COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Tuesday, December 15, 2009

The Council met at 9:33 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

ROLL CALL

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

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Would you read the Notice of Meeting?

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Pursuant to Section 79(1) of The City of Winnipeg Charter, the City Clerk was directed by His Worship Mayor Katz to arrange a Special Meeting of Council on this day, Tuesday, December 15, 2009, at 9:30 a.m., to consider the 2010 Capital Budget and the 2011 to 2015 Five Year Capital Forecast.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Pages, we don't have any. Delegations. First delegation, Mr. George Fraser in support of Item 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated December 4th of 2009. Mr. Fraser, welcome. Former Councillor Fraser, welcome.

George Fraser: Thank you, Merry Christmas.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, same to you.

George Fraser: Mr. Speaker it's a privilege again to be here today as a delegation. I thought it was opportune to appear to support the tail end of Capital Budgets that you've been dealing with, and in particular, I want to commend Council with respect to the Recreation and Leisure Facilities Initiative that began in June of 2005, when Council reallocated 17 million from the Sewer Utility towards a $43 million tripartite agreement between Canada who contributed 17, Manitoba, 17 million and Winnipeg had, as I mentioned 17 million from the Water Utility and found an additional 9 million from the General Purpose Reserve to be part of that partnership. The North End Recreation and Leisure Facility, which I know is close to the Speaker's mind often, is near completion or open. In fact, Bronx Park Community Centre is in the same category. The Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex is well advanced and open. And the Community Centre Investment Fund, although it's got complexities to it, I know is functioning too. And other recreational needs. Well, in the midst of that, and I appeared here previously with respect to it, of course, it was the Kildonan Park Urban Oasis, the number two project on the list at $9 million, second largest allocation. Unfortunately in January of 2008, that particular project came to a halt. The Mayor indicated there were soaring costs and there was no hope whatsoever to proceed with that project. And I don't want to get into the debate about the Water Park necessarily as I mentioned when I was here last time. But, the carry over from that decision was that there was $2 million left to redevelop the outdoor pool, 813 million for a spray park, and possibly another 2 million to finish some of the issues that are evident in a hundred year old park. The park celebrated its 100th anniversary. I think Councillor O'Shaughnessy was there with his barbecue if I'm not mistaken. I'm mistaken. (Laughter)

But, in this whole process in May of 2008, the City issued a design build pre-qualification for works that were to amount to 2.25 million. And in that document that went out, it said that construction would begin in September of 2008 and there would be an official opening in July of 2009. And, in the Budget that you have before you today…or I'm sorry, last year in 08, there was an allocation in the 09 section for 900,000 for Kildonan Park and Peguis Pavilion and for 2010, 200,000 for 1.1 million. Still some missing gaps. And when I appeared previously, my main

concern was the fact that there was no planning in and around first, the Urban Oasis, and secondly, the reallocation of the funds. And, despite all of the success that has occurred with all of the other projects which obviously had good planning attached to them, this project hasn't made the grade. So, we look at today's Budget and I'll leave it up to perhaps members of the Community Committee to examine it very carefully. We find that the Budget before you only contains $200,000 in 2010, still unplanned, and I would suggest should not be expended. And in 2012, some $617,000 that has been lingering there with respect to Kildonan Park and the Rainbow Stage again with no plans. So my argument previously over the last two years has been essentially, show me the plans.

And, I noticed today that Councillor Gerbasi is asking for a similar privilege under the helicopter issue, and I think it's a valid situation with respect to Kildonan Park. The Mayor and I chatted briefly about that and I would suggest to you that the expenditure that is currently in here, and the Administration may be able to supply some information on this, is not a valid expenditure because it doesn't have any planning support to it. It's not that the Park doesn't need this attention as I mentioned before, and it has been a slippery slope from 9 million down to the area, particularly the $200,000 that is identified in the Budget for 2010. So, in the careful examination that always goes on with capital budgets, and I don't want to jump on Councillor Gerbasi but she was also quoted in the paper today as saying the benefit of putting it in a projected budget is you're committed to doing it. I found out that often that's not the case.

So, my message is quite simple, and I won't take up any additional time, but the hundred year old park at Kildonan is also one of the great assets in our city, and it requires, as I mentioned before, some solid planning and reflection. And I challenge the Community Committee members, the Mayor's Office and the Administration to take that very seriously in the next while and perhaps some corrections can occur within the Capital Budgeting process. It's short, there is a million dollars missing, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it didn't show up in the Helicopter Budget. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I hope not. Thank you, Mr. Fraser. There is another delegation right behind you, and question periods will be addressed if there's any questions to you, and the next delegation. Please just take a seat in the back.

Janice Lukes, also in support of Item 1 of the Report of Executive Policy Committee. Ms. Lukes, you've got…you have 5 minutes.

Janice Lukes: Thank you, good morning. My name is Janice Lukes and I'm here today not representing any organization. I'm here representing my family and myself as a resident of Winnipeg. So…and also probably I know a lot that representing a lot of other families in Winnipeg. I'm here today in support of the Budget. Last year we were here and it was a very interesting time. This year I'm here in support of the Budget. I can't claim by any means to understand a lot of what goes on in the Budget. But I am following what interests myself and that is the Trails and Active Transportation component.

I've been following this since 2001 when I found out I was going to have three boys and I had nowhere to walk and nowhere to bike and nothing. So at that time, Councillor Swandel was an assistant to John Angus and he has been dealing with me for eight years and I bow to you. That was back in the days when we raised $200,000 for two kilometers of trail. It was $100,000 a kilometer in 2001, and there was no one to help develop trail or anything or understand it or anything. So thank you Councillor Swandel for all your help.

In 2004, a great shift started happening and that's when Mayor Sam came out with a pledge to expand on bike paths and jogging paths for Winnipeggers. Sorry Dan, I didn't vote for you. (Laughing), and since 2004 and up to 2009, we have seen phenomenal things happen, and I don't have to tell you about

the phenomenal things, the Marconi Line, a Coordinator, an Advisory Committee, an actual line in a budget for Active Transportation, every year increased funding, and funding for educational things like International Trails Day, Bike to Work Day, Ciclovia, Research. And then, of course in 2009, this year we see the Tri-party commitment of $20 million for Active Transportation. And I want to…I'm here today to thank you very, very much because I'm not doing this…I'm doing this obviously for my kids. I wouldn't be doing this if I didn't have three kids. I'm not doing it because I get paid a lot of money because I certainly don't. But I just want you all to understand how very appreciative we all are and I know politics. I've learned a lot over the last eight years how dynamic it can be and how challenging it can be, and sometimes when we're on this side we don't understand or we don't…we aren't privy to the information that you are and so when I tie into you on certain issues and they evolve later, please understand that I'm on this side and you're on that side. All of what you've done under Mayor Sam's guidance and as Council really is legacy material. There's no Council that has ever, ever done this in the City of Winnipeg's history that's put this much money or initiative or action into Active Transportation and Trails and Pathways.

You know, in the summer time in July or August I'm reading about two Councillors working on trail in St. James, I thought oh my god it's finally happening, the shift is occurring. You know, like, to read that article was…it was just…it was wonderful.

So, I really want to thank you for listening to us, for listening to the citizens and to listening to the organizations and for talking to us and continuing to talk to us, and our success on Active Transportation here is because we've all dialogued and we've all communicated and we're listening to each other. And that's…I guess that's what democracy and politics and City Hall is all about, is talking and communicating and listening. So, on the eve of spending $20 million or determining how to spend $20 million, I'd like to just make three suggestions as a mother with three kids, middle aged mother in suburbia, south end of town. Please, number one, please, when you build this new on-road infrastructure, build it so our kids can use it. Build it so that we're building for the future. Public Works has looked at this project and they've categorized A, B and C. A is the alpha cyclist or you know the…you know my buddies there, the Spandex Fit ones. B is the basic cyclist and C is the children and families. But, what we're developing in this infrastructure is for B. It's not for the kids and families. It's for the basic cyclist. The ones that are less confident but these are kids…probably the youngest would be 14 or 15 that are going to be able to use this infrastructure, and at 14 and 15 they're into their regime of what they do. They're looking for their license, they're looking forward to those days. I'm really asking that when we look at how we're building this infrastructure to consider building it for kids. If it means we have to build less of it, let's build it so everyone can use it, so kids can use it. Because if kids can use it, Harvey can use it, I can use it, Sam can use it, everyone can use it. I'm asking you to think about that.

Number two, as a mom, I'm asking that when you look at building this on-road stuff which you've never built before and I'm not calling these painted lines on-road infrastructure because I all know…I know how all of you think about these painted lines and you know, they're great, they're for a percentage of the population and they suit them, but for, I think the majority or the masses, when you build this infrastructure, look to investing in some training for your engineers and your people on cycling infrastructure and policy. The City…we have no policy on how to build on-road infrastructure. We have no guidelines, nothing. We've got right now seven or ten, I'm not sure, consultants churning up some system. Look to Velo, Quebec. Forty years they've been building cycling infrastructure. They've got a manual this thick on how to do it. They've got a climate like ours. Look at bringing in someone with that expertise to talk to your people to really help them understand. It's so similar the climate in Quebec, and they've been doing it for 40 years. Give all these consultants the manual, make them a one-day seminar to

listen to someone that…they have specialists, engineers that deal with this.

Mr. Speaker: Janice, your time is up.

Janice Lukes: I've got one more thing to say. The third thing is Pembina Highway (Laughter)…sorry, well you know what. Fine.

Mr. Speaker: Pretend I'm Santa.

Janice Lukes: Thank you. It's Pembina Highway and I read the paper today and there is more stuff turning on Pembina Highway. We're dumping a lot of pathways now and Active Transportation Routes on Pembina Highway and this is where all the university kids go. It's next to downtown. It's the second highest area of commute. I don't know how…no one wants to touch it. No City Councillor wants to touch it, MLA's at that end of town don't want to touch it, the Feds don't want to touch it. So, maybe you've got something going on which I'm hoping that you do on Pembina Highway before another ten years pass or whatever. I'm just asking you to really look at Pembina Highway.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Janice.

Janice Lukes: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Ms. Lukes, would you like to introduce your family members here?

Janice Lukes: This is Noah. We came today and it was Take Your Kid to Work Day. This is Noah who's in his suit and briefcase and this is Adam and this is Milan and they are 7 years old.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Janice Lukes: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: There will be some questions. Mr. Fraser, would you like to come up here? Is there any questions of the delegation, both Mr. Fraser and Ms. Lukes? (Inaudible) (Laughter)

Janice Lukes: Well, that was the gangster suit for Halloween and he likes it.

Mr. Speaker: No…Councillors, no questions? Thank you.

Janice Lukes: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The last delegation, Mr. Nick Ternette in opposition to Item 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee. Are you okay there, Nick?

Nick Ternette: Oh I should be okay. I don't know if that's long enough. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Katz, and members of City Council, I'm here to provide you my observations concerning your 2010 Preliminary Capital Budget. Initiatives I've always attached and I've made it very short because I've talked about this for the last five years or so is the issue of democracy. The manner in which the Capital and Operating Budgets are being handled these days to me is actually as many individuals in the community have told me, the death of democracy. There isn't even a pretence of involving citizens in the process of developing these budgets as there were at least under former Mayor Susan Thompson and Mayor Glen Murray. The public be dammed, here is the budget whether you like it or not, take it.

I'm here specifically to talk about the Transportation Budget because that's my area of interest, my concerns, and I have several kinds of questions to raise from it. The Capital Budget invests in priority roads, purchasing community amendments and other infrastructure projects. Over $498 million is earmarked for streets and bridges for over the next five years, of which 183 million is budgeted for roads and bridges alone, which is a 90% increase in street projects from last year, as far as this coming year goes. As you're well aware, I am now a disabled person and my perspective has changed a great deal since what I have gone through. I tend to be more closely environmentally oriented in terms of my own environment and where I'm going. If people want to ask me about that. I have never driven a car, have always previously walked, used public transportation, or ridden a bicycle. I did ride a bicycle until I was 50 years old. Now the wheelchair is my legs and that's

what gets me around. So as I bounce around and zigzag around cracks on sidewalks, I wonder what is being done to improve the lifestyle of those who use sidewalks. Those people are primarily pedestrians and wheelchair users. How much money is being put into repairing curb cuts or adding new curb cuts as well as sidewalks? Well, at EPC, Councillor Swandel indicated to me several issues which I want to state that there is $500,000 allocated for sidewalk and curbs of regional and local street sidewalk budget. Quite bluntly, that is peanuts compared to the $183 million which has been allocated for roads and bridges. Another 350,000 per year has been put into the Capital Budget for accessibility work for play structures on City properties, and I applaud the City for doing that, but that's far too little. Yet due to extensive lobbying from the cycling community in place, I don't object to what the cycling community has done, $20 million as compared to $500,000 is being put into place for bicycle paths through the Active Transportation Project. That's because they've been lobbying for a long time and I've watched them lobby at Council constantly that they're getting the kind of money that we in wheelchair and other people who are disabled should be getting. Yet no one on Council, I think, seems to care about pedestrians or those who use wheelchairs. I mean, furthermore, your Accessibility Program to make City facilities universally accessible while improvements are being made, I'm told, to the Archives Building and to the ramps at 510 Main Street, I don't see you having a vision of how to make the City as a whole accessible, and it is going to be one of my issues that I have to deal with. How do we make an active, accessible city is the key in a long term for what I think Council will have to deal with.

Now, several Councillors I know are disappointed about the absence in the Budget of the building of Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the Bus Rapid Transit. Now, you know I've always opposed Bus Rapid Transit as being irrelevant to the City of Winnipeg. Mayor Katz at EPC kind of commented on the BRT and LRT debate that perhaps there should be a public debate between Paul Hess, opponent of BRT and myself, opponent of LRT, and the tickets would probably sell out. Well, that's probably is true, so you've got a little comment. On the other hand, I am happy that the City is not making any commitments to Phase 2 and 3 of Bus Rapid Transit. On the other hand, however, I do have a problem that the BRT begins nowhere and ends nowhere. That is as this one will not lead to any kind of development, and we're talking about that's what Rapid Transit does along the sides, along the BRT line and it will not increase ridership because it doesn't go to the University and it doesn't go downtown. So who's going to use it? You're going to have the same amount of ridership as you have with the normal bus system. So, quite bluntly, unless you proceed with Phase 2 and Phase 3 to complete it, it's a complete waste of money.

Now, let's deal with transit improvements. The existing bus collection fares is many decades old and limits flexibility and that's their own report, and the type of fares that can be offered to passengers. Replacing the present fare boxes with electronic fare boxes, first of all it cuts out cheaters. Smart cards and proximity cards will allow more efficient processing of fares, and that was talked about already in the 2009 Budget. And monies were set aside for that. Consultations were held through the public, the implication being that it hasn't been held yet. I was involved in that quite extensively. So why will this not proceed in 2010? At the earliest I noticed in the Budget, it's not going to happen until 2011 and we don't even know how many of these fare collection boxes and what else are going to be replaced. Is it going to take four years, five years before we're going to have a completely new fare box system? I don't know. Nobody can say that.

In terms of the Innovative Transit Program, this deals with Transit terminals, shopping centres, passenger shelters, improved amenities at bus stop, Handi-Transit trip confirmation, automated Transit. Why is the same amount of money being budgeted each year until 2013? What impact will that have on the number of heated bus shelters that there

ought to be? Especially when, like I noticed and I've been saying that over and over, older bus shelters have been torn down and replaced with smaller ones. That does not mean that you're building new bus shelters, all you are doing is replacing old ones. That does not mean new, so we have no idea how many new ones beyond replacement is going to be built and what impact will that have on electronic displays of bus arrivals and departures. I've seen one and it's excellent. That's at Polo Park. Tell me how long we're going to have before we have them at every major intersection that kind of system, nobody can tell me how long it's going to take, five years, ten years, fifteen years?

Now relating to transit buses. That is for on-going purchases of low-floor urban transit buses and replacement of buses that have reached the end of their useful life which Transit estimates at 18 years. I question that, but anyway I'll get back to that. On average 30 new buses replace old buses. Is this figure going to go up or down? We are not quite sure. How many new buses are going to be built between 2010 and 2015? As you know, ridership is increasing and you are going to need more buses. Well, at EPC the Mayor admitted that he did not know how many new buses would be built in the next four years but he would try to find out, and I must give credit to Councillor Clement for the first time ever, admitting that I was right, saying that the 30 new buses were built each year to replace 30 old buses and that they recognized that they need more buses because of two factors. The need to expand routes which obviously is true especially with Waverley Heights and all the expansion into suburbia and the increase of ridership, which is what I've been indicating, the increase in the ridership being based on the fact that many, many immigrants are using it at the present time and many aboriginals are using it. And it's packed and it's not just packed at 4:00 to 6:00 and from 7:00 to 9:00, it's packed at 11 o'clock, one o'clock and two o'clock and any Portage Bus that I have to catch on, you know, I have a hard time getting on sometimes because they are just packed constantly. However, the buses have to be at what…Bill…Councillor Clement indicated this…that the buses have to be sheltered somewhere and the City has just acquired property in Fort Rouge to build a brand new bus garage that unfortunately will not be ready for two or three years. We can't have new buses until the facility is built because there won't be any room for them. Well, by that time we're going to be busting with the amount of buses that we have. On the other hand, I am questioning whether the estimate of 18 years for what I spend on buses is accurate, and then I also ask that the new buses that are being built are smaller than the new buses…the old buses, and they carry fewer passengers. On the average, 10 fewer. If you notice the amount of space, if you have two people on transit coming in, on wheelchairs coming in, it's unbelievable because it is much smaller than the old ones. It's more efficient maybe but it's smaller. It carries less passengers.

Ultimately if I can conclude, in Winnipeg, the trend continues to invest in new and expanded car-oriented infrastructure rather than Public Transit Infrastructure. Most Canadian cities except Winnipeg are choosing to invest significant dollars in transit as they recognize the fiscal, social and environmental benefits that come with this investment. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Ternette. Any questions, Councillors? If not, Mr. Ternette, to you and Emily, your wife…oh, Councillor Smith, your first question.

Councillor Smith: You know, Nick, the…you mentioned sidewalks. And I guess in a wheelchair, the sidewalks are even more important to you. But, can you comment on the condition of the sidewalks in the city or what you've noticed about how it affects you?

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, yes. Well, that's you know, if I could go through a whole tirade about that. As you know, I have two stumps now and what else. I have to have…put ointment on every night now because my muscles are just torn to pieces, because I like…I don't sit at home, I go out constantly on the

sidewalk. The amount of cracks and the amount of bumps that I have to go and amount of curbs that I have to cross over the streets are just unbelievable. I have to be honest, when I was walking I wasn't paying as much attention to them because when you walk you kind of ignore them, but this thing has to bounce over these things, I mean in the wheelchair, and the bounce just reflects onto my legs beyond belief. After two days, I had to go to a doctor in order to deal with my basically inflamed muscles because that's what happens when you are n a wheelchair, because the sidewalks are atrocious. They're as bad as the roads. I'm not denying that the roads need to be fixed and we know that. We've talked about that. They're in awful shape and many cost a hell of a lot. Look at the potholes we have, but sidewalks need to be looked at, too. At this stage, I'm even more concerned about curbs that are on major streets. On Portage Avenue, half the streets don't have curbs. I have to jump over about a foot, two feet up hills in there in order to get over it because I can't get around on major thoroughfares. Now, that I think, is significant and that there is so little money being aside, never mind the sidewalks but for curbs. I mean how much money is being spent other than 500,000, maybe 50,000 or a hundred thousand being spent on curbs? That's just completely inadequate. There are more and more people going to be using wheelchairs. When I was in the hospital, I met many, many people who are being amputated, significantly aboriginals who have diabetes and there are more people going into the hospital right now being amputated because like they are all getting wheelchairs. And I guarantee you, we're going to have a significant increase in ridership on wheelchairs in the next few years because of old age, diabetes and other health issues which requires people to have wheelchairs and those people are going to have the same difficulty that I'm having on sidewalks. So, you know, there should be at least a little more money put in to curbs and for sidewalks in order to make us feel a little more comfortable that this is an accessible city.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Nick. No further questions? As I was saying before, Mr. Ternette, to you and your wife Emily, the best of the seasons and a very prosperous happy new year and thanks for coming out. We'll see you, I understand in January you'll be here.

Nick Ternette: Yes, I'll be here last time…speaking last time in January. At 50 years of retirement, it's about time. I'm going to be 65, so I appreciate that and I wish all the Councillors no matter what their politics is, Happy Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Nick.

Nick Ternette: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Report of Executive Policy Committee, report of December 4, 2009. Mayor Katz, would you like to introduce the report?

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 4, 2009

Item 1 - 2010 Capital Budget and 2011 to 2015 Five Year Capital Forecast
eFile FC (2010)

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity. Just a brief introduction, and then I will pass it to the Chair of Finance, Councillor Fielding.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to thank our CFO, Mike Ruta, Jo-Anne, Betty and Howard for their…oh god, how many hours they put in. Late hours, weekends, et cetera, basically working with us to produce the document that we see before us, the Capital Budget. I also very much want to thank Councillor Swandel who started the process of working on the Capital Budget., and then Councillor Fielding who has taken it over. And, Mr. Speaker, it's very important for us to thank the delegations that showed up before all the Standing Committees, including EPC. As you know there were some very good delegations that came forward, that spurred, I guess the thought process of members of Council and some changes have been made to reflect those delegation presentations. And with that,

Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to hear from the Chair of Finance, Councillor Fielding, on the Capital.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to introduce the amended 2010 Capital Budget. Further to what Mayor Katz said, I do want to thank our Administration, Glen Laubenstein, Mike, Jo-Anne and Betty for all your hard work and professionalism. It's been an honour to work with you; you do a great job for us.

This is a budget, the 2010 Capital Budget, that really focuses on our core areas of priority. It invests $430 million in our core areas. The Budget invests in roads, it invests in regional streets, it invests in Active Transportation. It also continues our focused efforts in terms of some of the bridge work that we have whether it'd be the Disraeli or the Corridors of the Chief Peguis Trail. It also adds, I think, a very important investment, $8 million to Assiniboine Park, something that's going to help to help expand the Duck Pond, to increase the natural play area for our youth, for our citizens that are there, as well as the family centre that is there. I think it's a very important investment that probably will be a legacy piece I think of this Council, later on down the years.

The Budget also invests heavily into Public Safety. When I'm talking about Public Safety, I'm talking about the Police Helicopter. This is something that I very much am supportive of. I think that it's something that the Chief of Police very much supports, our Provincial Government…the New Democratic Government here in the Province of Manitoba. But as we go a little bit further into this, I just want to quote a couple of things that the Chief of Police, Top Law Enforcement has…personnel has talked about. The Winnipeg Police Services should be able to respond to more calls if a large number of patrol cars don't have to be chasing down suspects at night and engage in high speed chases or searches for people who are lost in wooded areas in and around the Assiniboine Forest area. A single police helicopter in the air can free dozens of cruiser cars to handle more calls on the ground especially at night, (inaudible) camera or GPS system tracking can achieve in minutes what could take hours for patrol cars to happen. The big benefit the helicopter is going to have for us is utilizing our resources better. When it's in the air, you're going to have a birds' eye view of determining your resources. I mentioned Chief McCaskill addressing concerns of the helicopter purchase is just a crime fighting gimmick. No, if you cut the number of cars off in other areas, it's going to drop the people in the queue, so I think it's very much time. I think the evidence clearly states that it's something we need to invest in our community.

The Budget also finds efficiencies and by reviewing past Accounts Capital Projects to the tune of $17 million which is money we can spend in today's budget. It also increases the amount of money we are spending on cash to capital, so we're spending more on cash on particular projects here in the new…in 2010 and scheduled for $2 million from years to come. It also looks at innovative ways to find…to fund projects in this year as opposed to pushing projects up. They're going to happen later in the year, which I think makes sense a lot for taxpayers. You're going to save six percent in terms of construction inflation that is there. So I'm going to maintain the majority of my comments for after I hear what our good Councillors here have to say about the Budget, but I do very much believe that it's a strong focused budget that focuses on our key priority areas, and with that I will introduce it and respond back at the end. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor, we have three Motions. Motion No. 1 and No. 2 and No. 3. We'll have to suspend rules to hear No. 3. Motion No. 1, Councillor Gerbasi.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

WHEREAS the 2005 Rapid transit Task Force recommended construction of Phase One and Two of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor;

AND WHEREAS the Province has agreed to 50/50 funding of the capital costs of Rapid Transit in the 2007 Climate Change and Emissions Reduction Act (Bill 15);

AND WHEREAS there is a population of 40,000 students, a potential new stadium being built at the U of M, and a significant new residential development in the south of the City (Waverly West);

AND WHEREAS Phase One of the Southwest Corridor is expected to be complete by 2011;

AND WHEREAS many projects in the forecasted capital budget are contingent on funding from other levels of government which are negotiated at a future time (water and waste projects, Assiniboine Park);

AND WHEREAS the total project cost of Phase Two is estimated to be $189 million, intended to be cost-shared by the three levels of government on a 1/3 basis;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Phase Two of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor be included in future capital budget forecasts from 2012 to 2014 and that the Capital budget be amended by adding the cost per year of $63 million (with the city's portion being 21 million per year) for the three years commencing with 2012.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce this Motion. The Capital Budget is about planning our future and the document covers the upcoming year of 2010, which we're passing today but it also lays out a framework of where we're planning to go for the next five years. So I thought it was very important to show what our key priorities are over the next five years, and if our intention is in fact to build further phases of Rapid Transit then that should be reflected in our five year plan. And obviously that is something that some other Councillors who have subsequently moved another Motion seem to agree with because they're also saying that it should be reflected. They've come up with, you know, I'll leave that debate to when they introduce their Motion in terms of their way of getting the money.

I think it's important to point out that we can't really expect the other levels of Government, particularly the Federal Government, to take Winnipeg Council's request seriously when our own commitment isn't made clear. And I'd also like to point out that there are many times when we put things in our Budget in the five-year forecast in order to demonstrate our commitment to seeing it happen even though the negotiations with other levels of Government are not yet completed. For example, the Water and Waste Upgrades we still haven't had the 200 million from the Federal Government confirmed and that's funding that is required for the Capital Budget issues and Water and Waste. Another example is Assiniboine Park where the City's commitment is written. It says right in the document that our commitment is contingent on the other levels of Government making the future commitment. And even the helicopter is another example because we've heard a mention of it in the throne speech but it hasn't been clear exactly what that commitment is in terms of dollars and so on. And this is a…this is a document that we have to put the numbers in, we have to put the amount that we're talking about in this Budget. We can't just say generally throw in some numbers.

I also wanted to mention that we are already seeing some of the benefits of the first phase of the Transit Project even though it hasn't even been built yet, it's under way and by the way, on time and under Budget so far I would point out, and I would like to say kudos to the Transit

Department and other departments involved for that. But I'd like to mention that even though it won't be completed until 2011, a 16-storey mixed-use residential tower was approved at City Centre Community Committee last week on Stradbrook Street. In the future it may have a direct link to the Rapid Transit station nearby. This is exactly the kind of infill, high density transit-oriented development that many around this Chamber have been hoping for. So I just wanted to put it out there that we've started a project that's not even built and we're already seeing the benefits in terms of economic development and I think that's pretty exciting and I think that's a pretty good case and there already was an extremely good case and a lot of public support for continuing with our Transit Plan.

To put things in perspective, if you look at other Canadian cities as Nick mentioned, you'll see that they have huge commitments to Public Transit. I'm not sure if you're aware of Toronto's recent Capital Budget, but Toronto is devoting 55% of its Capital Budget to transit. Fifty five percent of its complete budget. So I mean, obviously they're a larger city than us but even taking that out of the equation, there is a much greater commitment, you know, and I've mentioned before with the gas tax, you know in Manitoba, 10% of the gas tax goes to Public Transit. In other provinces, in Alberta and Quebec and it's at least 50, sometimes a 100 % of the gas tax has gone to Public Transit. That's how important this investment is. And I've been to Ottawa as your FCM rep and on the Canadian Urban Transit Association Board Members Committee and believe me, the Federal Government and all three levels understands the importance of Public Transit now. They've really come to understand that. So there's going to be more and more opportunities in the future so it's a very important time for the City of Winnipeg to be clear about what its commitment is and you know, I'm glad we're having this discussion today and that's the focus of this debate today, because it should be. It's probably the most important issue we're dealing with.

The Rapid Transit Task Force in 2005, chaired by Councillor Wyatt, was very clear that the entire Southwest Corridor should be constructed. And we know that the Province has agreed to 50/50 funding already of capital costs for Rapid Transit which they enshrined in their 2007 Climate Change and Emissions Act Legislation Bill 15. So that commitment's already there, so that pretty much means we're two-thirds of the way there if the City makes its commitment already. So it's going to be pretty convincing to the Federal Government who is already quite supportive of Transit Projects, you know, to come on board so I think it's really important for us to make that commitment.

The Motion before you is very specific in suggesting the time frame that we put this in the Budget for 2012, 13 and 14. The City's one-third portion…the Project has been costed at 189 million so we know the cost of this…completing the second phase of the BRT. And so the City's one-third amounts to 21 million a year for three years. So, it's really not that crazy when you look at the size of projects we do, the things we add in later and so on, 21 million a year for 3 years. And I also hope you understand that the second phase of BRT out to the University will deal with the concern on Pembina Highway that I know Councillor Swandel and Janice Lukes was speaking of that others are concerned about, then we have our bus…bicycle route to the University built with the synergy and the sense of building at the same time as the BRT rather than building a separate path and then having to take it out later. Makes sense to do it all at once.

So, one thing I've learned in my 11 years here is that if you want something done, it will be done. You know. The Mayor made it clear, he wants a police helicopter. So that's in the Budget now. I mean before we even have the report for all of us to see and by the way, some of us did actually meet with the Police Chief and discussed the issue, but meeting with the Police Chief and discussing the issue is not the same as having a public report in which people can make a judgment about the cost of something. And you know,

Council has approved the Rapid Transit Task Force Report. They've approved the Project we're building now, and I guess I'm just…well, anyway...I think that if there is a will, there is a way and it seems like there is more of a will growing on this which I'm very pleased to see and I'm pleased to hear commitments, you know, that the intention is to build this. But you know, words are only words if it's not in our Budget document and that's what I'm asking today, that it be in a…that it would be in the document. Investing in Public Transit has proven benefit scientifically. You know, I mean, everybody's doing it across the world with…we're in the middle of the Copenhagen situation right now where we really need to make that commitment to change across the world. People are recognizing that. And people are choosing Public Transit as part of the solution to addressing environmental issues as well as social and economic development issues, and I think when people sit on the Donald Bridge and they see those buses whizzing by on the new bus way, which you can already see where it's going to be. I'm actually quite excited about it. And I mean, they're…people are going to be screaming for that second phase and this Council's going to have to build it one way or another. So I'm pleased to see that there is another Motion that talks about building it. I do have some questions about that Motion and I hope that Councillor Steeves or Swandel can clarify why the City's portion is $250 million for one-third of the project because that would make it a $750 million project. Now, you know, of course I'd love to see $750 million invested in Public Transit, but I also…I think in fairness to our taxpayers, I think we need to have an explanation of what project is being built. I mean, like...you know, whatever we want. I guess I just wonder about that number, was that number just pulled out of a hat, 250? Because the next phase of the project is $189 million. And then the next project on the books would be the Eastern Corridor which I also would like to emphasize is very important. And I think we need to get started on that and we could build a whole network of bus ways.

But my concern is that I don't…I'm not sure that that's what's being proposed here, and I…because we know that there's been an ask to the Federal Government not sort of bypassing Council processes and reports and clarity about what that project is, for $600 million request from the Federal Government. Like great, I mean, I want to see Public Transit investment, we all do, but what are we asking for and what kind of message are we sending the Federal Government? And as a representative going to Ottawa quite often, I'm having a bit of trouble explaining what Winnipeg is asking for. I'd really love to know what Winnipeg is asking for because I'd really love to go fight for it on our behalf. But, I don't even know what this $600 million ask was about. I don't know what this $250, third of a project is. Are we building a sky train or are we building…are we replacing the Southwest Corridor or are we building something out to the IKEA? I think the public has the right to know what we're building and where we're going with this kind of dollars even if it is for Public Transit, like I'm all for it. So…thank you. Do I get an extension or is that it?

Mr. Speaker: That's it. Thank you.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Gerbasi: I hope you'll support the Motion and I have a…I know I'll have a chance to close up after. I also may wish to speak to the Clause, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Thank you. The second Motion that's before us moved by Deputy Mayor Swandel, seconded by Councillor Steeves. Deputy Mayor, would you like to introduce that?

Motion No. 2
Moved by Deputy Mayor Swandel,
Seconded by Councillor Steeves,

WHEREAS Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and sewage treatment upgrades are both environmentally sustainable projects ;

AND WHEREAS leading scientists in the sewage treatment field believe that the nitrogen removal of sewage treatment does not provide a positive cost/benefit;

AND WHEREAS the leading scientist in the field believes that nitrogen removal it will have a negative impact on Lake Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS BRT does have a positive cost benefit ratio;

AND WHEREAS the City and the Province are committed to BRT as part of environmental sustainability in Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS it is the citizens who pay the utility rates and both the property tax and bus fares in the City;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that contingent upon the elimination of the requirement to provide nitrogen removal from our sewage treatment projects that the City commit to spending $250 million on Bus Rapid Transit starting in 2012;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Capital Budget be amended accordingly.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll hopefully be a little bit briefer than that. I think the points that can be made can be made fairly quickly.

What we're talking about here is sustainability in this Motion. We know that the Province's requirement for nitrogen removal for the City of Winnipeg Sewage Treatment Plants are not supported by leading scientists in the field and in fact the leading scientist in the field believes that removing this nitrogen could have a potentially negative impact on Lake Winnipeg as the types of algaes that bloom there will now have to seek nitrogen out from the surface of the lake, will cause a darkening of the lake and a cooling of the lake and the potential impact could be greater. So by putting the removal of nitrogen costs in the context, in the scenario with the creation of Bus Rapid Transit, what I'm saying to you is let's not spend money foolishly but listen to the leading experts over here, let's go over here to Bus Rapid Transit where we know that there is a positive cost benefit when it comes to sustainability. We know that Bus Rapid Transit will bring us improvements. We know that this entire Council, although Councillor Gerbasi might like to make you believe that some are opposed to Rapid Transit on this Council, this entire Council has been extremely supportive of Rapid Transit in the City of Winnipeg.

The other reason is I saw a great deal of flaws in Councillor Gerbasi's Motion that it really didn't get to the point of how do you fund this. How do you rationalize this spending of money? There are errors in the Motion. It speaks to the Water and Waste Project. The Water and Waste Projects are actually budgeted for. What they are using when they state those outgoing years, what the utility rates are going to be, that's the amount of money relative to borrowing. So right now regardless of whether or not the other levels of Government come to the table, our current plan has already funded this entire project using borrowing. That's what they're doing. So that is an error on the part of this Motion.

The other Motion…the other error is when it comes to Assiniboine Park. The project for Assiniboine Park is a specific project. It is a 100% funded. There's no ambiguity there as to who else is funding it. This is the first phase of their neighbourhood or their Family Centre Project going on and the improvements to the Duck Pond. So that's what's funded there. It's the first commitment on a project and it is entirely funded. The remainder of the funds are coming out of fundraising at the Assiniboine Park Conservancy. So that also is en error I believe, you know, I stand to be corrected if need be.

You know, the Bus Rapid Transit, why is there $250 million put forward in this Motion? What Councillor Gerbasi neglected to mention was that $189 million is a 2008 estimate. When you get out to 2012, we're talking about 2012 dollars. Even if you use a simple number of 6% inflation which is what we're using today. It was greater than that in 2008. You can see we're quickly approaching $250 million. I also believe that $250 million, when I look at it relative to the costs of nitrogen removal, $250 million is a reasonable number. The cost of doing

nitrogen removal we know in 2009 dollars I believe to be $350 million. That's just the capital cost, Mr. Speaker. After the capital cost you also have $9 million estimated per year in operating costs. So, $250 million as a one-third commitment from the City, puts us in the realm of talking about much more than just a second phase of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. But I also think there's a bit of an argument that needs to be made as to what happens with the speed of buses and the service on the Corridor going out to the University. The University is in the St. Norbert Ward and I'm always advocating for the University. And I think…I think we sort of might want to look at what happens with Rapid Transit when we get past Jubilee on that South Corridor, because the greatest bottlenecks on that Southwest Corridor are the Osborne "confusion corner" as we refer to it, and the Jubilee overpass. Once you get passed Jubilee, buses move very quickly out there. So you may not be…want to be building new ribbons of concrete, you may want to be building transit hubs when you get out there. You know, that hasn't been put in the mix before. I just throw it out there because what I'm talking about by bringing this Motion forward looking at doing Rapid Transit in the future is about informed decision making here and making it relative to other sustainability projects.

I'm going to speak to the Clause afterwards but the $189 million, if we were to…it's 100% cost that out ourselves. I can just tell you that that second phase, that would cost us roughly $16 million a year. If we were to do…financed is what it would cost and we're financing it out over 30 years and I can also tell you that if we were to finance $250 million to…as our one-third contribution that would cost us about $21 million a year. So right now, you look at our budget of $65 million cash to capital, and you talk about doing these types of works and you're going to make that commitment yourself. If you have to, if the other levels of government don't come to the table, don't agree with the rationale because remember this is one taxpayer or one utility rate bearer. It's the same people we are talking about, so whether we're making them pay more in utility fees because of this unnecessary obligation brought upon by the Clean Environment Commission and the Province of Manitoba, or we're getting them to spend a little bit more money on bus fare or a little bit more money on property tax or other ways of getting revenue for the City, it's still the same people. So that cost per year of doing $250 million worth of work, our cost is $21 million a year, or if you go back and just do it in 2008 dollars at 189 million, it would be about $16 million a year.

So those are my comments on the Motion, and just sort of tie it a little bit relative to Councillor Gerbasi's Motion, but I will speak to the Clause as we go forward and I have some additional information to add in closing.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Motion No. 3, we need suspension of the rules. Councillor Wyatt moves to suspend rules to hear Motion 3. All in favour? Contrary? Some called for a recorded vote? You want it, Bill? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt, you want to introduce your Motion?

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan,

WHEREAS the community of Transcona celebrates its centennial year in 2011;

AND WHEREAS the Transcona Business Improvement Zone, working with the community and members of the Winnipeg Public Service, developed the Transcona BIZ Downtown Streetscape Revitalization Strategy that calls for the creation of the Transcona Centennial Square in Downtown Transcona;

AND WHEREAS the Transcona Centennial Square is an integral part of the revitalization strategy and to the 100th anniversary celebration of the community of Transcona;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council amend the Preliminary 2010 Annual Capital Budget to add $290,000 for the purpose of assembling land and constructing the Transcona Centennial

Square public park in Downtown Transcona in 2010, subject to:

1. A. *The said funds being funded from the Land Operating Reserve.*
   B. *That the said funds being returned to the Land Operating Reserve from the future sale of land(s) in the Transcona Ward, principally the sale of all or part of the lands known as 401 Pandora Avenue West.*
   C. *$150,000 from existing funds previously committed to capital projects for Transcona Centennial Celebrations are now dedicated to the land assembly and construction of the Transcona Centennial Square Project.*
   D. *$25,000 from the Transcona Ward share of the 2010 Community Park Amenities fund being dedicated to the land assembly and construction of the Transcona Centennial Square Project.*
   E. *$35,000 from the Transcona Ward share of the Land Dedication Account being dedicated to the land assembly and construction of the Transcona Centennial Square Project*
   F. *A minimum commitment from the Province of Manitoba of $500,000 toward the Transcona Centennial Square project.*
   G. *The project information as set out in the Transcona BIZ Downtown Streetscape Revitalization Strategy.*

2. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing, including the execution of any documents related thereto.*

Councillor Wyatt: (Laughing) Well, it's interesting. This is a Motion regarding the Centennial Anniversary. I'm not too sure where the Centennial Anniversary is for Charleswood, but I look forward to celebrating it at that time. But…in February of 1911, February 10, 1911, the Transcona Board of Trade was incorporated, and it was the precursor to actually the Town Council of Transcona. For a year the Board of Trade actually ran the town. The community was…this is a Motion to celebrate, Mr. Speaker, the Centennial coming up in 2011, which will be celebrating the past of the community and what it's done, not just for Transcona, but also for the City of Winnipeg. At the time when the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway came to Manitoba and decided to build…to buy 800-acres, 8 miles to the East of Winnipeg, it was a massive project which in today's dollars, it would've been in the billions, back then it was $6 million, back in 1909 when they decided to start construction of the project, and it took them actually four years to build the entire yards on the site. It was opened up in 1913.

So, this is an important occasion to celebrate, Mr. Speaker. And from that site, of course the Grand Trunk Pacific was later nationalized with…by the Federal Government to become the CNR and basically was the foundation of the community of Transcona as we know it, and has done a lot to contribute to the City of Winnipeg's growth and prosperity. Mr. Speaker, this…the proposal before us today, the business improvement zone of Transcona has been working on a revitalization project for the downtown of Transcona, and a key component of that is the creation of the Transcona Centennial Square. I'm not going to take much time to speak on this. I'm going to encourage all members of Council to support the amendment. This is a project that every year, the community holds…the BIZ organizes a market

garden and it also organizes the Transcona Hi Neighbour Festival. This would be a site for the festival, this would be a site for concerts, this would be a site for the market garden. It would be a central square park in the centre of downtown Transcona and it would be a meeting place for the community. It would include a…the proposal is to include a clock tower of remembrance which would actually have the names of all the war vets who when they enlisted and when they were living in the community, who passed away, who gave the supreme sacrifice to be listed on the clock tower remembrance as well as a history of the community in the actual centennial square outlining the history of the community and the different contributions in the community over the years.

You know, I'm very fortunate, I feel privileged to represent the community of Transcona. It's really an honour, Mr. Speaker. Like many communities in Winnipeg we have a really…a very much a strong sense of community even though we're part of a greater city, we still have that strong sense of community. I think that's a good thing because it actually strengthens our city. When people have a sense of community, they have a sense of wanting to contribute back. They have a sense of wanting to give back to the community whatever that way may be and it makes for a healthier and stronger city. So this is a proposal…this is a Motion. This would create a million dollar Centennial Square. It requires the Province to be for this…subject to the Province coming forward with half a million dollars as well, and I would encourage support. The funding as mentioned is from sale of lands on Pandora. It should be noted those are the forestry lands of the former city…actually previous to that there was the former City Hall of Transcona, then they became the Forestry Office. They were previously as Council earmarked for funds to…towards the East Yards. Those should be noted that the East Yards, Mr. Speaker, were going to include the Forestry Offices and the Forestry staff. The Forestry staff are not moving to the East Yards. Now they are actually in the Waverley Street Offices, Mr. Speaker. That's why the site's already vacant, and we're actually in the process of selling it right now.

So I would encourage all members of Council to support this. We have in the past had precedent where we supported, I think, over a million dollars of funding in various forms for the St. Boniface Centennial. I'm suggesting something a little bit more conservative here, but I would appreciate your support for this worthy cause. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. We've dealt with Motions No. 1, 2 and 3. Now we get down to business. The first speaker is Councillor Thomas. Will speak to the Motions and the Clause. Councillor Thomas, you have the floor.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very disappointed with this Budget and I will identify the reasons that I am disappointed with it. We, many years ago, decided on certain priorities, that our top priority would be maintaining our existing infrastructure, that our second priority would be expanding our existing infrastructure, and then our third and bottom priority would be creating new infrastructure. This Budget turns all of that on its head. The majority of money is going towards new projects and very little is going towards stated priorities. And even in the new infrastructure it's not going for priorities that I would consider to be important. We have been working for many years with regard to our Rapid Transit System, and all I see is in several years down the road, a one time funding of $4.2 million and that is for reserve. And if this is really the priority that a lot of people say it is, it should be there, it should be there every year and not just that one time amount of money.

What is so disappointing about this money…about this budget is the additional money that we got from the Federal Government and the Provincial Government, which we had never had before, unprecedented amounts of money. And with that extra money there is no extra dollars for existing back lanes which continue to be a travesty. There is no extra dollars for sidewalks. As one of our delegations said today, the struggle

with sidewalks is becoming quite serious. I had a person in my area who flipped out of their wheelchair because of poor sidewalk locations, and another person who was tossed from her scooter. Several people who walk with canes who have difficulty getting to the bus because of the poor sidewalks on their streets. No additional money for sidewalks. No additional money for back lanes. With all the money that's found for all these new projects, an additional million dollars for back lanes would make a significant, significant increase, and I'm disappointed in that. I am also disappointed because I showed up at Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works to express concern that again, the Molson Street widening has been left out of the Budget. It was in the Budget since 1999 and the year before it was supposed to be done it was summarily yanked out of the Budget and hasn't been put back in since. People were riding on the shoulders because the traffic is so bad there. It exceeds quite a few regional streets in the area that people were riding on the shoulders. The solution to that was to put barricades up so that people can no longer ride on the shoulders. That's not helping. It's just slowing down the traffic. It needs to be put back into the Budget. Concordia widening. There is half a street there. It is a regional street in the area that has a hospital, three nursing homes on it, it has a high school, and there have been times, and I know you people got the letters about it, there have been times where the ambulance has not been able to get down the street because if two buses are stopped across from each other on a two-lane street, no traffic is moving on a regional street for an ambulance to get to the hospital, and there is no plans to widen it. It has been asked for, for several years in a row and has been ignored.

But suddenly, aerial support unit, $3.492 million. That would take care of widening Concordia Avenue and part of the Molson widening. And this comes in out of the blue, and before it should've got here, it should have been vetted by the Standing Policy Committee of Protection and Community Services. As a matter of fact, no one in this Council that I'm aware of, has gotten a report on why this is necessary. In the throne speech, I've heard that this will take 35 staffing units. Where will that come from? This has implications for our operating budget that we haven't dealt with yet. Those 35 staffing units, are they going to come out of our community-based policing initiatives? Are they going to come out of our strategy to put police officers in high schools? Are we going to cut back on foot patrols? I've heard that we have…just driving by the news today, I was listening as to how…where we stand within the amount of crimes that have gotten solved. Will we be taking them out of crime units and putting them in helicopters? This idea may be worthwhile pursuing but you have no way of knowing it without the reports to justify its inclusion in the Capital Budget, and it had serious implications for our current budget. It was inappropriate to do that at the last minute. So, I will not be supporting 2C.

Now, I will be supporting the Motion for…Motion No. 1 with regard to the Rapid Transit Phase 2 being costed out. But I won't be supporting Motion 2 to see that it comes out of Sewage Treatment. That's balancing one environmental concern over the other. And because some people don't believe in nitrogen removal, they are tying it to Rapid Transit. I think that's just foolish. I think we have to look at the…

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

Councillor Thomas: Thank you.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

(Laughter)

Councillor Swandel: You stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. I've heard enough of this.

Councillor Thomas: He's using my time, Mr. Speaker. I think that we need to study the effects of removing the nitrogen removal from the Sewage Treatment before we do something so foolish as to just suggest that it shouldn't be there. And I think that scientists are divided on this

issue and I think we need to have, at the very least, a Council seminar before this is contemplated. I will concur with Councillor Wyatt that we have done quite a bit for Centennials in other parts of the City in the past and I will be supporting Motion No. 3. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Steeves: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll begin with a word of thanks to our Administrative team who have worked tirelessly on this document to get to this stage, although I suspect that if they could have the opportunity to speak, they would say it was entirely their pleasure to spend all these hours with us. (Laughter) They are not given that liberty today, Mr. Speaker.

I will of course be supporting the budget that everyone has worked so hard on to get to this point. I am never more encouraged with the process here at City Hall than with our Capital Budgets. I actually think our operating budgets are very difficult and getting more and more so. But you would be hard pressed I think in the context of municipal politics to find a better good news story than the Capital Budget. You've seen our cash to capital projections, how it continues to increase in lock step with other orders of government which I'll talk about in a moment. The priorities of the citizens of this city, which not exclusively but to a large extent rest in capital works projects in the city, have been represented. You will see in the coming years, in 2010, more capital budget projects than probably ever before. Roads and bridges, and that's not only good for our economy, but that's good for the people that we represent and they've told us, through a myriad of different ways this is what they expect from us. This is what they expect our priorities to be and I think this Capital Budget matches that.

There is nothing per se with respect to the enlargement of the Rapid Transit envelope but you will see based on past Capital Budgets a preponderance of that construction going ahead in 2010. It's obviously already under way in terms of the land reconciliation; of course, one of the things I'm always reminded of when we get the phone calls in the office is the terrible, terrible way that Council got itself into in the 1990's where for a period of time we stopped doing residential road renewals at that time. What a tremendously short-sighted thing that was because we're still paying for that and we're getting that back into lock step again, Mr. Speaker.

You heard the delegation on the Active Transportation. This Council could be very, very proud of itself I think with all that it's done in terms of Active Transportation. Proportionately, it would be impossible to find another city in Canada that has come close to doing what the City of Winnipeg has done over the course of the last five years in terms of Active Transportation. The credit doesn't all rest in this Council. It rests with groups that have worked with us. It works with the rest…with other levels of government that have also made this a priority. But today, compared to five years ago, Mr. Speaker, it is much easier to get around this city without a car than it ever has been before. I was particularly pleased to see Assiniboine Park on the Agenda of this Capital Budget. I think that's going to be wonderful. If there was one project in this city that I think truly does capture the entire history of all of us, it probably is that park. We're hopeful and I think we can almost guarantee that come springtime, you are going to see shovels in the ground, to coin a Phrase, working in that Duck Pond area to bring that area up to a different level of reception for the people that use that park, and the numbers are incredible. If you look at the amount of people that use that park, that benefit from that park. This is going to be a show piece model for the citizens of this great city, and that is great.

We always should take a moment to reflect on the other levels of government in this process, particularly the Federal Government. What a great thing that they have done and I'll think back to the former Liberal Government as followed by the current Conservative Government, with respect to specifically, the gas tax. I should say my impression is that it has been by and large supported by the entire

House of Commons in terms of what has been put in place there. I'm speaking specifically of the gas tax revenue that is flowing to this city. What a wonderful thing this is. And leaving aside the money for a moment, which is notable, the really great thing about that is the method in which the money flows to this city. The money flows virtually unfettered into the Capital Budget of the City of Winnipeg, and allows the City of Winnipeg to match its priorities with the funding that is received. That is exactly how things should work.

Nobody knows the priorities of this city better than this Council. Not talking about one or two or three Councillors, than this collective Council. We have a very good sense of what our people want from us. If we were just given the wherewithal to deliver it, we can. If you compare that model to the model we sometimes see from our Provincial colleagues, if I could offer some constructive criticism, in ways that that money flows, we don't always see the same unfettered discretion with respect to funding. I think of things like the Disraeli is a good thing and at the 11th hour, we know our Provincial colleagues stepped in and offered up I think another 50 or so million dollars to offer a different span so the road would not be closed down. I'm not going to let it stand in the way of the project. I personally have some questions about that funding whether or not that's the best use of $50 million to be perfectly candid with you. We've done the traffic projections. Councillor Swandel and I went through a similar period of dis-ease when we did the Fort Garry Bridge, between Fort Garry and St. Vital, wondering what was going to happen with that bridge. The modeling was done, the projections were made. It actually turned out to be true and it was fairly manageable. We've seen the same thing on the Water and Waste funding, we've seen a similar type of thing on the Rapid Transit funding and now, with the helicopter that's in the Budget, we don't know exactly what to expect from our Provincial colleagues. We know there was some mention of it in the speech from the throne. We understand the full commitment has been made for the entirety of the operating funding of that unit. But still, there is, as has been pointed out, a fair bit of, I guess, darkness in terms of what exactly does the Provincial Government mean when it says they're going to fund the helicopter? That is part of the consternation, part of the concern, part of the confusion of this Council, just to be clear.

Some cautions on this Capital Budget as we move forward, we obviously have this huge, untenable expense with respect to our Waste Water improvements. I'll talk about that in a moment, vis-à-vis Motions. We do have P3 costs that are woven into our Capital Budget. We do believe this is going to deliver a better product and be delivered back to the City in time. We have to be careful though about costs in the out years. We are going to incur some of those expense. There are safe guards in place with respect to limits et cetera, but Council has to always be mindful of that and I already mentioned my concerns with respect to the helicopter. My understanding with this Capital Budget is that contrary to what my colleague from Elmwood-East Kildonan just said, the City is not committed to the operating funding. For someone to stand up and say that we're going to do this and it's going to cost this many jobs is graphically and completely incorrect. The operating funding is to come from the Province of Manitoba. That has been committed to.

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

Councillor Steeves: With respect to the amendments that have been made, Mr. Speaker although I completely respect where my colleague from Transcona is coming from, I feel the need as the Chairperson of the Property and Development Committee to cautiously step aside on this amendment to the Capital Budget. I'm a little bit concerned about where these types of overage amendments are going. I know my colleague from St. Boniface just did one for $20,000 that has been pulled off of the Agenda now because of concerns about that type of use. I cannot in good conscience stand in front of my colleague from St. Boniface for $20,000 and then vote in favor of this one. My concern is

that if this begins to become a pattern, in terms of overages going to the local Councillor, that could radically affect the equity, particularly towards of lesser equity in this city. That's my concern.

The Motions on the Rapid Transit, I've seconded the one from Councillor Swandel, I believe that's No. 1 if I'm not mistaken to 2. No. 2, I've chosen that one over Councilor Gerbasi's because I think it makes more sense. It offers a total fiscal package. It offers an explanation as to where the money is coming from. At this stage, Mr. Speaker, there is not a scientist in the free world who is saying that paying for nitrogen removal makes sense. You cannot find one. They don't exist. This is supported by virtually everybody in this city and perhaps, if we could stand up as a collective group and say listen, we'll leave the money…we'll leave the money in sustainability and we'll move it to Rapid Transit. Perhaps that is something that we could all get behind. I'll support this Capital Budget.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to stand up here and tell you that this is a horrible Operating Budget because that's simply not the case. But likewise I'm not going to stand up here and tell you that it's a fantastic budget because that's simply not the case, either. There are issues that are in this Budget that I'm not sure how they have evolved to the point of getting here, and there are other significant omissions, which I think would add strength to this Capital Budget.

I like…what I like about this Capital Budget is…has not been mentioned before and I will be totally parochial here. I like the fact that there was money in the Budget for a Fire Hall in South St. Boniface. That is something that I've been working on for the last 18 months. I moved a Motion here about 18 months ago, it meandered its way through Protection Committee, Executive Committee, Fiscal Issues Committee. I'm not sure where it ever ended up but the facts remain that there is $2 million…$3 million in this Operating Budget for a Fire Hall and that's something that's incredibly important to the people I represent. In the last 18 months, Mr. Speaker, I've spoken to people from Island Lakes, from Southdale, from Royalwood, from Southland Park, and from of course Sage Creek, and 99.9 percent of those residents agree with me that this is something that is very important to the area. It's something that should've been discussed and approved and constructed four years ago before the mega suburb of Sage Creek was approved at the Riel Community Committee and at the floor of this Council, but as the old adage says, it's better late than never. And I think that when people buy homes, they are paying 300,000, 400,000 plus in those neighborhoods, they not only expect quality services from the City, but they deserve, especially Emergency Services, in terms of Firefighters, Paramedics and Police Officers and that's something that when they are paying 6, 7,000 dollars a year in property taxes that they deserve, and for South St. Boniface, the area I represent, this is incredibly important.

I share Janice Lukes' enthusiasm although I'm not as certainly animated or as powerful as she is but I think the $7 million for Alternative Transportation is incredibly positive for the City, and we know as our city evolves that the reduction of greenhouse gases, getting people out of their cars and into alternative means of getting to their destinations is going to take on an even greater importance, and I think the $7 million is going to go to good use all across our city and there's a significant trails of course that are going to be built in St. Boniface.

I also like the fact that we're putting $7 million for Assiniboine Park as Councillor Steeves has said before me. The Assiniboine Park is a jewel of our city park system and it has suffered over the years from tough economic times, from Capital Budgets where there simply wasn't the room to invest in amenities, such as Assiniboine Park from tax cuts, from trying to do more with less and I think when you couple our money with the Provincial announcement, I believe it was

near $30 million for a polar bear enclosure, research centre, added amenities. I think that's something that we can enjoy. It's going to enhance the quality of life for our city 12 months out of 12. And let me tell you when it gets cold out there those are our biggest challenges to try to keep active in the City of Winnipeg.

I also like the fact that there is money in there for building communities. This is an initiative that's been around for 25, 30 years in different incarnations and it's done great work in older shoulder neighbourhoods that aren't necessarily inner city, but they are neighbourhoods like Windsor Park which is on the list that is going to benefit greatly from a bi-government level investment in some of those older community facilities, to neighbourhoods that are often overlooked.

What I don't…what I have questions with or I need clarification as I sit down and listen to the Mayor and the Finance Chair wrap up and perhaps Councillor Pagtakhan, the Chair of Protection and Community Services relative to the Police Helicopter, which is before us today. And frankly, I like the fact that we're moving forward on a Police Helicopter because I think there is likely some merit to it. And as much as I respect the opinion of Councillor Scott Fielding in his introductory comments about the merits of the helicopter, that's simply no substitute for a report which should be penned and signed off by the Chief of Police for the City of Winnipeg, which outlines some sort of formal analysis, cost benefit analysis which would explain the merits of a helicopter in the City of Winnipeg, and in my opinion, that would've been so easy to do. It would've certainly been information for this Council, but for the entire City of Winnipeg because this is probably the issue that's going to grab the headlines tomorrow morning and it would've been so easy to explain to Winnipeggers the benefit of the helicopter. So, I think what we need in these proceedings sometimes is just a good old fashioned dose of common sense and I would've expected some sort of report to be here before us.

I'm going to support Councillor Gerbasi's Motion on Rapid Transit, Mr. Speaker, and let's face it, we're spending close to 200 million for Phase 1. I think the real plumb in the Rapid Transit argument is when you get to the University of Manitoba. Manitoba is arguably the second largest city and you make that connection between the downtown and the U of M. And let's not forget, Mr. Speaker, 2004 was a water shed year for the City as Janice Lukes has said but we were weeks away from starting Phase 1 of Rapid Transit and had we maintained that schedule, Mr. Speaker, we would be doing the finishing touches on the University of Manitoba connection probably within a couple of months. And I think this is something that was…has been talked about for generations and generations and I once met a former Federal Cabinet Minister who said he offered former Mayors millions of dollars to start the Rapid Transit Connection 25, 30 years ago and former Mayors turned him down. While other cities were busy building their Rapid Transit Lines, collecting money and looking at alternative forms of transportation, the City of Winnipeg was nowhere to be found. So we are significantly playing catchup on this issue. I think Councillor Gerbasi's Motion makes a lot of sense. It talks about three levels of government funding this initiative. It talks about moving money around to make this happen. The important connection for Rapid Transit, the first one is the most pioneering, it's the most difficult, and once we get to the University of Manitoba we're going to see the most benefit on the Rapid Transit Lines.

Other Motions, I will sit down and hear other people's inputs on them. I will, as always, I will vote my conscience on those Motions and the entire Budget and I want to thank the Administration. I know how hard you worked on this entire document. I know that the time lines are tight and the pressures are intense but I think certainly the work that you've done has been excellent and I look forward to the final vote on the Budget. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to first of all thank our friends from the Cycling Community, Bike to the Future, the Winnipeg Trails Association, our friends at One Green City, and especially all the folks that are working hard in Northwest Winnipeg, the Northwest Commuter Cycling Group for the consistent leadership and advocacy with respect to Active Transportation and also want to extend a personal thanks to the Mayor and to this Council for the work that they've done with respect to fighting for Active Transportation within our city, and this really is good news here, Mr. Speaker. When we have $20 million invested over the next few years to build the city of the future with an Active Transportation Network that spans the entire city, a plethora of trails and bicycle routes that will take citizens from their homes and to their places of work and for recreation. So I think that is absolutely unheard of and Janice Lukes said it here today, unprecedented across Canada. So I want to thank all of our partners and this particular Council and the Mayor for that initiative.

On this particular Budget, Mr. Speaker, you'll notice that in Old Market Square you'll see that the old stage is veiled right now and there is a lot of hard work that's being done right now and there will be an unveiling in the spring. The folks at the Exchange District BIZ have been working extremely hard with the contractors and all the various partners involved including the Winnipeg Foundation to ensure that the Old Market Square is going to be revitalized, and this Budget affirms that and honours that Mr. Speaker, by including Old Market Square's Phases 1, 2 and 3 as part of the Capital Budget. I also wanted to mention that the Central Park, you know if you drive by there or you walk by there, it's pretty much done and this budget, you know, we're adding $400,000, a little bit of money, but that compliments our previous investment, Mr. Speaker, $2.6 million out of a $5.6 million project from the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement and all the folks who, especially in that neighbourhood, Mr. Speaker, a lot of new Canadians who live there will really benefit from that huge community amenity. There is a pleasure rink there and there's a toboggan slide, and I encourage all the Counillors there, it might even rival Harbourview in Councillor Wyatt's neighbourhood there. So Councillor Wyatt, maybe you can take your son, Thomas down there at Central Park.

With respect to Public Art, Mr. Speaker, this honours and affirms our Public Art funding where we continue to support half a million dollars of Public Art over the next two years. And Councillor Vandal alluded to it. This is also a good news story where we have the City and the Province together are going to be spending over $12 million over the next five years to reinvest in community amenities, our community centres, our parks and neighbourhood infrastructure and to also engage our neighbourhood in developing crime prevention initiatives, Mr. Speaker. And that's…we just went through the Building Communities initiatives in the first round and that was hugely, hugely positive. And I know neighbourhoods in St. Vital, St. Boniface and in Point Douglas and Daniel McIntyre really benefited from that, and this right here, we have that here today, and I think that it's very important that we focus on this particular initiative because this is really about investing in our neighbourhoods and this is a really…a good news story and the hard work of this Council should be commended on that.

Also, I want to finally thank Councillor Swandel for his advocacy during our meetings and you know, getting the message across that the cost to borrowing is a lot cheaper than the cost of inflation and moving forward some amendments, Mr. Speaker, to do a major regional street which is in our amended Budget, and some local streets. I just want to thank Councillor Swandel for that a little bit.

And on the Motions, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I'll just speak to No. 3 here with respect to Councillor Wyatt's Motion and I'm pleased to second that. I think that In Winnipeg here, Mr. Speaker, when you can have the community leading something and with the local

Councillor showing leadership here, to build a sense of community, I think that we should in every aspect, try and support those types of initiatives. Here we have the Transcona BIZ working with the business community and members of the community at large, and they've come up with a plan, Mr. Speaker, a detailed plan for a town square to celebrate their local Centennial, and that doesn't come around very often, Mr. Speaker, every hundred years. So this is sort of a once in a lifetime project that the communities are going to see and this local Councillor, Councillor Wyatt, is championing and I think we've done this before. It's not as if it's precedent setting and Councillor Wyatt specifically states that this Motion is subject to certain conditions including funds from various areas that the Councillor has detailed in his Motion as well as a contribution, a Provincial contribution, Mr. Speaker, of half a million dollars towards this particular project. So, in the spirit of that, and in the spirit of community building, you know, I can say that in my end of town when there is a project that needs to happen and when we have members of the community working with the Provincial Government, the Federal Government, our Foundations and the City Government, and others, various philanthropists, you know, things get done. And I think this Motion really speaks to the spirit and attempt of that and so that's why I'm pleased to support it as a seconder and I'll be supporting Councillor Wyatt's Motion when it comes time for the vote. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just quickly, I echo the congratulations and thanks to all our staff for putting this together and all the Councillors' times who have gone through this. I'm just going to go right to my questions. Regarding the recommendation for the helicopter, I do concur that we're going into this a little bit blind, however this has been…seems to be driven by the Province more than by us even though it's a will of many of us to have one. I am quite concerned or amazed, shocked, hopeful that a Provincial Government or another body of Government is going to pay the operating cost of something that the City is going to be using. I find that quite remarkable, very thankful, but I've got to say, I have red flags up on that. That is a hard thing for another body to do. I can see them buying the capital cost which they usually do, here is your thing and off they go. That's usually the model. But this model of them committing to operating costs is very unique in my opinion. I haven't heard it even when I was with the School Boards. However, if that's the model they do want and they're willing to fund it fully, well that's a tool especially if the Chief is saying that he does really like the idea. I do have large questions. I've got to admit I'm not too sure how many times this helicopter will be used to find kids in Assiniboine Forest. You know I don't want children lost in Assiniboine Forest, but is that really the reason why we are buying the helicopter? That's a little you know, there's other people living…(inaudible)

The other issue is, you know, how does it…they've been spending six, eight months on studying this proposal? Why can't we have a report then on just the benefits of it? How is it going to be used you know, when we have one of the major issues that our city's facing of course is carjacking, but also with this huge spike right now in violent crime especially with guns. This is the number one priority I see of our city right now that we have to get a handle on. Will this helicopter benefit that? Again, it may, but again a report would've been nice to be able to vet this through. However, that said I do understand that this is only with new money. So again, we're not going to be taking away from our existing complement to pay for the operating cost of this. So I do see that in the Motion and whoever put the word "new" in there was very smart and I do appreciate that. It makes it a lot easier for me to support it because I do not want to be taking Police off our streets. I would prefer this money went to feet on the street. For first, that's my preference. Community based crime initiatives. That's where I see the larger impact than a helicopter, however we work in a global environment, the Province has said they want to pay the

operating cost, all the operating cost of this, forever, fantastic. Now, forever. How long does this last for this operating cost? Is it a couple years? Not too many years.

So my questions will be and I hope I get a reply to it, has the option…and here, it doesn't say so, but has the option been looked at leasing a helicopter? Is that an option? I don't know, but again if the Government pulls out that funding, are we now on the hook for that million and a half to 200…$2 million from somewhere in the operating budget to fund it. So again a leasing, you know, okay, you're not funding it, we can shut down the program if we need to. Have we looked at using it with other partners, the Fire and Paramedic Service, the RCMP, Search and Rescue, do we really need a helicopter 100% of the time or can we start partnering or sharing with other groups? Again a report hopefully would've mentioned that maybe jurisdictionally not possible I don't know, but a report would've been nice to help that out. However that said, I do…unless I'm hearing something much different, I will be supporting the helicopter. My question to is for…I guess it will be for Councillor Fielding, and I do appreciate the fact that we are trying to make sure that the money gets spent real quick. Don't leave money on the table, worry about when you're going to pay more for inflation later on. Makes complete sense, but in the economic modeling you always have to look at supply and demand as well. If we're lumping thousands of…this huge new number of projects in one year, Winnipeg only has certain amount of crews can do work. Will that drive up inflation in reverse? So again, it's a supply/demand economics. I'm not sure if that's been actually looked at all. And again I'm not even sure if it's possible to figure that out. But again, my concern is that we only have so many people in the City that can do this work. We already know the construction trades are stretched thin. Will this actually take that (inaudible) and just move it a year forward? So that's a tad concern.

My other concern is specifically and a little bit more my ward basis. I think again in the concept of Taylor, it's a wonderful idea, however in my neighbourhood next year, we're looking at the Sterling Lyon, Kenaston, massive redevelopment happening there with the IKEA Project happening. We also have the Jubilee overpass is going to be done, so this is going to cause some, I believe…and I've talked to (inaudible) over at our traffic…this is going to cause some serious problems with traffic running through the neighbourhood. So, will this project now that you're going to be bottling up Taylor, will that drive much more traffic down into the River Heights-Fort Garry ward or block even people who are trying to get from to Linden Woods and Linden Ridge? Because really the only trail they're going to have, and we all know how horrible this one is, is the Waverley, over the Waverley tracks. It's going to be very difficult to get through that Kenaston next year. It's just a massive development project. So again there's going to be people backed up at the Wellington…that Waverley track system and we also have…we have mass amount of concerns that Waverley and Hurst Way with that whole intersection. So I've asked for some kind of traffic report. Before we looked at combining these two Taylor projects. The Traffic people said no, I think we'll be okay, now they are not too sure so I…but we're going to put that in the planning so I'm a little concerned about that. I just want to put that on the table.

However, otherwise on the Motions of Rapid Transit, again, I think it's wonderful and Active Transportation that we're all on board on this and again we should be proud of ourselves. This is something that is very forward thinking. My question to Councillor Swandel just for clarity itself, I was a little concerned when I read it because we're taking from a ratepayer, a direct ratepayer system into more of a general revenue system but what I heard and I think I agree with is that you're talking about the borrowing portion and just moving that around so the ratepayer is not going to pay that rate. We're just moving that portion of borrowing over to another column. If that's the case, then I actually…I support the Motion. I'm a little concerned about its tie to the elimination of the nitrogen, so again I can support

both Motions. So at least we have it on the table next year. That's my concern. The government has already said they're not budging on this. If they do budge, that's wonderful. If they don't budge, then this isn't on the table. But the grand plan of $250 million, I love that. I just don't like the idea that it's tied with us using this negotiation tactic with the Province. So again I think it is…this Budget to me, my first one, appreciate it, has actually showed a lot more commonality than I thought. I thought it'd be much more divisive but I think the City Councillors have been able to speak their pieces and we are actually…we are able to come to compromise the Preliminary Capital Budget that I will be able to support.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking to the Clause today. With any Capital Budget…well, first I want to thank the staff as well who I know how hard they work on these things, and there is always a lot of positive things in the Capital Budget because basically it's a list of things we're doing so there...we're doing a lot of really, really good things obviously with this kind of money.

I'd like to point out some of the positives in here. Of course I'm pleased to see the reconstruction of the Osborne Village, the Bridge through Osborne Village. Repairing existing infrastructure has got to be a priority and I think it should be our highest priority. The Disraeli Bridge Project, I've always supported that project. I do have some misgivings about the financing which I'll just talk about in a few minutes. I'm very pleased regarding the Riverbank Stabilization Funding. I appreciate that Councillor Swandel came through in his commitment from last year in terms of when there was money removed, it was put back in for this year so that there's enough to complete the Churchill Parkway River Bank Project which is long overdue as we are losing chunks of that park to the River, so I'm quite pleased with that. The BIZ…there's other funding that remains in there that I always worry about not remaining because of previous budget experiences. And I'm happy to see the Public Art continue especially considering Winnipeg is going to be the Cultural Capital of Canada in 2010, and I'm pleased there will be no…assume there will be no raiding of that pot during the Operating Budget which has unfortunately happened in the past because we are the Cultural Capital of Canada for 2010 and I have the Mayor's commitment on that but, we will see that funding come through in 2010.

On the cycling, the $20 million from the Federal Government stimulus money is fantastic. I would like to comment, I don't agree with Janice Lukes that we shouldn't be…I think we should be funding cycling as well as recreational paths which we are funding. I think we also need to have commuter routes for non-alpha cyclists, people such as myself who actually want to ride to work but we're not one of those alpha cyclists who's going to ride across the Donald Bridge in the middle of winter or whatever. We need to have cycling (inaudible speaking in the background)…no, don't criticize my bike. It's classic. But…I…thank you. Commuter cycling has got to be something we're encouraging. That's the idea of a community-wide climate change plan. The idea is to get people to get out of their cars and choose another mode of transportation, so if we only build recreational paths we're really not going to achieve that goal. We need to do both because I think there is obviously other life style benefits and so on for the recreational paths. But commuter cycling should be a key priority and I'm really pleased to see in the $20 million dollars, a lot of that is going towards some downtown routes and some other routes so people can get to work. It's excellent. So I think that's very exciting.

I do want to express some concern that the Budget reflects, of course, decisions Council's made about privately financing a couple of the P3 projects that are in here. I recall the Mayor saying at a previous Council meeting, everybody knows that public financing is cheaper, yet we're still privately financing 50% of two major projects, the Disraeli Bridge and Chief Peguis Trail Extension. Now, there is an argument about the risk and the level of maintenance and all those

things, but I also think there is another argument that you really have to question using private…and I've heard there's two sides to this. And you know, there is an argument that it's ideologically driven. Well, I would argue it's been ideologically driven the other way in reverse, saying, you know, we bought into the idea of P3s so we're doing this. You could argue just as well especially when everybody knows that this type of financing is not a good idea at this time, I have to be…express concern about that and I've heard that from some of my constituents.

I'm also a little disappointed that obviously the reason for my Motion was that the Rapid Transit wasn't included in here but yet there is included in here significant road improvements around the Waverley West Project, and I do have to wonder how that jumped the queue so quickly. But I know how it did because the Federal Government announced the money. But of all our priorities that we have as a city I would've hoped that we would've gone to the Feds and said, these other things are more important but you know, you never get everything you want. I'm just expressing that I think that the people of Fort Rouge and a lot of people in the city who want to see our city be developed in a more compact, urban form, and would not like to see that be our number one priority for a huge project like that jump ahead of other projects so I just want to express that concern on behalf of the people I represent.

And I'd also like to speak briefly to the helicopter issue. I haven't made up my mind whether…I don't think anybody really should have made up their mind until we've seen this report, because, you know, I met with the Police Chief about a couple of issues and one of them was this. And I also…when I used to chair the Protection and Community Services Committee several years ago, I went to Alberta, to Edmonton and Calgary and looked at their helicopter programs there. And what was decided at the time was that if the funding could come from…there was private people interested in raising funding and that that would be considered, and I think again the issues are who's going to pay for this and how? I mean, the operating costs are probably a lot more than a million because there is the million and then they have to train pilots and there's other things on top of that. So we're talking significant operating dollars and you know, it's one thing to have a chat with the Police Chief and say, yeah, this sounds good, and it has some benefits and I believe him. But I mean, we have to look at the numbers and the priorities and I think it's been pointed out that we have to compare what do our citizens get the most benefit from. Is it more feet on the street? Is it more…or is this helicopter going to create and free up police resources. It's been talked about. And that might be the case, but we really need to have that document and it's just not the right way to do things and it just not the right way to instill public confidence in the decisions Council is making to just sort of say, "trust us, you know, there's no sheets of paper or there's nothing to look at, but trust us, you know we're making good decisions with your money, with millions of dollars." You know, and I think that's been said by a lot of people and I think this Council is owed, members at this Council as well as the public are owed an explanation about the cost benefits and the argument so that we can make an informed decision, okay? We're making a decision but I don't think it's necessary that informed and you know maybe Councillors had a brief…maybe EPC has seen a report. I don't even know. No one even knows where that report is at. But I haven't seen it and so it makes it difficult for those of us who haven't seen the numbers to decide about the numbers because budgets are about numbers as well as ideas. So I really think the public as well as all members of Council have a right to know and I think we would all like to make a very informed decision about, you know, the issue of safety as Councillor Orlikow pointed out is a huge concern. There's a spike in violent crime right now. Things are getting better on some other fronts because of some innovative programs dealing with car theft and that, which is great, but we still have some serious safety concerns. And you know, I can tell you and a constituent of mine called me yesterday and said that he'd run into some beat cops walking on the street and he was very thrilled to see

some beat cops walking on the street and he was very thrilled to see some beat cops walking on the street because we don't have see that as much any more. And you know, the beat cops themselves said, “yeah, well we want to be doing this. We want to be here. And as long as that helicopter doesn't take away our ability to be here, that was their concern as well. And I think that's a concern that probably a lot of citizens have. We don't want to lose anything in…in investing resources in something else that’s very costly.

Mr. Speaker: (Inaudible) extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: Now if we can do…if we can do that and still have the same level of Police Service that we have now, I think people would be very happy with it and if we can confirm that funding from the Provincial Government, I think people would be happy but we need to have something in writing before we change a budget for millions and millions dollars and I don't think that's an unreasonable thing to ask. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise today and state my support for the Capital Budget of 2009, 2010 and the next five years. I’d like to recognize our staff for the tremendous work they've put in on this. In fact, Mike Ruta worked so hard he lost 50 pounds. So that’s…that's dedication.

What this budget says to me and shows to me is the tremendous momentum that our city has right now. And I think that's really something Councillor Steeves sort of alluded to. It's…Capital Budgets tend to be good news for the most part but it really demonstrates to me that we have a lot of things going in the right direction in the City of Winnipeg and I just can say on behalf of the citizens of St. Charles ward, that we're by and large pretty pleased with the treats that we find within it for our ward and next door with St. James ward, we're going to receive the Bridge on Sturgeon Road in 2011. It will commence design and construction to replace something that right now does not allow capacity of large trucks to go over, and we're certainly excited about that. Councillor Fielding and I worked together as Janice Lukes suggested, on a trails initiative for the Yellow Ribbon Trail that commenced in my ward this year and will continue east all the way to Polo Park through the Board of St. James along with some Federal funding that is much appreciated and we will say that were it not for the support of Minister Toews and Minister Fletcher, that those funds would not have been forthcoming. So we do appreciate the senior level of Government's participation in Active Transportation and the philosophy that they've embraced along with the City of Winnipeg.

And again, Councillor Fielding and I have been a part of the Assiniboine Park Conservancy Board of Directors and we can tell you that the 7 to 8 million dollars that is dedicated within this Capital Budget for the improvements starting next summer of the Duck Pond, the Family Centre and restaurant, the Nature Park that playground that’s going to be constructed and just the overall momentum again that we have within that property, with the assistance of the Provincial Government's $31 million for the Polar Bear Exhibit and Research Facility is outstanding and I think it’s again showing that Winnipeg is not going to be left behind by anybody.

On the helicopter front, I certainly have had some similar questions in my mind as to its appropriateness, but I know we have a very strong individual and leader with our Chief of Police, Keith McCaskill, and that his views on the subject, I want to support, and at this point, I’m feeling that the $3 million in the appropriation is appropriate this time.

The two Motions that I will be supporting that came on the floor today will be the Motion 2 with Councillor Swandel. Hopefully moving that $250 million from the nitrogen removal to Rapid Transit. Rapid Transit’s not a big topic of conversation in St. Charles ward. We are blessed with having the widest street and the fastest street in the city to take our citizens back and forth along Portage Avenue. So, we're doing it in the overall

vision of what a city can be and will be in 20 or 25 years when there is Rapid Transit throughout the entire city as I see it. And I will be supporting Councillor Wyatt's Motion on the Transcona Centennial. The sun rises on Transcona and sets in St. Charles on the City of Winnipeg, and I just think that as Councillor Pagtakhan did state, that these kinds of opportunities only come along once every hundred years and it's certainly worth us giving consideration. So thank you, I wish everyone a Merry Christmas, Happy New Year and I will be supporting the Capital Budget.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Councillor Browaty, you're the final speaker.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of the Capital Budget here. First I would like to thank Mayor Katz, Finance Chair, Scott Fielding, former Chair Justin Swandel as well as the Administration for drafting a budget that I believe addresses the priorities of the citizens of Winnipeg. This year alone $183 million being invested in roads and sidewalks and streets… (Inaudible) oh, okay, roads and streets. By far and above, the number one issue that I hear about from my constituents is roads and streets.

Less sexy items that are not necessarily on people's top of minds, but need to be addressed are crumbling water infrastructure. Huge investments in sewers, watermains and infrastructures such as that, the New Water Treatment Plant that just came on board is a great investment that again most people would not fully appreciate.

Community infrastructure, parks, the Assiniboine Park money, I think all very good pieces of community infrastructure. In North Kildonan, we're seeing some of the advan…the benefits from previous Capital Budgets that have been invested wisely. Money that's gone into Bronx Park Community Club, the very popular Northeast Pioneers Greenway. Money…the small potato money, things like Community Infrastructure Grant Money that's in the Capital Budget that I was able to leverage to use to get a new roof on Gateway Rec. Centre by getting money through very quickly to do an engineering report that was able to leverage money from the other levels of government, stuff again that's important to people on the streets in our communities.

Regarding the Police Helicopter, again the Watch Program has been successful in reducing the number of stolen vehicles that are being used as weapons on our streets but hasn't eliminated them. We're finding now things like carjackings are becoming unfortunately more common and innocent bystanders on our streets are being negatively affected and killed in cases. A police helicopter is a way to avoid having Police as other high speed vehicles on our streets that are in pursuit of stolen vehicles. By eliminating high speed pursuits in many cases with the police helicopter, we are able to potentially save lives. This isn't just about dollars and cents. So I do…I am very supportive of the Police Helicopter and again the devil is always in the details and as we go forward with the operating piece if in fact the Province is paying the operating dollars I do want to make sure that there's an escalation clause involved in that as well, not the…this is what it costs to operate in year one as the cost of fuels, as the cost of parts for an aging helicopter escalate. I want to ensure that there's an operating clause in there that the dollars do increase from the Province going forward. Unlike, for example, you know, we're going to hire 40 new cops. You know here's the money on day one. That money wasn't increased over time so again as those negotiations go on with the Province I want to ensure that that's in there.

Again for projects this year that are coming up, the Chief Peguis Trail is a huge, long overdue piece of infrastructure for North Winnipeg, Northeast Winnipeg in particular. The Disraeli, again, very thankful for the Provincial Government for coming on board with a…with their investment in this project. The original Disraeli was paid for even half by the Province, again, this is still being borne predominantly by the City but I think the

right solution is going to come forward hopefully very soon.

Regarding the Motions that we see in front of us today, I'll be supporting certainly Motion 2. Again, I like to see more transparency when you look at the issue of the nitrogen, the cost of it being borne by water rates not by general taxes, but I think it does make an important point and therefore I certainly will be supporting that. I have spoken many a time in here about the lack of apparent wisdom, the lack of science about removing nitrogen from the effluent from the Water Treatment Plants. So I'm certainly on side with that.

Regarding Motion No. 3, I would like to see maybe a little more structure in terms of the process for taking, you know, neighbourhood infrastructure and reinvesting it, but again it's certainly not the first time this sort of things have been done. The Bronx Park Community Club with the sale of the East Kildonan City Hall is an example of that happening up my way, so I will be supportive of this. Again, it's good to see support from other levels of government. Looks like a lot of due diligence has been done on this one and I will be supportive of Motion No. 3 today. So again, I think this is a well balanced budget that addresses the priorities of people in the City of Winnipeg. I look forward voting in favour of it today. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Mr. Mayor, there's…okay. Mr. Mayor, you're next.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think first of all I'd like to use the words of the immortal Councillor Jenny Gerbasi, "we are doing a lot of really good things". That's what this budget is all about. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to basically repeat what's been said. So many of the positive things we're doing have been pointed out by many of the Councilors here today. Do we want to do more? Absolutely. We all know if we had more money, we could spend it on a lot more positive things. I would like to address a couple of the comments that were made here earlier. One regarding our infrastructure deficit. Just for the record, we didn't get to where we are overnight, Mr. Speaker. A couple of decades of neglect helped us get here so let's all be cognizant of how we got here and let's all be cognizant of how we're trying to address the problem. Yours truly and many Councilors here today have been saying how we need a share of growth revenues to address our infrastructure deficit. Councillor Wyatt took it upon his broad shoulders to identify our problems and how we can possibly address them and we will continue that fight, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to remind people about the gas tax. When the gas tax originally came out, we were not allowed to use it to fix our roads and bridges, Mr. Speaker. I went to Ottawa on two occasions to fight that battle and in the end we persevered and they relented and let us use that money for roads and bridges. That was not the way it was from the beginning, Mr. Speaker.

I don't want to get into it but it's come up so often. I would like to share a bit of information regarding the helicopter and some factual information. Mr. Speaker, contrary to what may have been reported or said by others, this was not my idea. Chief McCaskill came up with the idea that we need a police helicopter, that it would help us use our resources, it would help us solve and prevent crimes and many other amenities to that. Mr. Speaker, yes, I am totally supportive of Chief McCaskill and his idea, and it appears to some extent so is the Province and so is the Minister. But let me explain one thing so everybody knows. Before the election for a new leader to replace Premier Doer, we had meetings with Premier Doer as well as Minister Chomiak. And the ask that came from McCaskill and yours truly was quite simple. We will find the money to purchase it. We're asking the Province to pick up the operating costs of approximately $1.3 million.

Number two, as Councillor Orlikow has said, "I love it, I don't see that happening." And he is right, Mr. Speaker, because we're doing business backwards. We have the least amount of money from every tax dollar we get eight cents. Province gets 42. The Federal

Government gets 50. And yet we keep on having to come to the table with matching money or picking up the operating expenses. We can't afford to do that. We all know that. We need more revenue so we went and did what we believe was the smart way and in this Budget, Mr. Speaker, it specifically states "subject to the Province coming to the table with new money and the operating money" and the reason for the new money, Mr. Speaker, is because Premier Doer when he was here, already made a commitment for new police officers and yes, we don't want to lose that. And Mr. Speaker, since I've been Mayor, we've added 118 new police officers to our contingency, just for the fact, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Speaker, I'd like everybody including me to see a report. I happened to see the Chief yesterday and it's my understanding that a report will be coming very soon and I can assure you it will come prior to the Province making their decision, Mr. Speaker.

Just to address Councillor Vandal's question about Fire Halls. My understanding is that report will be coming to the proper committee either in January or February at the latest to move that through. And how can I not speak about P3s? For those who don't know, it's all about value for money. And the reason we're moving forward on this is because our Administration is saying this is a good deal. It's not Sam Katz, it's not Jenny Gerbasi, it's not Gord Steeves. Our Administration is saying this is a good deal, we can build now and it's saving us money, we're getting value for money. Forgetting about what everybody forgets is what a great job we've done maintaining our streets, our sidewalks, our back lanes, our bridges, et cetera, et cetera. This does a fantastic job. Mr. Speaker, I will definitely be supporting the Budget and I'm happy to see that so many people on the floor of Council recognize the positives in this Budget and there's no doubt we'd all like to do more.

I'd like to address the Motions, Mr. Speaker. Motions 1 and 2. I will not be supporting either of them and I will tell you why. Although they both have a great deal of merit, Mr. Speaker, on Motion No. 1, Mr. Speaker, I spent six months negotiating with the other two levels of government, and as was mentioned on the floor of Council, at our last Council meeting when Councillor Jenny Gerbasi asked the question, I told her right now that there are negotiations going on regarding Stage 2 of Rapid Transit. These negotiations, Mr. Speaker, are rather sensitive at times, number one. Number two, I believe we are very close to crossing the finish line. And I have no intention of doing anything to jeopardize that because I know how to kill a deal quite simply, is have the City of Winnipeg make an announcement that we're doing something prior to other two other levels of government being committed. There is very little doubt in my mind we will cross the finish line. I will ask Councillor Gerbasi and others to be patient.

On the other Motion, Mr. Speaker, my personal opinion, all 16 of us should be on Broadway telling the Provincial Government "do not flush $350 million of taxpayer dollars down the toilet" because that's what this is doing and I very much appreciate and respect the intention of the Motion, although Mr. Speaker I don't think it's the way to get things done. I think we as a Council should be united to fight this and Mr. Speaker, if there was a vote on the floor of Council and the vote is 15-1, I don't think you'd call that a divided Council. The realities are, the scientific community has basically said this is a waste of money. Plus, it will harm Lake Winnipeg and somebody better start listening and we'd better start screaming loud because obviously people are not listening to us. They are not hearing us, and if there is anything we should be united on, it should be $350 million, forgetting about $9 million a year and operating expenses, flushed down the toilet and I think we can all see…

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

Mayor Katz: I think we can all see what can be done with 250 million, 350 million or $9 million a year. It's a waste of money, someone better start listening.

Motion No. 3, Mr. Speaker. Although, Mr. Speaker, I am one who very much believes in policy, I know that in the five years I've seen changes to policy on a regular basis. It was pointed out before when someone has their centennial, they ask for money and quite often we do it. It happens once every 100 years. I would rather have things done ahead of time as opposed to the last minute, Mr. Speaker. I believe that if any Councillor here was celebrating their 100th year and wanted to so something special and have a capital project that would enhance their community, I think we'd all want to support them. The facts are, we are one city. Maybe we should think as one city. But the facts are, everybody here represents a different ward, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I will support Motion No. 3.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'm definitely not going to support Motion 1. Not going to support Motion 2 either because if Motion 1 is wrong, you simply vote against it you don't create another Motion that is going to cost the taxpayers a lot of money in my view, the way it's worded, to kill No 1 or to look like you're only partially killing it. First of all, the second "whereas" blows me away. The Province has agreed to 50/50 funding it says in 2007. Well, this is for Phase 2. I mean if they did that then why did we borrow their share of Phase 1? That's because that's what we did. They couldn't even go get the money so we had to borrow it and put it on our account. That's not real money, it might be in some kind of a bill but they've only announced it once. They've got to announce it three or four times before it's real. It's not real, trust me.

As far as the fourth "whereas" dealing with Water and Waste Projects, they're all funded, every one of them, is funded through the Utility Rates, all the way down the line, even a couple that I don't like, and Assiniboine Park is basically the same thing.

The other thing, if the Province thought that Phase 2 was so exciting and actually had some money, then why did they go after the Federal Government for all the stimulus money for the Floodway and for CentrePort? Because that's where almost every nickel of the stimulus money went before we even got a chance to get to that. I mean, there were nickels and dimes left around but that's about all there was, so I can't support either one of those first two Motions, and I've heard some people stand up here today and say they're going to support Motion 2, and I don't understand it because if you read it, and I appreciate the intent, but the first money, if the Province changes their mind finally and does the right thing, all that's going to do is relax the rates a little bit because all that money is going to be paid for by Utility Rates, not off the tax bill. If you do this and you all of a sudden contribute $250 million towards Rapid Transit starting in 2012, then that's real money that you've got to put on the table. That's real money that has to be paid for by the taxpayer with increased taxes. That's what you're doing. So why would you pass a Motion like that to be seen to be killing No. 1 on the floor during a Capital Budget debate that's been going on for months, when you don't have to do that right now? That doesn't make any sense to me. There is no fiscal…I don't think it's fiscally responsible anyways. So everybody can do what they want. I just don't think it's the right thing.

We keep hearing about the Province and all this money and I'm going to go back to No. 1 again. You know, two years ago in December, almost exactly right now, they announced $206 million for Clean Environment Commission Initiatives and to this day, other than the $11 million they announced about 6 weeks ago, we don't know when we're getting the other 195. I haven't got a clue because they announce this stuff over and over and over and ad nauseam. And we don't really know when that's coming. I don't know how the hell they budget for it. They make announcements and then it just doesn't show up anywhere. So I don't know how anybody can go back and look at that 50/50 funding thing from some kind of the emissions bill.

As far as the helicopter goes, the Mayor's made that pretty crystal clear. Okay, we don't have a report. Keith McCaskill thinks it's a good idea. He is well respected by his staff, and they are having a lot of trouble as we all know with the court system and what that has been doing to us and they honestly believe that this will help. And so we've got the capital money here and the current money is not supposed to be a problem because I read it in a Bart Kives' column and it wasn't in Twitter either, it was actually in the paper, that Greg Selinger said he was supporting the helicopter. I read it and was it Dan Lett that wrote it? I'm sorry. I apologize. (Inaudible) I was sure that that was…it was one of your columns, but anyway that's okay you can let him take the credit for it, it's okay. Bottom, bottom line, I'm glad he was in town, you know, because he is all over the place, Dan. But, these days it says it would appear. Anyway, but I was excited that it made the paper and not just Twitter, you know, and…but he said it and so it had to be right.

And you know, as far as Assiniboine Park goes, I mean that's an exciting situation as well. I mean we don't have any commitment from the Federal Government yet, but I can't believe they won't be there in the end, but we've got a very, very strong commitment from the private, the people in the city, the philanthropists. We know we're going to have our money on the table plus $3 million a year beyond that in capital. We know that the Province has already put two-thirds of their money on the table for the Polar Bear Exhibit and…so I think that the initiative at Assiniboine Park is going to be exciting over the next five or six years and come together very, very well.

The other thing I want to talk about though is some of our servicing costs on this Budget and that's why I really don't like No. 2 a whole bunch where we're going with that because that's current budget stuff. You know, it wasn't very many years ago, we were headed down a real slippery slope of the debt service. And that debt service instead of going from about 129 to $159 million is now down around 45 million. I'm not counting the P3s because there's only two and a half million dollars with P3s that's actually in our Budget so far. It will grow and I appreciate that but as it grows to roughly 27, 28 million over the next two or three years, that 45 is going to keep on dropping like a rock, so it's going to even itself out and give us some flexibility which is why I'm prepared to support the $30 million borrowing that's in there. The By-law today for the Peguis Trail, something I wouldn't have done a couple of years ago, I can tell you. And I supported the same thing with Disraeli for the same reason. The other thing I just…I've got to say it one more time. I'm not gonna go to No. 3. I don't know what to do with No. 3 yet. The only thing I don't understand about No. 3 is where the heck were you six months ago? Like why is this coming now? That's what I don't understand. Maybe there was a problem cobbling the stuff together. I don't really know or understand it and I haven't talked to you about it but it's… timing isn't great on this thing is one of the issues, notwithstanding that we do things different from time to time. But the...

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

Councillor Clement: I don't need the two minutes, Harry. The bottom line is I'm not going to support Motions 1 and 2 and I'm going to support the Budget. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith I believe you're the last speaker and I will close on the three Motions and on the Clause.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, you know when you look at any budget, there are lots of things in any budget you can support because you know, for example in this Budget, I'm very supportive of the Active Transportation and Assiniboine Park Investment, Public Art, but the biggest thing I'm really keen about is the Central Park Redevelopment. That park is going to be incredible. And the people around the neighbourhood are talking about it. They see it developing. You know, it's…it's going to be such a change for the neighbourhood that I really think that this is a key thing in this Budget. But you know, there is also the whole

question about the helicopter. Now, I would rather have a report too, but I have some faith in Chief McCaskill, and if he wants a helicopter, you know, I'm inclined to be supportive of it. But at the same time, I really would like to know what it's going to do, okay? But the thing about this Budget, it really to me not worth supporting is that it represents a deterioration of many of our neighbourhoods. For example, indoor aquatic facility. Go to the Pan Am Pool, go to the Sherbrook Pool and you will see that work has to be done and needs to be done. Outdoor aquatic facilities. We have wading pools that are crumbling, you know, like it's incredible. We're not thinking about what we're offering.

Now I want to talk about building communities, too. It's a cut of 650,000 over last year. The program goals are to improve living conditions in Winnipeg neighbourhoods where capital improvement in parks, community facilities, municipal infrastructure and crime prevention initiatives will have long term benefit to the neighbourhood in the larger urban community. Well, you know, it's really worthwhile. Why are we cutting it? I know we still have it. It's still in the Budget, but it's not the same amount.

Now, let's talk about back lanes. You know, in 2008 we budgeted 3.3 million for back lanes. This Capital Budget cuts the amount we spend on back lanes to 2.75 million. Now, you know, we're not spending enough on back lanes. I mean, it's peanuts anyway. Why slice it a little bit more? It seems to me that back lanes are pretty important to many of our wards. For example, in Daniel Mac there are 200 lanes in need of repair, with an estimated cost of 3.49 million, River Heights, Fort Garry, 80 lanes, 25.9 million, Fort Rouge, Fort Garry, 160 lanes, 21.7 million. Mynarski ward, the Speaker's ward, 50 lanes, 8.6 million to redo them. Point Douglas, 24 lanes at 5.1 million. Now, you know, it's really important to have back lanes redone. Now we don't need to do it all in one year or two years or even five years. But we should have a definite plan to deal with the back lanes and we don't do that, and this Budget doesn't help. Also the regional streets. A cut of 12.8 million in 2009, to 2.6 million on major regional street rehabilitation. Look, the regional streets are crucial to this city. You know we can't afford that sort of cut. So I'm not supportive of this Budget though there are things in it that I'm excited about and I think are great, but I have to vote against it because of the back lanes, because of the streets…regional street cut. I can't support that. I think we should maintain what we have. That's my first priority.

Mr. Speaker: Councilors it's 9 minutes to 12. Councillor Wyatt, do you have a Motion.

Councillor Wyatt: Move that we go beyond lunch just to finish.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, did you hear that? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will be closing right now, we will be closing on Motion No. 3, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll keep my comments very brief, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank those who spoke in support and others, I thank Councillor Pagtakhan for seconding the Motion. I appreciate that, Councillor Pagtakhan. And also, thank the Mayor for his words as well and even though I'm supposed to speak to the Motion, I just will…to say, Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention the throne speech. We need…we talked about the 380 million infrastructure deficit. Our message is not getting through on Broadway not just for this municipality, but every municipality in Manitoba , so the challenge…

Mr. Speaker: He is…he is done. It's okay...it's okay. Since you're standing Councillor Swandel on your Motion No. 2.

Councillor Swandel: Pardon me?

Mr. Speaker: Your Motion No. 2.

Councillor Swandel: Did he conclude his comments?

Mr. Speaker: He's finished.

Councillor Wyatt: Just want to say Councillor Swandel is quite right, and anyway I appreciate the support on Council and for the Motion and look

forward to voting on the Budget. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, as you are aware I can only speak to Item 2 as all the conversation on the entire Budget is closed. I will say that on Item 2 a number of comments have been made, in particular I will jump to Councillor Orlikow's comments on the economics of it, and why are these things not in the Budget? It's about supply and demand and ensuring that things are in the Budget. I mean, you can use that argument anywhere in this Budget, Mr. Speaker, not just specifically to Rapid Transit. We certainly look at value for money when it's…when we've had the argument on the Budget process about whether or not we should be borrowing or not. These monies can be brought forward into the Budget. It's a matter of…through borrowing and by eliminating inflation, the cost of borrowing being less. You can certainly be there. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when you look at it in this Rapid Transit Motion, you can even apply some of the argument to the helicopter. You know, it's like keeping the idea alive. We have a great deal of flexibility in our Budget process. We leave additional monies in the Budget process for things like Rapid Transit and we create the opportunity to do things as we go forward. The helicopter is certainly the example of that. And this Motion No. 2 is basically talking about opportunity and the opportunity to make a real investment in sustainable development and sustainable practices in the City of Winnipeg. I believe firmly that it's a great mistake that the Provincial Government is making, you know, in holding the rate payers to pay this exorbitant amount of money. Three hundred and fifty million dollars of capital costs and on top of that another nine million dollars a year of operating costs, and when you look at what that means, you put it into the context of just Rapid Transit, that certainly gives you pause, when you know that the leading scientist in the world on this matter and you know, I respect Councillor Steeves' comments about this mass of scientists saying it, but I know that the leading scientists in the world in this regard says, "don't do this." But yet, for some reason, politically we're going to choose to go ahead as the Province is going to politically choose to go ahead and force us to spend $350 million where it is not necessary. You know, it befuddles me that a government would do that when that level of expertise is in front of you saying, do not do this.

With respect to Councillor Clement's comments, I believe that Councillor Clement failed to read the entire Motion. Councillor Clement spoke to it shifting from ratepayers to tax, it would have to come out of taxes. The Motion clearly articulates that yes, there is only one payer in this equation but whether you're the Water Utility Ratepayer or whether you're the taxpayer of the City of Winnipeg or whether you're the transit fare payer of the City of Winnipeg, you…you're the same payer and it doesn't matter. At the end of the day if it's going to cost you a hundred dollars a year as a payer, it doesn't matter whether it's coming out of your utility bill or it's coming out of your tax bill, or it's coming out of your rent or it's coming out of the business…the commercial taxes that people pay in the City of Winnipeg. So, you know, that comment really is invalid.

Councillor Gerbasi I think made some reference to where does the money come from. I believe that the money would have to come from some form of borrowing. It's you know, it's not difficult to figure out that if you're spending…if you've got $350 million in play for the nitrogen removal and $9 million in play for the operating costs that you can go to your ratepayers, you can certainly do that. There is really no issue here other than we're keeping this conversation alive. We know that when it comes to sustainable practices, that investing in Rapid Transit is far better than investing in what the Province is telling us that we have to force our utility rate payers to invest in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know I don't expect to get support for this Motion. I put it forward in large part to have the conversation. I thought Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Orlikow's Motion was a bit of…more political than a well informed

way to go. So I thought it would be interesting to politicize this issue a little bit more and put it into the context of nitrogen removal verses Rapid Transit and where should you be spending the dollars. I think Mayor Katz probably said it very articulately and very clearly that we're always at the table in these conversations. We're sitting at the table with Bus Rapid Transit whenever we get the opportunity. I believe that we are at the table in our budget processes as well. You know, we maintain a certain amount of money in our budget processes and we look for opportunities to gain value for money, you know, we always…we have in recent years, this year we're applying some of the capital investment funds somewhere else, but in out years you can see that we do have monies ranging from 2 million to $8 million a year going out into the out years that we…gives us a little bit of flexibility to react and to respond. You know that when we did the first leg of BRT, we did it by establishing…thank you, Councillor. By establishing…that was my two minute warning. By establishing the Rapid Transit Investment Fund. But you know, I think we have to be respectful of what the Mayor has said and the situation that he's in and I'd be the first to say I did this really to politicize on this issue and to sort of get the discussion steered where it is. With that being said, Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw the Motion at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, your Motion No. 1 closing.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to clarify a couple of things. I did make the point earlier that there was some disagreement that the funding from Assiniboine Park, whether or not it actually is contingent. First of all, I totally support that funding but I just want to say it does clearly say on page 364 of the document that it's contingent on funding from other levels of government which we don't yet have. I checked with the budget staff. And I also checked with the head of the Water and Waste Department earlier and it was confirmed that there is 200 million in unconfirmed Federal Funding. So I'm just…the only reason I'm raising that…it…like that there is…in order to build all the projects that are in our budget that are just mentioned in the five year forecast, you know, we're counting on 200 million coming from the Federal Government and that's not in the …so I'm just trying to say that that is how we do things in the Budget. We put things in, knowing we're going to do it in partnership with other levels of government and then we…because it shows our commitment to doing those things whether in Water and Waste it's because we have to, it sounds like from what people are saying and in the Assiniboine Park, we want to be leader on Assiniboine Park, so we put it in there. So we put it in there and that's exactly what I'm suggesting we should be doing with Rapid Transit is putting it in there. I also I have a concern that the Motion No. 2 where it says it's…the funding for Rapid Transit is contingent on that decision by the Province…about the nitrogen removal. That's a bit risky to link a totally unrelated project to another type of political decision because does that mean that you know, we can't fund Rapid Transit if that doesn't occur? So I just think that's one caution.

I also think it…the Mayor's expressed a concern about jamming other levels of government that we're doing diplomatic sensitive negotiations with and I agree with him. I just…I don't happen to think that putting something in our Budget that we've already talked about doing like completing the second phase of Rapid Transit that we've already gone in and published Rapid Transit Task Force Report is jamming them. I mean, they know that it's in our report. They know…they themselves have talked about doing it in terms of the Province. So we're not jamming the Province at all by putting this in the Budget, however this Motion and the other Motion that's competing with this Motion is pretty undiplomatic. It's pretty much jamming the Province and trying to embarrass them into doing something that perhaps you legitimately want to have done but in terms of methodology of trying to accomplish what you are trying to accomplish, this is a pretty good solid political jam.

Now the first, Motion No. 1 is simply a straightforward adjustment to the Budget to say here is our commitment to building Rapid Transit. And we've already stated that commitment publicly, so I really don't see what the problem is there. I really don't understand why this can't be supported unless there is some other thing going on that no one is talking about, like not actually supporting the idea of building Rapid Transit which is one of the reasons, you know, words and actions are two different things. Justin…Councillor Swandel and his comments wasn't clear about whether he supports the second phase which really concerned me. He talked about maybe it wasn't the best thing to do, maybe the benefits weren't that clear, et cetera. So what is the 250 million for? And it's 250 million that's a third of 750 million. Nothing is on paper, nothing is explaining about what projects. You know, I'd love to support…I'm really thrilled to see a Motion coming from that side of the Chamber over there, supporting a whole pile of money for Rapid Transit. I should be dancing a jig, but the fact is it doesn't say what it's for and it's also contingent on a political decision that another level of government has to make that we don't know if they're going to make. So, it's…I really think…I appreciate an alternative Motion coming forward I think is really you know, it's expressing some frustration about the nitrogen issue which I know people have been expressing every meeting and I understand that's a huge cost and there is doubt and concern about that issue. And I think it's going a bit far to say that there's not a scientist in the free world, that's a bit of an exaggeration because there are people on both sides.

But having said that…having said…I would never doubt Gord Steeves. But my point is that really I think this Motion is a bit of…like I think that Motion No. 1 is a very good Motion. I think it's logical. It fits with the plans that came forward from the Rapid Transit Task Force Report. It's 20 million a year for three years, and we've got the second phase built, but because it's coming from this side of the house or whatever, since apparently we have non-partisan politics only the left or only one side of it is partisan and the other side is non-partisan by the way, but it seems to me that in the partisan manner, the Mayor's side of the house is not willing to consider ideas from our side because I haven't really heard any reason why we wouldn't do this if we actually want to do it. It's not jamming any other level of government. It's not unlike the way we put other things into the Budget because we often do things contingent. We all claim we want to build it, so I really haven't heard in all this debate one good reason why you wouldn't support Motion 1 other than the fact that it's coming from who it's coming from and that it's not the ruling party that is acting at a party. So, you know, I think that's disappointing if that's the way you go. I mean you ask us to support your budget and work with you and work as a group and then when we come up with a good idea, you won't consider it. So I would like to…unfortunately I haven't heard a reason. I would hope you would rethink your partisan position and I hope you would actually look at what it says in my Motion because it makes perfect sense according to the goals that we've all agreed on that this Council should go. If in fact, you actually agree with continuing to build the second phase of BRT and if you actually believe in what you're saying you believe, then support a Motion that actually makes it happen.

And you know, I just also would like to mention that the Provincial Government, you know, always gets criticized here and it's almost like a blood sport and you know we are allowed to do that. But I don't know if you're aware, I checked this out, but the Province actually spent a greater amount you know…we hear complaining about the fact that we're borrowing the money for the first phase of Rapid Transit, but just so you are aware, the Province is putting in cost sharing the $90 million in borrowing plus putting in additional 27 million so they're actually putting more money into that project than we are. So, plus they put in 31 million to Assiniboine Park and a whole bunch of other funding things that they put in, so I would like to be the first person in this entire meeting today to thank the Provincial Government for the support that they do give the City because they

actually give us a lot. They don't give us everything we want obviously and there's obviously issues we need to negotiate with them which I agree with Mayor Katz should be negotiated diplomatically.

Mr. Speaker: Don't forget about the 50 for Disraeli.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah, 50 for Disraeli. So I think the point is we…my Motion is…is diplomatic, it is appropriate, it is how things are done and it explains what the money is for. I know we know what the cost of the project is. I talked to the staff and figured out what the cost of the project is. I did my homework and I sent it to you a day before Council, and this Motion appeared here and I'm afraid I don't think it's been…either it hasn't been very thought out well or it's just trying to confuse the matter so you look like you're supporting Rapid Transit even more than I am. It's a nice game but I mean it's got to hold up and I'm a little disappointed with that tactic because I honestly think especially Councillor Swandel who the second phase of the BRT goes right through your ward to the University and then eventually will lead to the Rapid Transit to Waverley West in the future and all those things, I don't understand why he's so luke warm to something that would be so beneficial to his own constituents. I've never understood that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. In closing, Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll briefly deal with the amendments. The first amendment, the Rapid Transit one, I noticed there wasn't a report attached to this. (Laughter) So it confuses me because I know there has been a lot of talk about that today. But…so I won't be supporting that one. The second one I'm not quite sure if it's on the floor still. I heard that you had taken it off the floor. I wasn't going to support it anyways, sorry to say. Item No. 3, Councillor Wyatt's. I will be supporting that. I think it's an important investment. I know there's…I guess there is a Council policy in terms of the land sales. I just don't agree with the policy quite honestly. I think that some money should stay in the community if it's sold for infrastructure. I don't think there's anything wrong with that and I supported that. I think I worked with Councillor Vandal on that on other items so I don't have a problem with that.

For me really what this Capital Budget really boils down to is making strategic investments in our core areas of business, investing in streets and roads and public amenities as well as public safety. We're spending our money more effectively. We're coming up with new and innovative solutions that really have value for money that's there. There's been a lot of talk about the infrastructure deficit. It definitely is there. I don't know what the numbers are. There are numbers that have been floating around but for a city to be great I think we can't just work on the existing infrastructure. We need to look at new infrastructure that is there and that's exactly what this Budget does. We've also had some problems over the last number of years in terms of construction inflation. I think it was upwards around 16%. We dropped it to 12% and 6%. I think there has been some good work in the City side in terms of coordinating this, hiring a manager, we had some good luck. I don't see we had some good luck with the economy. The economy has…has helped drive down but it makes us budgeting more properly and that's thanks to some of our people in our Administration.

As mentioned earlier, the number one concern for our citizens out there are streets, they are roads, they are bridges, they are Active Transportation and thanks to some of the funds from the stimulus, the three way split between, we're able to do a lot more. In fact, over a 90% increase in total streets budget from last year that are associated with it. So there's more money being spent in these particular areas. Some of the projects we talked about, the Waverley West arterial road extension to the tune of $54.7 million I think is an important investment in our areas. The project really ensures improved transportation flows and capacities for growth within these…this high area of growth area for our community. So very supportive, I know that something that was supported by the

Provincial Government with their dollars because money talks and I don't know what the rest of the expression is but they are very much supportive of it.

Active Transportation, Janice Lukes was here. You know this investment is a fantastic and you know, I've talked a little about the legacy pieces but I think it very much is. The total budget goes up to $22.2 million in 2010. I can tell you from my specific ward, we are putting $2.4 million of new trails in our system. I worked hard with Councillor Nordman on that. That represents over eight new kilometres of trails in our area. What this represents is not just choice for people how they want to get to and from work or wherever they are going, but it's also quality of life issue that I very much support and I'm very proud of the fact that we were able to invest this type of money with it. All totaled the total streets budget over the next six years represents just under half a billion dollars.

The helicopter. Well, there's…you know, I don't think you need to look…and this is on a sad note as far as this weekend, where you saw, you know, another stolen car that's happening on our streets. You heard a person that was killed because of this. These things are happening. Crime is a major issue here in the City of Winnipeg. There's no doubt about it. This is the number one issue that is on the minds of our citizens, and I think that the City over all has done a very good job in terms of that. Mayor Katz has talked about the number of police we put on the streets. We've talked about innovative stuff like crime stat. We put crime cameras which I was very supportive of and now we're looking at the helicopter issue. It's something that Chief of Police supports. If you look at some of the evidence in Edmonton, in Edmonton they're saying there were just under a thousand arrests that were associated with the helicopter that they can tribute towards this. Calgary, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 850 arrests that are associated with it. And on occasion when you get the calls that come in, if a police helicopter and a car are called at the same time, 56% of the time the helicopter gets there first. So I truly believe this is something that's going to help. We need to help the crime issue here in the City. It's going to help catch criminals, it's going to help prevent crimes. And I think we need stop delaying, we need to start taking action. That's what our citizens deserve and respect. And I think this is a part of the solution. We need to give the tools to the police that are there. We have examined leasing options. I know Councillor Orlikow had brought that up earlier on but we have decided to go in the capital. You're not going to save any in operating unless you are able to write things off of course so we decided to put that in the capital.

Another important piece mentioned was the Assiniboine Park. We talked about the key investments there whether it'd be for the Duck Pond or whether it'd be for the Family Centre, whether it'd be to fund the Natural Play Area. I think this is a very important investment. I can tell you that the day after…you talk to the CEO of the Assiniboine Park Conservancy…the day after we made our investment here at City Hall, she got calls from both the Federal and Provincial Government saying how can we contribute, so it's our contribution to the Assiniboine Park that I believe is spurring in other developments from other levels of government which I think is important. The investment in the Assiniboine Park is the jewel of our park system and we need to invest in it. That's why I'm very proud of this. I think it's once again, I've use that word three times, legacy piece, but I think it's something that you're going to see thirty, forty years down the line. They're going to say, you know what this Council this day made some right decisions on this fund, so happy to do it.

Environmental stewardship. You know, I think this Council's made some very big strides in this area. You look at our investments in terms of the five year capital where we're spending $147 million on the Water Utility, $812 million on the Sewer Utility. These things of course mandated by some from the Clean Air Commission or Clean Environment Commission. But, over all this is something that's going to help Lake Winnipeg, help to maintain our streets or help to maintain our rivers and streams to

make sure they're cleaner. It's also another item that we talked about in terms of the gas capture. I think we've got some information that the Brady Land Fill gives off I think it's the third highest rates of emissions I guess overall throughout the city, so doing a project like this, giving the borrowing authority work in the Province to do this, it's something that's actually going to have a very big impact on the city in my mind so I'm very happy that we are able to include this in on the Budget.

Talking about the Sewer and Water rates, in 2010 we're spending $124 million on waste water systems. The nutrient removal has some debate one way or the other, but overall there is a big investment in there as well as investing $20.6 million in terms of the water system, primary water main renewals, $11.9 million in terms of land drainage and another item…so I think there's been some important investments for the City of Winnipeg.

Turning to the financial side of things in terms of the Budget, Councillor Orlikow I think had mentioned, just addressing his question, is there a capacity to do some of the work that's out there? Throughout our budget consultations we had the Director of Public Works. We asked that same question, and there is capacity to do this extra work. That's the indication from Public Works. So we need to take that information as such. I was very happy that we were able to find some new and innovative ways to get projects done a lot quicker. As mentioned earlier, we're doing $3.1 million more work on Taylor this year in 2010, which makes some sense for that heavily trafficked area. The TBO program. Another item we are able to put a million dollars more into the TBO program. What that means to you and your residents is that we can do eight or nine more streets in 2010 which not only is going to…I wish someone would…move extension. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No extension.

People in the background: There is no extension.

Councillor Fielding: There is no extension?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Councillor Fielding: Okay. Well, anyways, it's a very important investment in our community. P3s, we've talked of the P3s. We've moved…we're maintaining our portfolio what we're doing in terms of P3s. We've moved to an item where we're representing as the City will pay for 40 or 50% of the funding. The reasons for this are as such because we're…we can borrow the money at a reduced rate, the Province…the private sector who haven't been able to get the 30 year money that has been there, so we are able to…still have value for money to save 15%, upwards of 15% on these projects. They make sense. They transfer risk from the City to the private consortium and you are able to save on some of the maintenance cost. So very happy that we are part of that. Cash to capital of course has gone up by two million dollars a year a schedule to pay more. We're also just ending here, Mr. Speaker. Very happy that we are able to save or find $17 million making the system more efficient from old capital accounts that have been there. That's money we are able to spend into our system and the value for money I was going to go back to that we're able to invest in the 2010 as opposed to 2011.

Mr. Speaker: Time out.

Councillor Fielding: It's not only good for residents who are going to see the streets, but it's also good for the taxpayers because they are going to save upwards (inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor…

Councillor Fielding: So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. We're able to make these key investments in the area and I hope we can count on your support here with the Budget. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: A long speech, just don't lose any Councillors. Councillors I would just like to say a few words to our

Administration headed by our Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Glen Laubenstein. Fine job folks, beautiful job in your work that you've done, convinced me to vote for this Budget.

Also, I really, really want to thank members of Council for voting for the helicopter. That accident happened on Friday where a person was killed mercifully for no reason at all. If there had been a helicopter I'm sure they would have apprehended that…that vehicle. That was my constituent, and so I for the helicopter, yes, yes, yes, yes.

Okay now in a reverse order, on Motion No. 3 by Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Pagtakhan, recorded vote has been called for. Those in favour of Motion No. 3 please stand.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Clerk: Councillor Swandel.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 1.

Mr. Speaker: It's carried. On Motion No. 2 by Councillor Swandel, seconded by Councillor Steeves, recorded vote has been called for. Those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Nordman, Orlikow, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt.

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: It's lost. Motion No. 1, recorded vote. Councillor Gerbasi, recorded vote has been called for Motion No. 1. Councillors, please rise in favour of Motion No. 1.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: Motion is lost. On the Clause as amended. 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, Fielding, Nordman, Orlikow, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 3.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is carried. The Clause is carried. By-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that By-law No. 150/2009 be read a first time.

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

Clerk:. By-law…

Mr. Speaker: Was that Councillor Thomas? You want to be recorded in opposition? Let it be recorded.

Clerk: By-law No. 150/2009.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor. That's it?

Mr. Mayor moves adjournment. All in favour? Contrary, carried. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 12:24 p.m.