or even when they partner, but my understanding is those opportunities are there for others.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions?

Standing Policy Committee on Finance, report of May 14, 2009, Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE
ON FINANCE
DATED MAY 14, 2009**

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move Consent Agenda Item No 1.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions. None. Consideration of By-laws none. Finance, Question Period. Any questions? If non we'll continue on to the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Councillor Pagtakhan.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE
ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED MAY 4, 2009**

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

Before I move this item, I just want to thank the Friends of Upper Fort Garry for their hard work on this. They've raised the money to move this project forward and I want to thank all my colleagues on Council and His Worship Mayor Sam Katz on this, and this is a really good news story for the City. It's also…this is another destination theme that we're doing here today. I think it's extremely important to recognize the good work of the Friends of Upper Fort Garry. The Upper Fort is the site and birth place of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba and several historical events happen here throughout the Winnipeg and Manitoba history. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move my report and Consent Agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions none. By-laws none. Question Period. None. Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Report of May 5, 2009. Councillor Wyatt would you please move it on behalf of Councillor Fielding.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE
ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MAY 5, 2009**

Councillor Wyatt: Sure. Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 8.

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

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

**Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Steeves,**

WHEREAS:

(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 37/2009, The City of Winnipeg authorized the expropriation of the lands described therein and made a Declaration of Expropriation dated the 25th day of March, 2009; and

(b) The City of Winnipeg served notice of the intended expropriation upon all owners of the lands intended to be expropriated and published notice of the intended expropriation in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the lands are situate, pursuant to section 1 of Schedule "A to The Expropriation Act; and

(c) The statutory period for owners to object to the intended expropriation has expired, and the confirming authority has not been served with any notices of objection.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated the 25th day of March, 2009, made pursuant to By-law No. 37/2009 and expropriating the following lands:

The lands taken for Work and Additional Land and shown as Parcels A and B, on Plan Deposit 222/2009 WLTO, prepared by Leslie Neil McLaughlin, Manitoba Land Surveyor, is hereby confirmed.

The lands described above are expropriated free of encumbrances. The lands described above 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

● 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. 4
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Steeves,

WHEREAS:

(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 38/2009, The City of Winnipeg authorized the expropriation of the interest in land described therein and made a Declaration of Expropriation dated the 25th day of March, 2009; and

(b) The City of Winnipeg served notice of the intended expropriation upon all owners of the interest in land intended to be expropriated and published notice of the intended expropriation in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the lands are situate, pursuant to section 1 of Schedule "A to The Expropriation Act; and

(c) The statutory period for owners to object to the intended expropriation has expired, and the confirming authority has not been served with any notices of objection.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated the 25th day of March, 2009, made pursuant to By-law No. 38/2009 and expropriating the following interest in land: The Easement taken for Drainage Channel as the same is shown bordered on Plan Deposit 221/2009 WLTO, prepared by Leslie Neil McLaughlin, Manitoba Land Surveyor, is hereby confirmed. The interest in land described above is expropriated free of encumbrances. The interest in land described above 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

● 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 Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Steeves,

WHEREAS:

(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 39/2009, The City of Winnipeg authorized the expropriation of the temporary interest in land described therein and made a Declaration of Expropriation dated the 25th day of March, 2009; and

(b) The City of Winnipeg served notice of the intended expropriation upon all owners of the interest in land intended to be expropriated and published notice of the intended expropriation in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the land is situate, pursuant to section 1 of Schedule "A to The Expropriation Act; and

(c) The statutory period for owners to object to the intended expropriation has expired, and the confirming authority has not been served with any notices of objection.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated the 25th day of March, 2009, made pursuant to By-law No. 39/2009 and expropriating the following temporary interest in land:

The Easement taken for Work Space as the same is shown bordered on Plan Deposit 220/2009 WLTO, prepared by Leslie Neil McLaughlin, Manitoba Land

Surveyor, is hereby confirmed. The interest in land described above is expropriated free of encumbrances. The interest in land described above 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*

● *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.*

Mr. Speaker: There is a motion 3, three motions, 3, 4 and 5 by Councillor Wyatt and Steeves. Housekeeping motions to reconfirm By-laws passed at the March 25 Council meeting as required by the Expropriation Act. Motions No. 3, 4 and 5, Councillors All in favour? Carried. We could have done it one by one but I included them all together. Consideration of By-laws. Councillor Wyatt.

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

Councillor Wyatt: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 79/2009, By-law No. 80/2009 and By-law No. 84/2009.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 79/2009, By-law No. 80/2009 and By-law No. 84/2009.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Madam Clerk. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll move that By-laws Numbered 79/2009, 80/2009 and 84/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 79/2009, 80/2009 and 84/2009.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws Numbered 79/2009, 80/2009 and 84/2009 be read a third time and that same be passed and order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. None. Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Service Report of May 11, 2009. Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MAY 11, 2009

Councillor Steeves: I'll introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions, none. Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Steeves.

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

Councillor Steeves: I move that By-law No. 85/2009 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 85/2009.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-law No. 85/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 85/2009.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move the rules be suspended and By-law No. 85/2009 be read a third time and that same be passed and order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Questions. None. Standing Policy Committee Infrastructure Renewal

and Public Works. Report of May 12, 2009, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED MAY 12, 2009

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I'm pleased to move Items 1 through 5 as Consent.

Councillor Gerbasi: Number 5.

Mr. Speaker: Number 5, Number 3. So then it's 1, 2 and 4. Move as Consent Agenda Items. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Number 3.

Item No. 3 – Amendments to the Water Works By-law No. 504/73 and Sewer By-law No. 7070/97 resulting from the Implementation of the Water and Waste Utility Billing System, Customer Care and Billing
File WW-2.3

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I'll move the recommendation.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I should probably wait to get identified before I stand up, but I…just a quick conversation I wanted to have with the Chair while this is here. The other night at Community Committee, I was looking at some of our development agreements, and in them they have the clause that something to the effect with doing everything consistent with the City of Winnipeg Sewer By-law. I'm wondering…I don't know that the Councillor will know this, but if these changes that are being brought forward and this by-law will affect any of the development agreements that we already have in existence and if it's information that's difficult to bring forward, you can just bring it forward to me at his convenience. I don't need to have it come back to the chamber, but I think there are going to be development agreements that are going to have some hiccups with some individuals, where changes to the by-law are going to impact on what they have to do within their development agreements. I'll just let him respond to that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that there's anything detrimental about this. This is mostly housekeeping stuff as far as I've been made aware of but I can certainly ask the Director, Barry McBride, to contact Councillor Swandel and have a discussion with him about these changes to give him some information if there is something of concern there.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. On Item 3, All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 5. Madam Clerk.

Item No. 5 – Chief Peguis Trail Extension Project Conceptual Design Recommendation
File SB-23

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Yes. I'm pleased to move this forward and try to get this project going. It's a project that's been around these chambers for a number of years and in and out of capital, et cetera and we're at the point now where we're ready to move forward with it. There is one small amendment in here where we are asking the Public Works Department to go out one step beyond what we actually did in the capital when we approved this project. What's actually in front of us is the project that was approved by us in the capital already, and we're tinkering a wee bit where we've suggested that the Director, or the Acting Director of Public Works, can review the issue of the grade separation at Rothesay in the design, to see whether that can be accommodated for a reasonable amount of money, which is a small change to it, and that's what's in front of us and I would urge everybody to support this so we can get on with the project.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been said many times in this chamber that it's about priorities, and it is my view that our priorities right now should be to expand transit ways, active transportation routes and to fix existing roads and infrastructure. The expansion of new expressways for single use automobiles should not be a priority for spending 64 to a hundred million dollars or whatever this is going to end up being at the current time.

It seems to me that this Council is making the mistake of trying to be all things to all people. We need to understand that we don't have the financial resources to build an extensive new network of wider and newer expressways and also be able to build city wide rapid transit and fix our existing infrastructure deficit. It simply does not make sense to put, as everyone keeps saying, an addition on your house when you can't afford to fix the roof especially when that addition is something that is contrary to climate change reduction strategies and the building of a sustainable city. We may have had a cold spring this year, but that doesn't mean the climate change problem is going away. We all know it isn't and that a real change in attitude and behaviour is necessary.

It makes more sense to priorize repair of our existing infrastructure and to choose to invest rapidly in rapid transit and commuter cycling; in other words, alternatives to the automobile so that people have better choices throughout the city. There is no clear financial plan in place that explains how the City will pay for all the infrastructure needs we are talking about. Almost 30% of our capital spending right now is tied up in lease payments or will be for P3 projects. Phase 2 of the southwest transit corridor and eastern corridor are unfunded. With the approval of the Tuxedo Yards development recently, we are hearing more and more talk of a massive widening of Kenaston through to the St. James Bridge as well as other expensive projects totaling hundreds of millions of dollars. All of these projects are unfunded or not in our capital plan.

To take it back down to earth, my office has been swamped lately as usual with calls from people whose residential streets are falling apart. All I can tell them is that we have only enough in the budget to reconstruct three streets per year in the entire ward of Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry. A twelve-year tax freeze has certainly resulted in less ability to invest in existing infrastructure and local streets, but just to use my ward as an example, think about how many old and decrepit streets there are in an area that covers a large part of the downtown, Osborne Village, Corydon, Riverview, Lord Roberts and a large chunk of Fort Garry, and I won't even start talking about back lanes.

It is difficult to explain to people, okay well I'm talking about them. It's difficult to explain to people how long it will take to get their street redone especially when the answer is basically, not in our lifetime, in many cases. The Chief Peguis Trail example, the extension, is another example of putting the priority on widening and extending new infrastructure to facilitate the suburban commute in a single occupant auto. It won't end with this project. In fact, the next phase of extending the Chief Peguis Trail has already been put into secondary planning documents in the Transcona area. I believe they are calling it the Wyatt expressway.

This isn't about east verses the south of the city. I just want to make that clear because it's very difficult to talk about infrastructure projects without…I don't… certainly am not…this is not one area of the City against another. But I am saying what we should be doing in the eastern part of the City is investing in the eastern transit corridor and a transit system in the eastern part of the City so that people can get out of those cars so there won't be the congestion to the extent that we have today. We must get that eastern transit corridor project back on the table as a higher priority. In 2005, the Mayor's Rapid Transit Task Force recommended that the top priorities would be to build rapid transit from downtown to the U of M and the first phase of the eastern corridor. It is fabulous that we are at last building phase 1 of rapid transit to Jubilee. As you

know, the open houses are tonight and Monday. But we don't yet have funding in place for phase 2 or for the eastern corridor.

It's been recently pointed out that the south Osborne underpass needs to be widened to allow for proper cycling commuter paths, and I think we probably all heard about that issue in the Confusion Corner area. This project would also deal with the significant traffic bottle neck coming from the entire south part of the City as well as benefiting pedestrians, cyclists and transit users. This again, unbudgeted and unfortunately overlooked in the scope of Phase 1 of the BRT. It's a project that should be on our books but how do we pay for it all, especially when we are doing projects like this? We have to make very difficult choices as leaders and elected officials. We have to choose a direction for our City. Will we cripple our ability to invest in sustainable green projects by blowing our money on expressways for single use automobiles? This decision today is part of that choice.

Another concern about this project is the financing approach. It has been clarified by our C.F.O. that private partnerships are another simply another form of borrowing, the P3's, and have the same impact on our credit rating as traditional borrowing. And I agree that in some cases it certainly makes sense to borrow for long term capital investments, however as I've already argued today, I believe our priorities for that investment should be environmentally sustainable projects or fixing existing infrastructure, criteria which this project unfortunately does not meet.

There is also a lot of concern about the lack of transparency inherent in the model of public-private partnerships. The public and even members of Council have not been allowed access to the full financial details and business plans related to previous P3 projects such as the Charleswood Bridge. There are many questions about whether this approach will actually cost us more than traditional borrowing in the end after the 30 years of lease payments we will be making. But the truth is we may never know how much we are paying as there are few requirements for transparency as private business partners we have been told are not required to show us their books under current laws.

So again I would emphasize that an appropriate investment in the eastern part of the City would be getting going on the eastern transit way and rapid transit system which would, which could be expanded to the entire area of the City there. Our other priorities should be fixing our existing infrastructure.

For those of you who attended the Mayor's Sustainability Summit Symposium recently, I know there was a number of Councillor there, I'm sure you heard the message loud and clear from 99.9% of those in attendance. They spoke with one voice that new investments should be in sustainable, alternative transportation such as public transit and active transportation to reduce automobile use.

Another motion before us today is calling for our 25 year plan to be a sustainable plan. For those words to mean anything, our actions and spending choices ought to reflect those values and goals. So I hope that this Council will heed that advice that we were given recently at the Mayor's Symposium and start making infrastructure choices that reflect the changes we need to really become a truly green city. I will not be supporting the clause today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the previous speaker said, I cannot support a P3 until it's proven to save us money. Part of the problem with that is that access to the information is continuously blocked, and prove to save us money, that's the issue for there.

But my bigger concern as area Councillor in the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee, is that this project was proposed as an effort to solve traffic problems, but it's become a traffic problem rather than a traffic solution. I will show several issues for that.

Not only has the price gone out of this world, while this has occurred, overpasses are missing. The closure of Disraeli which I strongly object to, is going to be for 16 to 18 months. During that time, now we have two additional closures for alternative north south intersections. The closure of Raleigh between Donwood and Gilmour will be that now, instead of having Raleigh and Gateway to go through, Raleigh will be closed. Raleigh is actually the longer street. Gateway doesn't go as far as Raleigh does and now, the proposer to close Raleigh rather than have an overpass, underpass, is a problem.

Now the other closure that's going to occur is the closure of Molson Avenue. It stated that Molson Avenue acts as a service road for Lagimodiere Boulevard. There is in excess of 15,000 vehicles up and down that street. It rivals many retail street systems…many streets in the regional street system. Now, you close that off, you're forcing people who have chosen not to travel down Lagimodiere because they don't want to travel in excess of 75 to 80k. They want to travel 50k. If they choose to do Molson, now you're cutting their access off. That's going to lead to major problems throughout my ward. You're blocking access to people at the end of the ward. There is not going to be any more overpasses, underpasses any more, just the streets are ending. So now you have two less places for people to go as well as not having Henderson Highway open at the beginning, so you have people who are squirreling all around through my residential streets. This is not a solution, this is a hundred million dollar traffic problem and it's getting worse each time I see the new proposals for the Chief Peguis Trail. I would love to be able to support the Chief Peguis Trail. Right now I can't. It's more of a problem than a solution and it's getting worse each and every time I see it. Stop that. Stop it now before it creates more problems for the constituents of my area. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker when I got elected in 2002 to Council, one of the first things I did was request the Public Service to give me a breakdown of the uncompleted inner ring road in the, not just northeast Winnipeg but also northwest Winnipeg right through to Brookside Boulevard, and they broke it down by section and they gave a price estimate at that time. I can tell you the price estimate at that time for this section of the road was a heck of a lot less than what we're spending right now. But, the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the design of the roadway did include an underpass at Rothesay. The traffic planners have always had the intention of doing that. Why? Because they know what they're trying to build here. They're trying to build an express corridor with higher speeds to move traffic and not just automobile traffic which Councillor Gerbasi spoke to, but truck traffic from going through the middle of our City. Right now we have trucks…you can go and stand at the corner of Notre Dame and Portage Avenue, and you can watch trucks rolling past there coming from the east end of the City going right through the middle of St. Boniface right through downtown, the heart of Portage and Main and then up through the west end through Councillor Smith's neighbourhoods and out to the industrial parks near the airport, Mr. Speaker. It's ridiculous that we are subjecting our roads and existing neighbourhoods and older neighbourhoods, roads that were never properly designed for this kind of truck traffic or these kinds of trucks. Our forefathers never knew these types of trucks could ever exist, and yet that's where they're having to go.

We have partly completed the inner ring road system, Mr. Speaker, to the south end of the City. We've done a lot with regards to Bishop Grandin over the many years and decades, and then the extension and then the extension to Kenaston. This is starting to build the northern part, if you like, of that inner ring road system, Mr. Speaker, that the only section that really exists is the Chief Peguis Trail Bridge which was built when Howard Pawley was Premier and Bill Norrie was here and Gary Doer was the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs or Urban Affairs as it was called back then. Mr. Speaker, this is a good project, but

let's build it right. We know that if we don't build Rothesay today, we're not going to go back and build it again. That's the reality. We never seem to do this as a City. The cost to go in and to start to build detours for an underpass becomes prohibitive, and we know the benefits of doing it right now and the economies that we get by doing it right now as part of the overall project.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support this clause. I really believe in this project. As I mentioned, I started pushing for this when I got elected in '02 and it's a very positive project, but I just wish we would build it right instead of nickel and diming it and yes, it's going to cost a bit more but you know what Mr. Speaker? I believe in this City. I believe in the growth and the future of this City. I believe that we should be building more new infrastructure where it makes sense. I believe we should be building the eastern transit, rapid transit corridor. Absolutely. But, Mr. Speaker, we have been living off of the infrastructure investments, if you look at a lot of them in this City in the last number of years. We've been living off those investments that were made years ago. Investments made by days before Unicity, by even Metro. All those major investments made. We've been living off them, and the City hasn't really been growing that fast, so you know what, we've been able and managed to live on it, but the reality now, the old saying that it only takes anybody 20 minutes to get from one end of the City, well that's changed. That's no longer the case anymore Mr. Speaker, and it's changing pretty fast. We have to start building and being prepared as a City to grow, and there's nothing wrong with that. There is nothing wrong with that at all. I believe in the future of this City and I think we should be investing into this type of infrastructure. Whether it's a P3 or not, I agree on a lot of comments made by the previous speaker but I disagree. I believe that P3's are a tool that have used all over Western Europe and the United States. They do work, they do make sense, but they're not the silver bullet. They're just another tool in the arsenal to be able to finance and to ford and build the infrastructure that we need to build today.

So Mr. Speaker, I'd like to support this. I want to support this. I think it's important that this project proceed and I would prefer it to proceed but I want it to see it proceed the right way rather than handcuffing our C.A.O. and say if the money is there, maybe we can do it. Maybe, if the money is there. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's do it right the first time instead of having to leave it to another generation to come back and try to fix it later on. As Councillor Thomas rightly pointed out, we are already having an at-grade crossing at Gateway Road. The distance from Gateway to Henderson Highway is not that far and right in the middle you have Rothesay. It makes absolutely no sense. Just like it doesn't make any sense Mr. Speaker not to have a grade separation at the future Kenaston extension and Bishop Grandin. Why would we have an at-grade intersection there? We shouldn't. We should have a grade separation there as well, just like we should have a grade separation here Mr. Speaker. It was planned from the get go, from the beginning. This makes sense, Mr. Speaker, to have it in the report as part of the plan. Right now it doesn't do that so unfortunately, I spoke against it when I was at the Standing Committee. I appeared in delegation there, and I didn't vote for it at EPC and I'm going to vote for it today unless it gets amended. Thanks Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. The motion before us today authorizes the C.A.O. to move forward with the Chief Peguis Trail project if it comes within the budget of approximately $64 million for the entire project. This now gives us the opportunity through the P3 process and for the companies that are going to be involved in this, an opportunity to say hey, if I can do this with an underpass for $64 million this project is going to get a green light. It does not need to go back to Council. We have an opportunity here to do it right and to do it at a very reasonable price at $64 million. If we can do this at $64 million it's going to get a green light.

I've had absolutely every assurance from the C.A.O, the Mayor and the Director of Public Works that whatever the number is, I'm going to have an opportunity to work with them to see what this number is before it's finally awarded, and if it does come in say very, very, very close, I will have the opportunity to look at this again. I have every confidence that that is going to be done right and that they want to do it right. They have repeated over and over again, the right way to do this is with the underpass. I think it needs to have a serious consideration if there's going to be a…if it's not going to go forward with the underpass. We need to come and take a look and have discussion about it at that point, but I think having the opportunity for the C.A.O. to go forward with this, if it comes in and it's done properly is the right way to proceed.

I want to respond to a couple of comments by Councillor Gerbasi. She complains about our residential streets falling apart. I have that in North Kildonan too, but the reason is, residential streets aren't designed to handle 22,000 vehicles a day. They're not designed to be 24-hour truck routes. I've got Springfield Road that's a 24-hour truck route and has semi trailers going up and down it all day long. It's not designed for it. It's one of the, if not the, it is one of the busiest 24-hour truck routes that's a two-lane residential street with single-family residential housing on it. It's not all designed for this.

Chief Peguis Trail Phase 2, according to people I have spoken to in the administration, has suggested that it was a higher priority than the Kenaston Underpass. For all sorts of political reasons, Kenaston got built and Chief Peguis Trail was waiting. Chief Peguis Trail needs to proceed now.

Again this is not just about single-occupancy vehicles. This is about trade, this is about business, this is about jobs. This is an opportunity to do a big section of the ring road that we need in our City to improve our commerce going forward. In terms of sustainability, there is a massive active transportation component that is part of this project. We're spending millions of dollars in adding trails that are key links between other major active transportation routes that provide easy access to our downtown, to the east and west sides of the river and it's a key piece of active transportation infrastructure that links all sorts of important pieces together. This is being done properly. This is being done in a proper fashion, I really do believe.

In terms of it being this project or another project, I was watching question period on television the other day. Someone asked about Phase 2 of rapid transit between Jubilee and the University of Manitoba. Intergovernmental Affairs Minister, Steve Ashton, in fact said in the house that they're looking at that but he also made the point of adding to that; that they are still looking at the northeast rapid transit piece, so that part is still certainly there:

Chief Peguis Trail Phase 1, just for a little background here, with the Kildonan Settlers' Bridge, was opened in 1990. The plans were always that the next piece needed to open quite quickly because of the additional stress it would put on residential streets in North Kildonan. That was 19 years ago. That second piece hasn't come up yet. This is really a very needed project and, again, I'm standing here to support this. Again, I do think it does need to be done right and I really do hope that we find a way to include the underpass at Rothesay. The Rothesay underpass is a…Rothesay is a very local collector street. There's kids that across it going to school on a regular basis, and it's, you know, has a 50 km/h speed limit today. Chief Peguis Trail is being designed to a standard to some day handle traffic going as fast as 100 km/h potentially. That won't happen until separations are added at other points, but it's certainly the way it is being designed from what I'm told by our engineers.

Rothesay being so tight and so close, it would be very difficult to later add that underpass in comparison to other grade separations at places like Main Street, Henderson Highway, Gateway, and Lagimodiere Boulevard. So again, I think we really do need to do this now if we want to be looking forward, and we want to make sure that we have the proper

networks we need going forward. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's good for us to have this conversation. I think it sort of shows us some of the differences that exist here in chamber.

We listened earlier on today to a conversation about whether or not we should proceed with a water park, and a motion where we should be putting money into maintenance as opposed to…in this water park it had a private partner. The maintenance piece was very important in that argument. It was about the fact that here we can't…we shouldn't be spending money in this partnership to have a water park that would basically have perpetual maintenance because it would be built in with a private partner, and that we should be spending on our historic deferred maintenance. But yet now we have a project in front of us that, because it's a private-public partnership and you look at the language, you have to look at the language very closely. When Councillor Gerbasi speaks of it, she speaks of it only as a lease. Private-public partnership is a contract, and in that contract there is certainly a capital lease. There is usually almost always a component for maintenance for the life of the contract. So here we have a piece of infrastructure we are going to put into the ground that is going to have maintenance built into it, not only maintenance built into it, but an outcome that will happen at the end of the term, and that term's 20 years, 25 years, 30 years. We as a City will be handed this piece of infrastructure well maintained, fully looked after. We'll get it handed to us in pristine condition. Now if that's not looking after your infrastructure I don't know what it is. And yes we do a value for money evaluation and an analysis to figure out whether or not that's the best way to spend our dollars and the best way to deliver for the citizens of the City of Winnipeg and for their needs.

When we were at the Mayor's Symposium on Sustainability, we weren't just talking about environmental sustainability. We were talking about environmental sustainability, economic sustainability and social sustainability. In the case of the Chief Peguis Bridge, I think somebody already raised it. You know, there is an environmental component here because we're not just talking about cars verses buses when we talk about this type of infrastructure. We're talking about the efficient movement of people and goods, and if you can do that efficiently on a road system enhanced with a rapid transit system, you're doing very well. So it's not roads verses rapid transit. We're not just moving people to and from one place. We're moving a myriad of goods and people. So on the environmental side, it makes sense to be making these improvements. On the economic side, using Councillor Gerbasi's own argument on the (inaudible) issue, it certainly makes perfect sense. And you look at it globally on the social side doing both a bus rapid transit system and enhancing infrastructure like this, it certainly makes sense.

There is also an opportunity factor here. Moving this forward and putting it into the hands of the C.A.O., you know, I don't know if it can meet the time lines of Federal stimulus spending, but if we were able to get a small chunk of this money out of the Federal stimulus fund to bring this overpass into play, you know, talk about another piece of economic sustainability, if you can include that money into the overall P3, get the maintenance looked after on this thing and get the overpass handed back to you in pristine condition in 25 or 30 years, great. Why wouldn't we be doing that? Why wouldn't we be at least making the opportunity available to the C.A.O. as he's going forward and dealing with this stimulus, infrastructure stimulus fund.

So, you know, we're looking at, you know, on the rapid transit side spending some $300 million to get out to the University of Manitoba to do Phase 1 and Phase 2. We've got Phase 1 in the books. We're borrowing that money. We can call it a lease if you want it, but you know, it's borrowing, it's what we're doing. We don't have a built in maintenance component.

We should probably be doing it as a P3 because we could build a maintenance component and look after the maintenance and have this thing function and give it to us in a number of years in pristine condition, but that's not what we're doing. We're not exercising what I would consider economic sustainability when it comes to the rapid transit corridor. And I voted, supported to put the rapid transit corridor out to the University of Manitoba into play, albeit I had my reservations about whether or not it's the wisest investment of $300 million of taxpayers' money when what you're trying to do is something that is environmentally, economically and socially…adds to the social sustainability, economic sustainability, environmental sustainability of our City. You know, I'd like to see that analyzed at all three of those levels and where you would go and what other opportunities would you have. You know you look at Councillor Wyatt mentioned the extension of Kenaston through to the Perimeter. You know, get these people out of their cars when they're coming into the City onto the bus. Well you know, you make it efficient for them, they get down there, you have an overpass at Bishop Grandin and Kenaston. They can drive their cars right up to the rapid transit where there would hopefully be a park and ride system. Jump on the park and ride to come downtown rather than taking their cars all the way downtown. It's not one verses the other. You know, this is a good step in their right direction. It's good policy. It makes perfect sense. It's environmental, economic and social sustainability. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers. Councillor Clement, closing on Item 5.

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's always interesting to hear a lot of different views. We hear them all the time. We don't always listen to them but we certainly hear them.

You know, it's interesting to hear the way that some people portray exciting projects like this. I'm hearing about the first phase of rapid transit going ahead. Of course we've already voted for that. The very same people who were pursuing that and pushing for that, even though we haven't even started that part yet, it's where's the money for Phase 2. It doesn't matter what you do, you can't satisfy some folks. It's the same with bicycle paths. We've made great strides with bicycle paths in recent time. The same thing with active transportation. We have a policy, Mr. Speaker, that every single capital project that we do and infrastructure piece that we do includes active transportation. A huge change in recent time.

The long and short of it is, is that there has to be a balance, and Councillor Swandel has just eluded to that. You can't just have rapid transit and you can't just have more buses. If you believe that by building a rapid transit system that people aren't going to drive cars, then you just don't understand it, and frankly, that's not a sustainable argument. The…this particular project and P3's for that matter, and I hear lots of discussion about lack of information and that type of thing. The fact of the matter is, is that P3's have worked very well in most other major cities in this country and in others, particularly in North America. The only project like this that we've ever proceeded with has worked out very, very well. In fact the only complaints I get about the Charleswood Bridge, Mr. Speaker, is people don't understand why it's being maintained so much, and then I have to tell them that we don't own the bridge. Actually a numbered company owns it and they have to do that because they have to make sure that the bridge is perfect, pristine condition when we get it back in 2025 and they go, oh that was pretty smart. It is pretty smart. And so are all the other P3's that are being done that include maintenance. And this is a good project.

The northeast area of the city…and I'm surprised, notwithstanding Councillor Wyatt has very strong feelings in regards to this area, the fact of the matter is that northeast Winnipeg is growing very rapidly. In fact, it's one of the fastest growing areas in our city, and it needs infrastructure to go along with the speed of that development. And while I appreciate that you can't always have a hundred percent of a loaf, when you've

got a pretty good, edible loaf, the appropriate thing would be to support it, particularly when you've already voted for it in the capital budget Mr. Speaker.

In any case, I think this is a good project, it's timely, it's well structured to go ahead and we're also trying to keep an open mind to the flexibility of how broad this project can be, which I think was a fairly flexible move on behalf of EPC and Public Works when this came forward Mr. Speaker. So I will once again move it and would like to see everybody stand in favour of this and I'd like to have a recorded vote on this.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. On Report of May the 12th, 2009, Item 5. A recorded vote has been called for. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas, Vandal: and Wyatt.

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

Mr. Speaker: It's carried. Motions none. Consideration of By-laws second reading and third reading only. Councillor Clement.

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

Councillor Clement: Yes. I'll move that the Borrowing By-law No 183/2008 be considered for second and third reading. This of course is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that I've, other than local improvements, that I'm going to stand to support a borrowing by the City of Winnipeg since 1998, and this money of course is for the first phase of rapid transit, and of course, because of our strong credit rating we're supporting the Province's share of this as well and their strong support of rapid transit of course by borrowing their share of the money at the same time, Mr. Speaker, and I'll move that.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 183/2008.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law 183/2008 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Councillors, before we get into the other by-laws I believe Councillor Orlikow you had a possible conflict of interest on By-law No. 89/2009. Would you like to leave the Chambers?

(inaudible speaking in the background)

No, no might as well. Because, how long is it going to take to read? Just…and you come back before we…Councillor Clement....You can read 89/2009.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 89/2009 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 89/2009.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 89/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 89/2009.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 86/2009 be read…pardon me, By-law No. 89/2009 be read a third time and that

same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Orlikow you can come back now. By-laws No. 86 and 87 and 88. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Just a second here. Okay, I will…just trying to go back here. I'll move that By-law No. 86 to 88/2009, both inclusive, be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 86/2009, By-law No. 87/2009, and By-law No. 88/2009.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-laws No. 86 to 88/2009, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 86/2009 to 88/2009.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 86 to 88/2009, both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed and order to be signed and sealed.

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

Now before we adjourn Councillors don't forget up at the Mayor's Foyer today at 12 noon, the Mayor indicated right from the beginning of the meeting there is going to be a little celebration there in respect of 100 years of the Chinese organization being here.

Councillor Swandel moves that Council do now adjourn. Roll call. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 11:44 a.m.