COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, December 16, 2009

The Council met at 9:34 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Pagtakhan.

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.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have a page, Kayla Ruiz of Kevin High School resides at Daniel McIntyre Ward. Is Kayla present? Kayla? That's not Kayla. (Applause) Welcome. Guest announcements. Councillor Pagtakhan, do you have an announcement?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to share with the Council today that a little bit of background about the West Alexander and Centennial Neighbourhood Plan, and there is an award that the City received, but before I get into it I just wanted to really give a quick background about the Centennial West Alexander Neighbourhood Plan. It was a response to the expansion of the Health Sciences Centre, the Virology Lab and associated institutions, the Red River College, the University of Manitoba, Cancer Care Manitoba, and various institutions within a …sort of a health and wellness area within the Centennial West Alexander neighbourhood.

So, the City of Winnipeg Council, we sort of led the process along with our Planning and Land Use Division, and we had various meetings, about 12 meetings over the course of about a year and a half, Mr. Speaker, and put together a plan that sort of provided the guidelines for development, design guidelines, as well as ensuring that we encourage development within the institutions within the Centennial, West Alexander neighbourhood specifically with respect to a BioMed city and sort of leveraging the strength to the Health Sciences Centre, the Virology Lab and all the academic institutions. We want to encourage development there Mr. Speaker, as well as to preserve the integrity and the neighbourhood feel. One key aspect of that, Mr. Speaker, to preserve the neighbourhood feel was a…sort of a policy that said there shall be no net loss of housing, and what that meant was that if one of the institutions were to expropriate some of the housing, they had a social responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that there was another home or another house in the area to replace that expropriated home. So, it was a very good plan and just recently, the neighbourhood went through a planning and rezoning process with the Women's Pavilion. It's on our Agenda today and I just wanted to recognize the principle author and City of Winnipeg Senior Planner, Mr. Speaker, who was a recipient along with other stakeholders of the 2009 Manitoba Planning Award of Excellence. The award was signed by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Ron Lemieux. It was signed with the Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Linda McFadden, as well as the Assistant Deputy Minister of Community Planning and Development Division, Claudette Toupin. And our department, Mr. Speaker, was…went against six other nominees from other planning departments across the Province of Manitoba, and I just wanted to recognize in the Gallery today, Mr. Speaker, our Senior Planner for the wonderful work he's done in creating that plan with all the stakeholders, Mr. Michael Robinson. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Congratulations, Mr. Robinson.

MINUTES

Councillor O'Shaughnessy moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on November 25, 2009, be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Delegations, none. Well, let's get right on to business. Executive Policy Committee, report of December 2nd of 2009, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 2, 2009**

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

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Report of December 9th of 2009, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 9, 2009**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 3 to 17

Mr. Speaker: Three and seventeen? Three to seventeen. (Inaudible speaking in the background). You want to set them down. Okay. Good. Any further? Agenda Item 1? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, which is the first one?

**Item 2 – Councillors' Representation Allowance Fund Policy Audit
eFile FA - 2**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. Did you stand on No. 2? Oh there's a Motion. Oh pardon me, I'm sorry. Motion No. 1, Councillor Clement.

**Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Clement,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,**

That Recommendation 2 of Item 2 of the Executive Policy Committee report of December 9, 2009 be deleted and replaced with:

"That unusual (potentially non-compliant) expenditures be referred to City Auditor for review and forwarded to Council Secretariat for final disposition."

Councillor Clement: Doesn't somebody introduce it first?

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute, Bill. Mr. Mayor, you want to introduce it?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as you know, I stood down on No. 2 because I have some changes that I wish to make and that would be to amend Clauses 1 and 2 to change all instances of the word "should" to "shall". And then basically delete Clause No. 3, and then change the numbers accordingly.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Any Motion to change has to be in writing and has to have a seconder.

Mayor Katz: I'll leave the Motion exactly the way it is then.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: Can I move referral at this point? Or…because it sounds like people are making a number of changes. I don't see why this can't wait until January and then maybe we can sort out whatever concerns people have. That's my suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: So, you're moving referral Councillor?

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillors, any discussions? None? Move referral? Referral to the Secretariat Committee? Yes. Referral to the Secretariat Committee. All in favour, please rise. A referral Motion.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Clement, Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Fielding, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Vandal and Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 7.

Mr. Speaker: Referral Motion is passed. The next one, Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 - Access Advisory Committee - Citizen Member Appointments
File CR - 3

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether Councillor Wyatt stood down 3 to 17 and if he did, I would be more than happy to hear what he has to say first and then I would respond, and I think he did. Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Do you want to speak to No. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 to 17?

Councillor Wyatt: That's pretty good.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah I'm prepared to speak to all of them, not each one individually. The reason I stood down, Mr. Speaker, is these Committee appointments come to Council. These are actually at the end of the day, Council appointments, and I just…you know, we're being asked to vote on appointments which I, as a member of Council, have had little input into. We're technically supposed to appoint them. I feel strongly that we should be looking at a different process with regards to these appointments. It has not just under this Mayor but previous Mayors, come forward as appointments from EPC or from the Mayor. I think these are Council appointments. I want to state very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that I'm everybody here who has been recommended here, is very worthy of the appointments that they're about to receive, which I'm sure they will with the majority vote of Council. But I'm more concerned about the process and the process about how we go about these appointments. I think there could be a joint Committee of Council or Committee of Council struck to review these appointments to look at them, to look at resumes coming in.

The other concern I have too, Mr. Speaker, is some of these appointments we openly advertise and other appointments we don't openly advertise. The book that was prepared by the Clerk's Office clearly documents which ones we have advertised, others we don't advertise. And I think all positions that are available for appointment by Council should be publicly advertised. I think that's an important part of transparency. So my concern, Mr. Speaker, is this transparency and process. If we're being asked to vote on appointments here today, then I think we should as a Council, assure that we do our due diligence with regards to those appointments, and as an entire Council, not just EPC.

And secondly, I feel very strongly that all appointments that are publicly appointed should be advertised. Some of the appointments that do carry with them a per diem, I might note, a small amount of pay, most of them don't but some of them do, which is even more reason why we should be ensuring, Mr. Speaker, that the process is transparent, open, openly advertised, accessible to any citizen who feels they have the qualifications to apply to be in any of these positions.

So I just want to state that those are the concerns I have and that's why I'll be just out of principle, voting against it but again I want to restate, the individuals here I'm sure are all extremely worthy of it. I might add that I know there are some which are recommended by the Community Committees directly, and I don't have an issue with that, such as Seven Oaks Museum, and such as those. It's more the

general, larger, city-wide committees that I'm concerned about. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Is there any further discussions on this? If not, Mr. Mayor would you like to close on the topic raised by the Councillor? Oh, just a minute. Oh Councillor O'Shaughnessy, I'm sorry. Mr. Mayor. Councillor O'Shaughnessy, you have the floor.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: What am I, chopped liver?

Mr. Speaker: No, chopped kidneys.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

(Laugher)

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Whether it's flawed, whether it's not flawed, this is the system this Council has used since it was formed in its present fashion in 1972. The question that comes to mind is of my dear friend from Transcona. How come this problem never surfaced while he was a member of EPC and had a previous look, an early look at them and had a hand in appointing them? How come now all of a sudden, it's such a big problem? I think someone wants a change. If someone wants a change in a system that has worked for over 35 years, I think they should bring it up through Secretariat and have it looked at a year in advance. To bring it up when good people's names are on the table, I think, is definitely out of step, and I would ask Councillors to vote for the Clause as it was presented by EPC and if they want a changed, do it through Secretariat for next year.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: No, Mr. Speaker, I'll stand down. That's fine.

Mr. Speaker: No further Speakers? Mr. Mayor, would you like to close?

Mayor Katz: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That will be 3 to 17.

Mayor Katz: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'll do them all and make a quick summation. This is the policy that we've always followed and I can tell you, we not only get input from Community Committees, we also get from the Chairs of these Committees. It comes from all over the place. Some of them are advertised and some of them are lucky to even find people to be very frank with you. From my point of view, if Councillor Wyatt or anybody else has an idea that would make this a better process, I'd be happy to listen to it. It certainly would've been nice if this had come up before and we could've discussed it. But, in the meantime, this has been vetted and has gone through the proper process. I believe the right thing to do is move forward. We need people on these Committees, and if Councillor Wyatt has ideas and wants to come and talk to us, he knows my office is open to him at any time, Mr. Speaker. In the meantime I hope we can move forward and approve 3 to 17.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillors on the Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Wyatt wants to be recorded in opposition. That's carried. Report of December 16th.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 16, 2009**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the rule be suspended and the report of Executive Policy Committee dated December the 16th of '09 be considered.

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

Clerk: Item No. 1, Loan Guarantee, Southdale Recreation Association Inc. Facility expansion.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions? None. By-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 151/2009, 152/2009, 156/2009, and 157/2009.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 151/2009, 152/2009, 156/2009 and 157/2009.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that By-laws numbered 151/2009, 152/2009, 156/2009 and 157/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 151/2009, 152/2009, 156/2009 and 157/2009.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 151/2009, 152/2009, 156/2009 and 157/2009 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Questions. No questions. It's getting on to the end of the year. Good sign. Standing Policy Committee Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED DECEMBER 1, 2009

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the report of December the 1st and move Items 1 to 3 as Consent.

Mr. Speaker: Item 1 and who else?

Clerk: Item 3.

Mr. Speaker: And 3. Item 2, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 1.

Item 1 - 2010 Capital Local Street Renewals, Alley Renewals, and Granular Roadway Improvements - Delegated Authority to Director of Public Works
eFile SC - 3

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Yeah I guess I'll have to wait to hear what the concern is. This is the list of streets that have been chosen by Mr. Dean for renewal, reconstruction, et cetera, including a supplementary list because we added some money, and that's all this Clause is, so I'm not sure what the concern is but I'll wait and hear it and I'll try to answer.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The concern I have regarding the recommendation is Item No. 2, which list that the Director of Public Works be delegated authority to identify new projects using surplus funds in the 2010 Regional and Local Street and Active Transportation Facility Capital Programs. And my concern is in the past, Mr. Speaker, that has always come back to the Standing Committee of Public Works, surpluses for decision to be made with regards to where those funds go. And I think that is a practice that has been in the past, it's worked in the past and I think that should continue. Sometimes these surplus funds could not just be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars but in the millions of dollars. And the fact of the matter is, you know, I guess the red flags go up here, Mr. Speaker, when I see Delegated Authority to the Director of Public Works. It's not the Director of Public Works that I don't…I'm not concerned about as I don't want to see any kind of political inference and that's why we have a safe guard of having it sent to this open process, transparent process again of having been sent to the Standing Committee, or in some cases also the Finance Committee has input too. But, there is obviously a Standing Committee that has input into this, Mr. Speaker, and to delegate the authority right now I think is the wrong decision to

make, and I think it sets the wrong precedent with regards to surplus funds of any kind and of any nature as far as that goes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further Speakers? Councillor Clement, if you'd like to close.

Councillor Clement: Yeah. This is not new and it's certainly not the first time that we've delegated authority. First of all, we have way better numbers than we used to have. Our…we've had staff working on the costs over the last three or four years to try and get the costs pretty tight. It's…you know, the changes are in the 6% range a year, but you know, a couple of years ago they were 20 and 25% in some cases. And, so there was more residual money, but in this particular case, they are pretty tight. Usually, there is a supplementary program that might involve two, three or four streets, and that's what we're talking about here, and all of these streets that are on this list, as far as I'm aware, have come right from Lester Dean. I'm not aware of…like the committee didn't have any involvement with any of these streets, and that would be the way that it would be done. The difference is, is that if you…if you bring it back to the Standing Committee, you know, sometimes it costs you a bit of time, and by delegating the authority to the Director, he can simply get at this quicker and get tenders out if there is a possibility of a supplementary program, Mr. Speaker. And that was why the recommendation came the way that it did, and the Standing Committee acquiesced to it. So, I don't think there is anything wrong with it, frankly. I understand what Russ is saying, but there really hasn't been any political involvement with it one way or the other. It's all being done through Mr. Dean and through Brad Sacher himself.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillors. On Item 1, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt wants to be recorded in opposition.

Councillor Wyatt: I called for a recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote. Sorry. Recorded vote has been called on Item 1. All in favour, please rise.

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, Swandel, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillor Wyatt.

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

Mr. Speaker: It's carried. On Item 3.

Item 3 - Award of Contract for Supply and Delivery of Automated Garbage Carts
eFile GL - 9

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Yeah. It's pretty straightforward I think, Mr. Speaker. We have to acquire these carts and this is the award of tender for them. That's all it is. So, I'm not sure what Councillor Orlikow's question is. I'll wait to hear it and then try to respond.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: The Chair, my concern as I mentioned before…or one of my concerns that I mentioned before during the debate was the fact that I felt that using the environmental fund to pay for these bins is inappropriate. It's not the right fund. That's supposed to be for environmental initiatives to reduce waste. This is just for garbage collection. It has no environmental impact except making our back lanes a little cleaner. So I'm concerned about why are we using this

fund to pay for garbage bins which really aren't in line with waste reduction?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: That's not really the issue. This is an award of tender. Where the money is coming from I guess is what the concern is. But, I guess we could stand here all day and talk about whether it's environmentally friendly or not. I mean, the reason why we were going to these…to this particular size cart, at least my understanding of it anyway, was that it would allow people to put out a certain amount of garbage in them. It also would limit, to some degree, the amount of garbage that they could put out and therefore, hopefully get people to recycle more. And my understanding is the recycling…well, we haven't made that decision yet but the recycling bins could be a little larger and hopefully we'll get people using recycling more than the garbage side of it, and I would think that that is environmentally friendly and correct. And that's probably why the department has moved in that direction and suggested that this is a good account to take the money from, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Clement. You're ready for the vote? On Item 3, all in favour? Contrary? It's carried. By-laws. There's no Motions. So we go into By-laws. Councillor Clement.

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

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law 159/2009 be read first time.

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

Clerk: By-law 159/2009.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the By-law No. 159/2009 it be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law 159/2009.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law 159/2009 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. None. Standing Policy Committee on Finance, report of December 3 of 2009, Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE DATED DECEMBER 3, 2009

Councillor Fielding: Sure, Mr. Speaker. I'm ready to move the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda 1 through 4.

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

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Gerbasi wants to be recorded in opposition to 1. It's done. Motions. None. Consideration of By-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Fielding: Sure I'd like to move that the By-laws numbered 158/2009 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law 158/2009.

Councillor Fielding: Okay, I'd like to move that By-law 158/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law 158/2009.

Councillor Fielding: And, I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 158/2009 be read a third time

at the same time be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. No question period. No questions asked. Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development. No report. Motions none. By-laws none. Question period. Downtown Development. No questions. Standing Policy Committee Property and Development, report of December 3 of 2009. Councillor Steeves.

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

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to move Items 1 and Items 5 through 12. I'm going to ask for a referral back on Items 2, 3 and 4. Just so we're aware.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Stand down…

Mr. Speaker: Can you stand, please?

Councillor Orlikow: Sorry, stand down number seven, please.

Mr. Speaker: Pardon?

Councillor Orlikow: Number seven.

Mr. Speaker: Number seven. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Twelve.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker, recorded against Item number eight, please.

Mr. Speaker: O'Shaughnessy, Gord against number eight. Mr. Clerk do you have that? Okay, so 5…1, 5 and 11. One, 5, 6, 8 and 11. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 7 - Subdivision and Rezoning - former Railway Right-of-Way north of Corydon Avenue, south of Kingsway between Lockwood Street and Grosvenor Avenue
File DASZ 14/2009

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: So, we're okay on the referrals of two, three and four, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Pardon?

Councillor Steeves: We're okay on the referrals of two, three and four?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I'll just to double-check…referrals…we did it before. Pardon?

Councillor Steeves: Lay over, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to Mr. Clerk.

Councillor Swandel: We probably need to vote on that.

Councillor Steeves: I think we have to…no…I don't think we voted…

Mr. Speaker: I can't hear you. (Inaudible) Yeah, that's what I'm saying. A referral on two, three and a layover I should say, a layover of two, three and four. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: On Item 7.

Councillor Steeves: Item No. 7. Mr. Speaker. Yeah, with a bit of a heavy heart on this one, the Community Committee, Downtown Community Committee, this is the River Height lands located, as everyone is aware, just between Lock and Centennial on the east and the west, and Kingsway and Corydon on the north and the south bisected by Grosvenor, Mr. Speaker. This is the old Oak Point lands I guess is what it's called. This has been at this…Mr.…Councillor Pagtakhan, can I just ask you…thanks. This has been on the agenda several times in the past years at this Council. It's been…I think it began September 10th, 2002, where there was a single-family application back then. I believe that was denied by Council, if I'm

not…denied by Community Committee at the time. Going back to 2002 again, I think just immediately post that there was another motion that was filed by Council. I believe that was to acquire the land in some fashion. Post 2003, there's been a variety of pieces of this land stemming from, I guess depending upon where you want to draw the northern boundary, it's almost out in St. James now across the river in some people's estimations, all the way back down to Taylor. There's been pieces sold off that have made…that have made any linear development, in my respective opinion, probably impossible if someone was talking about a road or a transit way or something to that effect. The development is, in my opinion, relatively low impact, small footprint stuff. This primarily a lighter R zoning, we're calling for a maximum of 62 condominium units, sort of a townhouse, row housing type development. As I read the plan, the units are scheduled to be between 1,000, 1,200 square feet, Mr. Speaker. There is a C1 piece right up against Corydon. Looking at the plan, we're calling for two-story stuff right along that small piece that fronts onto Corydon, again, (inaudible) in keeping with the neighbourhood in my estimation.

All private approaches, Mr. Speaker, 2.2 parking stalls per unit is my understanding. No fencing or gated community type of things in this development. Appropriately landscaped with nice plan approval guards for the final facade development. We all know how that works at Community Committee. Ten trees per unit, per door is my understanding based on the plan. Appropriate signage, appropriate lighting. The lanes in question, because this development would have to use lanes by virtue of the narrowness of the land. The lanes are to be widened out from 16 to 24 feet to accommodate those…the residents who'll be living there. Because of the, I guess alternating method of development, there's only going to be a garage at every second door, so my understanding is you're going to have around 40% less garages in this development that are going to be backing on to the lanes that also service Lockwood and Centennial. So there will be a lot less garages.

If you look at the densities, the density comparisons in the report, there are…if you compare the units per block, with Lockwood and Centennial, the units per block here are only marginally higher than the units per block in Lockwood and Centennial. But, the units, of course, Mr. Speaker, are marketedly smaller than the units that are obviously long-time placed on Lockwood and Centennial. These are one-story condominiums, again, of 1,000 to 1,200 square feet. We're probably talking about seniors although I understand that's not the exclusive case. But if you think about who might move into these condominiums, you're probably not talking about families and we all know how the traffic projections go for that, in terms of traffic. You'll see with these type or size of units, markedly less than you obviously would see on a per unit basis on Lockwood or Centennial. It would be the same in any other residential development. If we have a 1,800 or 2,000 or 2,500 square foot house on Lockwood or Centennial, it's obviously producing more traffic, more people, more everything than 1,000 square foot unit condominium in this new development. I think we can probably take that as a fact.

The infill development I know is something that everybody on Council here supports. I think that probably goes without saying. We understand that through Our Winnipeg discussions that have been going on, we anticipate that our land supply in the City of Winnipeg at current projections will run out in 13 years unless we sort of change some of the density developments that we're doing. What we're going to be trying to do is addressing some of those difficulties that we're going to have, and we all know with respect to infrastructure, the need for new infrastructure, this type of development compared to exurban development is much cheaper to do, because obviously, the infrastructure that's going to service this development doesn't have to be built either in the development plan or something that we have to add generally as a city. We all understand the infill argument. We all understand that it makes sense, I think.

Again, with the utmost deference to our friends on this Community Committee, this plan, I think, is a very, very reasonable one. I've tracked the report, I've tracked the actions of the developer. I've tracked the actions of the developer in the way they've interacted with our public service. Everything appears to be in perfect order. If we look at this developer who is honestly not a developer who is very well known to me. I believe this developer is relatively new in the development community, in this city. But they appear to have put in place a plan that is very, very low impact. I know this…post our decision at the Standing Committee and that of Executive Policy Committee. I understand that letters have gone out to all of the community or all the people who registered at the meeting. I have received some correspondence back but very, very little. I'm not going to sort of base my decision based on that. But, I do not, honestly, get the impression, based on sort of what we have heard if we compare it to something, other developments that we have seen and sort of the proportionate response back from the community, I just sort of don't get that same sense, Mr. Speaker. Again, I don't want to speak on behalf of the community. I don't have that authority. But, we do have sort of that sixth sense, Mr. Speaker, trying to gauge reactions in the communities, and I think that perhaps there might be some folks in that general area who are looking at this plan and looking at the idea of single storey bungalow, smaller condominiums on this rather unique piece of land and saying you know what, this might make sense.

So it's one of those very, very few times, not exclusive times, one of those very, very few times that I'm going to come forward as Chair of this Committee and say, "Let's deal with this land finally." This has been on our radar screen for a very, very, very long time, and we have to act, I think, as responsible members of this Council. I regret that we have to in this circumstance, perhaps, go over top of the Community Committee. I want to assure everybody, we don't make that decision lightly. But, there are sometimes where we have to look beyond the Community Committee, into the overreaching interests of this city. And I think this may be one of those occasions. This is not an obtrusive or offensive development. This is not something that is at all out of character with the area. In fact if you look at what we've all done in our communities, we're trying to allow for some smaller scale developments so people can age in place. We know it's a problem in St. Norbert, we know it's a problem in St. Vital, St. Boniface, a lot of areas. People are having to move out of their communities because of housing prices. This may allow people to access a smaller, I guess, stock of housing in the community in which they have resided. It's good for extended families, grand kids, all those of sorts of things. I'll await everyone's comments.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Throughout the Centennial Development Proposal, residents have shown a great interest in their neighbourhood and have actually attempted to take part in this decision. They not only have brought up their concerns, but they have paid for and provided alternative proposals. This development does not fit the neighbourhood. Even residents have…and residents have provided more than one alternative even offering to collectively purchase this land to build an Active Transportation path.

Their second proposal is a detailed alternative single family development plan, not only addressing their concerns, but showing that they accept development in this land if they are part of the plan. This shows that the community is willing to work hard with the City at finding a co-operative solution that is both safe and fitting to the area. This is an opportunity that we rarely get, and by throwing it away, we are telling the citizens of Winnipeg that we will not listen to them when they are willing to work co-operatively and responsible for a better community. I believe that by working together, we can have a safe and appropriate development that can be

used as a model for infill housing in established neighbourhoods.

The reason provided for not supporting the Committee was illustrated briefly by Councillor Steeves, was one that this proposal has already been to the table numerous times. It's getting exhaustive. Well, actually there's only been one development proposal in 2002 that was rejected and I will point out for the same reasons this proposal is rejected. It wasn't good then and it wasn't good now, but we seem to have different opinions. The other option was…the other rationale was that this is probably the best that we can get. I strongly disagree. I believe we deserve a lot better for infill developments. We can do better. The community is willing to do better. I'm willing to work with the community to do better. We can have a development that better meets the needs of the community.

On the point of why would an initial proposal in 2002 was rejected. I believe it's important to note that the key reason for both development applications were rejected was due to safety concerns with regard to the amount of local and through traffic utilizing a lane that is more of a back lane in size rather than a residential street. When the previous development proposal came through 2002, the Planning and Property Development Department report, we recommended that the lane be the width of 40 feet without parking and 50 feet with parking. The current 2009 proposal before us has a residential street the width of 20 feet plus 4 feet right-of-way with no boulevard, while the typical residential street in the area is between 60 to 60 feet wide including boulevards, significantly different.

No traffic study was conducted for this development proposal. With narrow streets and no boulevard this, I believe, will be a major safety hazard as drivers will have little view of their vehicles pulling out. It will also decrease safety for children. As we mentioned, this is a family dominated area and there will be families moving in. As the traffic will surely increase considering two things, it's very important to note and as the area Councillor, this area is completely impacted by through traffic. There is a huge problem in that quadrant with the amount of through traffic. Now we are going to make a small lane that is accessible to the public to whip down two blocks unimpeded because Grosvenor does not have a through street. As through traffic, they'll always find a way that's the quickest and having two blocks of unimpeded traffic, they'll whip right through. They will do so. So I believe through traffic will be a very large concern.

Finally the housing type, lot size and zoning is completely inconsistent with the neighbourhood. The 2002 recommendation could not have stated better. In that case, the proposed development would eliminate a feature that currently unites the neighbourhood replacing it with a barrier. Well, side by side houses that go…66 of them go two blocks solid and possibly three blocks in the future; is in my opinion, a barrier. We deserve more diversity in their planning. Different single families, town houses, there's different opportunities are in proper line with proper infill development. Residents have expressed their concerns regarding traffic, safety and the neighbourhood character and even provide solutions. We still have an opportunity to stop this proposal before us and invite one that the residents accept and will want to be a part of. It will be a model for infill development in existing neighbourhoods and will be an asset to our community and the City's future growth. We as Councillors have a job to represent Winnipeggers and by ignoring them, we are just doing the opposite, not representing the interests of those that we are supposed to serve. So I plead with you, please reject the Property and Development Committee's report recommendation and let's get an infill development that meets the needs of the community.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I was just going to comment as well. I am supporting Councillor Orlikow today. One of the problems with…when another committee

such as the Property Committee makes a decision to flip a decision made by a Community Committee, you know, I appreciate the fact it isn't done that often but when it is done it has a really, really serious effect on the residents in the area's confidence in the processes at City Hall. It really shouldn't be done unless you're absolutely sure of what you're doing because, and perhaps you feel you are, but the Community Committee had two public hearings on this matter where there was…took many, many, many hours of listening to individual residents, looking at their proposals, listening to their point of view, as well as discussing it with staff. I mean, we spent hours and hours and hours at two very, very long public hearings and to have that rejected or, you know, just overturned by another committee that didn't hear those people speak, that wasn't present, you know, it is a very serious thing to do that and I've seen it done in other cases and it really leaves the residents in the neighbourhood quite disillusioned. So I mean, if you're sure of what you're doing, obviously that's what you're going to do, but I certainly hope that it isn't being done lightly. I take Councillor Steeves' words that…I know people are very keen about infill development. We all are. I mean, in Fort Rouge, we just approved a 16 storey tower, a high density development. We certainly approved… (Inaudible speaking in the background)…no, but I'm pointing out that there is a lot of support for infill. I think everyone on Council agrees we need to see infill development and I don't think there's anyone here, and I hope that nobody is going to be painted as being against infill development. I think Councillor Orlikow's made it very clear that he has concerns about the particular way, particular proposal before us today with issues and those are very real issues. And I don't think anybody is making any decisions lightly, and I just want to say I don't like to see…I don't want to see any member of this Council painted as being against infill development, because I think we all know we all support that. It's a matter of a specific development in a specific neighbourhood and the nature of that development.

I also think one of the issues that's confusing this whole issue is the corridor itself should have been purchased by the City years ago and used as a transportation corridor. It's right beside Kenaston. I meant even in the recent discussions on widening Kenaston, they were talking about purchasing and expropriating it and this is going on while we're in the middle of some of these hearings. I mean, it was very confusing to everyone, particularly residents but also Councillors. Like, here is the City talking about buying it and expropriating things as we're in the midst of a hearing to discuss whether to approve a development on it. So you know, it's not that far-fetched that in the future it could be expropriated but having said that, I think Councillor Orlikow has been very clear that there is a willingness to support a kind of infill development if it's something that's acceptable to the neighbourhood. I don't think it's fair to paint those residents as against all change or development. And I don't want to see them painted that way and I don't want to see Councillor Orlikow and others painted as being against infill development. I think that's blatantly unfair. I think you have to look at the individual case and City Centre Community Committee looked at it for hours and hours and hours. And unfortunately none of you are…if you're not on that committee, were able to be there to hear all those people's concerns but we were, and that's why we supported Councillor Orlikow. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No further Speakers? Councillor Steeves in closing.

Councillor Steeves: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. We've all been there. We all know how these Community Committee hearings go. We know how difficult they can be. We all understand that each and every time a resident stands up they are going to say, "Don't do this, I have another idea". That's a standard remark at every single controversial Community Committee hearing. Yeah, of course, if we just keep moving the ball around enough and saying let's not do this proposal on the table that someone has sank a lot of

time and effort into, let's just push this off the table and say maybe we can do that or let's just push it off the table and say maybe we can do that. Well, yeah, that always is the way it is. We understand that's perfectly part of the process. We…this piece of property has been sitting there kind of forever in a lot of ways. There's been no offers from folks coming forward in the neighbourhood that I'm aware of. There's been no plans that have been put together. I always look very, very skeptically, Mr. Speaker, at a group of residents that say, "Yeah, we'll buy this property from you, just trust us, eventually we'll get together and we'll put together enough money from the residents and we'll buy this property." We all know that our communities, most times, any given street you can't get 50% of the people to even pave their back lane in a local improvement process let alone get together the thousands, potentially millions of dollars it would take to buy this property, very, very difficult to do. Councillor Gerbasi mentioned confidence in the process. We've always been very clear as a Council. Community Committee is persuasive but it is not the final arbiter of fact. Everybody understands the system. We generally honour the system in terms of the decision of Community Committee. But at the same time, as we want to assure people in the community that the Community Committee process is worthwhile, we also want to be true to our actual process that says "this process does continue down the line" and that is clearly enunciated at every Community Committee meeting.

Talks of a transit way and this and that and the other thing, this development is going to have the linear path, publicly accessible, done to our standards going right through it.

The talk about the width of the streets, Councillor Orlikow made reference to 60 foot wide streets with boulevards. Well, I don't know how big the boulevards are in River Heights but in St. Vital they're 18 feet on both sides. I don't know how wide of a street that would actually leave but it's probably smaller than the lanes that we're creating or close to it.

There's another issue that I have to bring up that is of concern. My understanding is that the Community Committee, for reasons that I'm not entirely clear, before this meeting, sent out letters into the community, sort of getting… (inaudible speaking in the background)

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

Councillor Orlikow: It wasn't a Community Committee. It was… (inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead, proceed.

Councillor Steeves: And again, my intention is not to…I don't think there's any bad intent. I don't think anyone deliberately did anything wrong, but I just want to remind my Council colleagues that at Community Committee, when there is a development application on the table, you sit as essentially a judge. We discourage actively the interaction of the sitting Councillors on the community. We discourage their interaction with either the community or the developer before the hearing actually takes place at Community Committee. The reason for that, of course, and we know that it's sometimes very difficult because people are sending information, e-mails, phone calls. I understand that. But you are essentially sitting as a tribunal of tryers of fact at Community Committee, to make a very, very important decision. That decision can and often is appealed. It's a quasi-judicial process. We wouldn't, in a perfect world, expect any member of the Community Committee to be sending letters out to private residents prior to the hearing. I'm not saying anything wrong was done here I'm just wanting to caution people on this type of thing.

This is infill development. And Councillor Gerbasi says she doesn't want to be painted with a bad brush because she is against this infill development. Well, the truth is, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to do infill development in this city, it's going to be hard and there are going to be people against us. If what you think is going to happen is every time we have an infill development plan, is everyone going to put up their hands and applaud every

single thing that we do, you're wrong. If you want infill development, you're going to need a backbone, Mr. Speaker. We've all been through to Community Committee. Heck, when we built that YMCA in St. Vital, when we built that community…when we ripped down the old Canoe Club and built the new development there, when we built Dakota Place in the former green field across Dakota Community Centre, do you think that was fun for me? I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it was the opposite of fun. But somewhere deep down in my Councillor's soul, I understand that it's the right thing to do. And even though you're getting the barbs and the insults and threatening phone calls, I mean, we understand that's part of the drill here, but that is not cause to back off on infill development. If we are going to build the housing stock that we need in this city, we are going to collectively have to periodically stand shoulder to shoulder and say, "Wait a second. This is the right thing to do." And this is the right thing to do. You will never, in a year of Sundays, get a less obtrusive development than this. These are small condominiums, serviced by 2.2 lots, parking stalls each. We know who's going to live here. The grandmas, the grandpas, the bubbas, the aunts, the uncles who grew up in this neighbourhood. That's who lives at Dakota house. They grew up in St. Vital, these people. That's who lives at the Canoe Club. They grew up in St. Vital, these people. The people who are going to live here are going to be long-time, River Heights residents, who no longer want to live in their large homes. Again, with maximum respect to the Community Committee, I think this is one situation where Council has to step in and say, this is a good, fair and just development.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Vote on Item 7. Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour, please rise, of Item 7.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Thomas and Vandal.

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

Mr. Speaker: It's carried.

Item 12 - Declaration of Surplus Land - Northwest Corner of St. Mary's Road at Kenny Street
eFile - 2.4(35)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I think I understand the issue that we're gong to hear about here from Councillor Vandal. We spoke about it at Community Committee. I'll wait to hear his comments.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appeared in delegation for this issue In Camera at Property Committee. The request was that we take a small percentage of the funds that we're going to receive from the sale of this piece of land in St. Boniface. I understand we've received more than what the land was listed for. We were going to take a small percentage and apply it to a community centre in St. Boniface that we're working on. There's ample precedent for this sort of thing across the city. In fact, yesterday we did the same thing in Transcona for $300,000, I believe, from a land sale. And it was Recommendation No. 2 which was laid over by EPC and I understand it will be at EPC early in January and I'm just wondering if the Chairperson can give me some explanation as to the layover, the reasons for the layover, given that I understand it was unanimously approved at Property Committee. Again, I will be there in January and I just wanted some explanation from the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves. There's no further speakers? Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: You know, I feel a bit bad about this one for Councillor Vandal. I know we talked about this at Community Committee. I know he's just trying to do the right thing for his community centre. This is nothing personal. I hope he doesn't take it as such. Obviously, Winakwa is a great project. A couple of issues that have arisen that we'll have to discuss before Executive Policy Committee next. Winakwa was receipt of I believe rink funding…or Federal Government funding and there's become a bit of an issue that's risen with respect to funding that has come in from other orders of government, flowing into projects and what the expectations are from the City of Winnipeg. These were fairly brought to my attention by a person in our public service who has concerns about that, and again, outside of this particular project, what…even though we are grateful generally, I think, for the money that's flowing from other orders of government on these types of community projects, it is putting a bit of strain on local Councillors and money that we have to find and indeed this Council by extension. So, we're a little bit concerned about the math on Winakwa. We're a little bit concerned about how much money is going into it, and I can tell you generally this is now the second time in two days this has come on to the table where the local Councillor is counting on overages in our local land sales to fund local projects. I understand the intent and I understand the benefit. I am not 100% convinced about the equity of this plan. We did it yesterday. I completely acknowledge that. Who knows, maybe we'll wind up doing this again in January. But, at some stage we're going to have to have a little chitchat as a Council as to what is fair here. A little bit worried, as I said yesterday, even though it was supported virtually unanimously by Council, that this road we've been going down might lead to some inequities particularly for regions of our city that are less well healed than others because of land sales and those types of things. That's a concern that I have. But I guess we'll have to see what the will is of Council or generally speaking, maybe that can be anecdotally or off the record, but we'll leave it as it is. I note there's no Motion on the table. We'll have to have a discussion about this with apologies to my friend from St. Boniface. I'm not sure what we're going to be doing going forward but obviously we're prepared to talk.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, on Item 12, all in favour? Contrary? It's carried.

Reading By-laws, second and third reading will not be dealt with today. Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Steeves, By-laws number starting with 148/2009.

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

Councillor Steeves: I'll move the following By-laws be read a first time. By-laws 148, 149, 153, 154, 155, 160, all of 2009, be read a first time. Give one of my chocolate bars here, be all read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws…

Mr. Speaker: Just wait, wait, wait. Just hang on a second.

Mr. Speaker: Are you okay, Terry?

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: No.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Merry Christmas to you. Okay, proceed.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 148/2009, 149/2009, 153/2009, 154/2009, 155/2009, and 160/2009.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker, I'm not a hundred percent certain, but I'm pretty

sure that gentleman compared me to Louis Riel. Is that what I heard?

Mr. Speaker: You look like him.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Steeves: Okay, fair enough. My Council…my Council colleagues have reminded me quite correctly, I'm not worthy of comparison.

I'll move that By-laws No. 148, 149, 153 to 155, both inclusive, and 160/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 148/2009, 149/2009 and 153/2009 to 155/2009, both inclusive, and 160/2009.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 148/2009, 149/2009, 153/2009 to 155/2009, both inclusive, and 160/2009 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Oh, pardon me. Any questions? No, there's no questions. Councillor Pagtakhan. I smell gas here.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: It was gasoline.

Mr. Speaker: We're all going to get high now.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE
ON PROTECTION AND COMMUINITY SERVICES
DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2009**

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, pleased to move Consent Items 2, 3 and 4.

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

**Item 1 - LiveSAFE in Winnipeg - An Interconnected Crime Prevention Strategy
eFile GF-2**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just want to put a few remarks on the record and to thank Clive Wightman, Director of Community Services and the Winnipeg Police Chief, Keith McCaskill and Kathy Knudsen for the work that they have done with respect to preparing the LiveSAFE report and the leadership conference that they held with respect to having 85 different members of the community come out, leaders in the community, to putting together an interconnected crime prevention strategy, Mr. Speaker. This policy is basically grounded on the fact that the best product on crime prevention is everyone's responsibility in the City of Winnipeg and this is not a City of Winnipeg initiative, Mr. Speaker. It's an initiative that's led by the citizens of Winnipeg, by the city…the city spirit, and from business, from faith groups, from education to governments, and various community members. So I just want to put out there that our role on this particular project is going to be relative to a building community capacity through Recreation and Library Services as well as put the Winnipeg Police Service working with neighbourhoods in a proactive way to prevent crime and reduce crime in their neighbourhood. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to move Item No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: Any discussions? All in favour, Item 1? Contrary? Carried. Motions, none. By-laws none. Question period.

Terry, what is that bloody smell out there? (Inaudible speaking in the background) Sniffing kerosene. How did he get into the building? (Inaudible speaking in the background) Councillor Thomas. Do you have a question?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Thomas: With the disruption that occurred in the Chamber, I neglected to pull off Item No. 3. So what I'm going to do is ask you an "are you aware" question because both myself and Councillor Pagtakhan served on the Library Board, and there is a naming of the…of a room in the Windsor Park Library for Dr. Allan Patterson who served many years on the Library Board with me, with Councillor Pagtakhan. Are you aware of the wonderful work that he has done, and how pleased we all are to honour him in this manner?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Are you aware?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. (Laughter) And I echo Councillor Thomas' and applaud her for bringing that up. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: That smell is getting to all of us.

Councillor Gerbasi, your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just wondering as Chair of the Protection and Community Services Committee if you have seen a report from the Police on the helicopter proposal?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Gerbasi for the question. It's my understanding that report is forthcoming to our committee or it's coming forth in January. I have not seen a report yet, but I understand it's coming forward.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That's it? Councillors, we experienced an unusual event here by some individual person walking into the Galleries and spilling out some kind of a substance that Councillor O'Shaughnessy had to leave. He complained that he was getting a headache, and I think, Mr. Clerk we have to take seriously take a look at the type of security we have in this building because something like this did happen now, could have been more serious and that's…that's unusual.

With that, before roll call, I would like to thank all members of Council, and we had a wonderful year and good discussions, debates, and I wish each and every one of you a very merry Christmas, Happy Hanukkah and a prosperous new year. And to my friends who are celebrating the Orthodox Christmas, (greeting in Ukrainian) Councillor Thomas, thank you for that. And (greeting)...Councillor Pagtakhan you wanted to...would you please stand? Stand, stand.

Councillor Pagtakhan: (Greeting in Tagalog) to all our Filipino friends.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, thank you. Moved by Councillor Steeves that Council do now adjourn. 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, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Vandal, and Wyatt.

Council adjourned at 10:45 a.m.