COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday June 24, 2009

The Council met at 9:36 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Vandal.

ROLL CALL

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy entered the meeting after the roll call.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Pages we have with us here this morning is Rory Mitchell of Kelvin High School, resides in the Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward and also, Kayla Ruiz of Kelvin High School resides in the Daniel McIntyre Ward. Both of you, welcome. (applause) Welcome of guests and announcements, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations on behalf of my Council colleagues to Mr. Phillip Lee on his recent appointment as Manitoba's new Lieutenant-Governor by Prime Minister Harper. As many of you may be aware, Mr. Lee has been a distinguished public servant who worked for the City of Winnipeg for nearly 40 years. He was born in Hong Kong in 1944 and emigrated to Canada to study at the University in 1962. He began his career at the City of Winnipeg as a research chemist, and he retired from the City in 2005 as the Branch Head Chemist in charge of Winnipeg's Industrial Waste Control Program. Outside of his role in the public sector, he has been an active member in our cultural community and has worked diligently to add to our reputation as the Cultural Capital of Canada. So again, I wish to congratulate Mr. Lee on his new appointment and I know he will continue to serve our City and our Province well in this new capacity.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We have in the gallery a person I haven't seen for some time, Mr. Ed Blackman, Former President of CUPE 500. Ed, welcome. (applause)

Ed comes from the old school of politics being as the leader of the CUPE Union, that we were able to get places real fast.

Condolence motion.... You'll find out later. A condolence motion. Would you please read it, Mr. Clerk?

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Lazarenko,
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan,

Clerk: *THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Tom Yauk, former Commissioner of Planning and Community Services, which occurred on June 19, 2009.*

This Council extends to his wife Rose Marie, children Theresa, Evelyn and Noah, and their families, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Before I call for a moment of silence, I'd like to say a few words about the former Commissioner, Tom Yauk. I've known Tom Yauk for about 35 years. A person who had integrity, understanding, one who believed in team work and worked with the people of the City of Winnipeg and also to work with the staff and he was one of the fine leaders that was able to accomplish a lot of…that we were able to accomplish ourselves as our responsibility as the City of Winnipeg. A compassionate person, one of many in our staff. We have a lot of good people on our staff, most are good and it's something that recognition has to be given. So, I would like to get everyone to stand in the Gallery and the Chambers to give a moment of silence for the late Mr. Tom Yauk.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow moves the Minutes of meeting held on May 27 of 2009 be taken as read and confirmed. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Now we get to the Agenda dealing with delegations. We have delegations are for and against. The first delegation is Mr. Bill Cody, Sunstone Resort Communities, in support of Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee Property and Development dated June 2nd of 2009. Mr. Cody? Is he present? And followed by Susan Feldman, also in support. Mr. Cody, you'll have ten minutes and Ms. Feldman, you'll have five minutes and then we'll ask questions if there will be any. Mr. Cody, you have ten minutes

Bill Cody: Ten minutes? Thank you.

Your Worship and Councillors, good morning. Let's begin with the original historic report and the letter to your Committee. Right now we're just handing out some information that I'll be following along with. The historic report is Tab 1 in that binder. Early in the letter to the Committee of PP&D there was a statement that the heritage values of this house have not changed. Let's review the original report to investigate what the heritage values seem to be. The original report consists of two typed pages, 11 short paragraphs in total. Six paragraphs discuss the Dennistown Family, two paragraphs talk about the subsequent owners. Two paragraphs only deal with the house and its architect. One extra paragraph talks about the architect's other homes in the area, Ding Wallhouse and his own home were mentioned and the summary paragraph again talks about the Dennistown Family.

The style of the house is noted as Old World English Look in the original report. Again this is all in Tab 1 of your binder. So what's changed since the 1984 report? I think we would suggest that in many ways the report was not all that well presented. It seems like the original author probably didn't speak to the family, even though the preponderance of information in the report, you can count the words, count the paragraphs, the vast preponderance of the report deals with the Dennistown Family. It doesn't appear that the family was contacted. We kind of know this by the fact that the name was spelt incorrectly throughout the report, and that there are some gaps in the history. So, we've learned that and one of the most important things we've learned is that from speaking to the grandchildren, is that Judge Dennistown only lived in this house for a relatively short period of time, and that the true family home was on Cockburn Street. This is kind of new information and we think it's changed a little bit of the content of the report. What I can tell you is that the family has contacted us to contribute comment. The personal stories are incredibly interesting and the first hand recollections of Judge Dennistown and his wife are very impressive. What is important is that the family did not live in the house very long, and according to the granddaughter who called me again last night, and we had a lovely chat, the family in fact lived on Cockburn for some 30 years, much longer than 166. The true family home was on Cockburn. That's where the memories reside and by example, both of Judge Dennistown's granddaughters were married in the garden on Cockburn and I was told many, many great memories last night and earlier in the month.

So what is new since '84 is that a family member has asked me to read to you that the family are not opposed to the delisting of this house and to restate that the grandfather was very proud of the building…of building the home but he just didn't keep it that long. That the family understands that it cannot be kept in its original pristine condition, and that a new, high quality, residential project on the site is a worthwhile goal. I'll talk more about these conversations later. But in this light, what we know now is the home the Judge lived in for most of his career was on Cockburn. He lived there much longer than 166. If the preponderance of the information to support the listing of this house is about the family and the judge,

you know, perhaps it would be a contare that Cockburn should be listed as well or in place of this house.

What else has changed? Well, since '84 there has been a comprehensive neighbourhood plan in place, and over this time, the zoning under this house has changed. It's gone from single family to the highest density residential designation in the City. And what's kind of remarkable about this is it was done…this upzoning was done without prompt by the current owners, who have owned the house for a very long time. The rezoning process has occurred as a natural planning and response to housing need and good use of infrastructure. So, those are two very important things. We wouldn't be here if this land was not zoned appropriately for density. We just wouldn't be here. Now, the goals of the neighbourhood plan are many and in many ways there are conflicts between these stated goals. On page 26 of the plan, describes the conflicts as they relate to our topic, history and revitalization. There's always going to be conflicts between historic and revitalization and renewal. They are described in the plan. They are there for us to see. What I can say is that our proposal responds to many, many more of the stated goals in the plan, then doesn't run afoul. And to support that statement, I can refer you to tab 3 in your binder which is a letter from Planning, back to us after their review of our submissions, and I'll just quote the Planner very briefly. "The neighbourhood plan designates the subject property as village high density residential which encourages medium and high density residential development." The Planner then goes on to report back to us: "In your submittal, you go into great detail about how you are satisfying the intent of the Plan. You also indicate that you have already done an extensive amount of consultative work with the community. It appears, based on the information provided in this report, that you have endeavoured to design your proposed development to meet the intent of the Osborne Village Neighbourhood Plan wherever possible." So that's the Planner's report back to us. Tab 2 contains some information of these consultative workshops that we held. You can review those as well.

So the Grade Three Historic structure is by definition of building, of moderate historical significance. It's the lowest grade that can be listed. The interior can and has been modified. It's a five-plex.

Again, the letter that you received from the Committee goes on to state that this is one of the few private homes, private dwellings remaining from one of Winnipeg's early affluent suburbs. Now I'm not going to go into this in great detail, but this is an article from last week's Free Press. It just illustrates many, many private residences. The first error in that statement is this is not a private residence, it's a five-plex. There's dozens listed in the Free Press last weekend in affluent suburbs that are still private homes. This particular house was not mentioned by the Free Press. But I think we all know that there are dozens if not hundreds of Old World English Look homes in affluent Winnipeg suburbs, South River Heights, North River Heights, Crescentwood, Old Tuxedo, Wellington. The letter also mentions that the home is an example of Tudor style. Now, again, the original report does not mention the architecture of this house in more than one or two paragraphs. It does not mention the word "Tudor" It calls it Old World Look, Old World English Look. So I'm not a historian, but our architectural firm has offered to us that stylized half timbering and three chimneys do not make this house Tudor style or Tudor (inaudible) and it was never proposed to be a Tudor home in the '84 report.

In closing, the letter introduces the prominence of the occupant again. I recall that the name was spelled wrong in this letter as well, and states that the style of this particular…it's of particular importance establishing the dominant character of the area and contributes to the historical continuity of the streetscape. In our information here, I think it's tab 5 or 4, we have some of the area character pictures, and I think everyone can use their imagination now. That house does not dominate this street. The Osborne Village Plan itself talks about the

predominant character of that street as being 50s infill, 70s and 60s mid-rise and high-rise. So, I think we all know that that house doesn't dominate the street now. It didn't in 1984. It's a mixed use area, and the plan is very, very clear about that.

So, talking about the streetscape, again, I think this is one where we're not quite sure what that comment means in your letter, that there's a contuity of historical continuity of the streetscape. If you look at the pictures of the street, there is that house surrounded by mid-rise and high-rise. So, we don't see that it's a continuum or a district or a cluster like we might imagine in our historic neighbourhood or a Cannery Row of adjacent historic buildings. It's just not that. It's one building on its own. If it were part of a cluster, if it were part of a designated or an adjacent continuum, we wouldn't be here. That's gone. So, in talking a little bit more about the continuum we think maybe what's being suggested there is a continuum is desirable, and we would support that. There are other homes of this era on the street, but where the continuum stops is about 1970, as if there was no other architecture beyond 1970 in Winnipeg, and what we're suggesting and a lot of what we're here to promote is revitalization and, you know, moving that continuum along in a positive way.

So what we've done, of course we examined the quality of the house. We had engineers and contractors go out. Can we save the house? Not in this plan. Can we work around the house? The engineers and the contractors have told us that it won't marry up with new construction. It's moving, new construction doesn't move. In addition it has a basement. We can't feasibly put a parkade and underground level of parking around this basement in the middle of this site. So we can't work around the house. Can we move the house? Again, the contractor and engineers have told us that the house can't survive a pick up and a move. In addition, the historic significance of the house would be lost if it was moved. So, can we use parts of this house in a new project? The answer is yes and although we're talking about a modern project, we do have a streetscape that's pedestrian friendly. We have lots of new landscaping. We have a green roof. Parts of this house can be incorporated in adaptive re-use. One of the most interesting things…where's that beeping? Oh.

Mr. Speaker: Very, very, very shortly.

Bill Cody: Okay tab 4 just shows our idea of our gallery, and what I just want to mention about the gallery that we're proposing is the family have now offered to participate in this gallery providing information. The granddaughter has already been through her archive. She's very excited. Her statement to me was that the existing house does not tell the story. She is very excited about the gallery idea. She's been to the photographer. Provided us stories. She's ready to provide it to us this month. She is very, very excited about telling the family story, which is very interesting.

So we have this fabulous gallery. All of Atchison's work that we can promote and design into the entrance of this building as a professional legacy, and in closing I'd just like to say that we support the previous committee's decision. We think it's very bold and forward looking to move forward now and we look forward to your positive decision as a Committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Cody. Would you…you can just stay back there because after the second delegation, there will…there may be questions for the both of you.

The next, Ms. Susan Feldman, also in support of the Item 1, and this is dealing with regarding Historical Building By-law No. 1474/77. You have five minutes.

Susan Feldman: Thank you, Mayor Katz, Councillors, I'm the owner of the building at 166 Roslyn Road. My family purchased it in 1986, 23 years ago. It has been a revenue property since 1977, for 32 years. It was purchased as a revenue property with the full knowledge that it had a Grade Three Historic Designation, meaning it was of moderate significance

and interior modifications were permitted as well as some exterior modifications.

After 32 years as a revenue property, it has reached the end of its useful life. We totally respect the need to protect and honour our history. However, as noted by my colleague, the Osborne village Neighbourhood Plan contains inherent conflicts. The major conflict is the need for infill housing to further bring new…young people to the area, keep our young people in the City, to allow empty nesters to have affordable housing, with the need to preserve our heritage. Unfortunately, sometimes these principles conflict.

In the summer of 2007, over two years ago, I assembled a competent team to explore the possibility of moving forward with a development. My instructions to them at that time were to try and incorporate this structure into a new development. Unfortunately, the building will not sustain incorporation. We cannot move it. But what we can do is take some of the architectural features, some of the brick work, create walkways, gateways to a new pedestrian-friendly group of townhouses which will form the new streetscape. We have engaged in an extensive public consultation process over the two year period. We have had six meetings with community members. Three of these have been advertised in the paper. Three of them were by invitation to community leaders and neighbours in the area.

I realize that delisting is the main issue, but there are other issues that have come to the fore that are related, and I'd like to take an opportunity to digress just slightly because people in the neighbourhood, there are a few who certainly feel strongly about this and we understand that…had an on-line petition put on, in the Free Press yesterday. But unfortunately, there were incorrect facts that were part of that petition and I'd like to address them for a moment. The number of trees that will be removed from the property, from public property, according to our original proposal was zero. We now, in order to work with the neighbours at 188, we had a meeting with them, we sat in someone's living room and they said, you know, "We're worried about the traffic, we're worried that if you just use a lane in and out it will be unlivable." So they said "Go in on Roslyn Road and go out through the lane". This is why we have to take out one tree and that is the only reason.

The architect, John Atchison, has built 14 homes. He has built 46 buildings in our City. So, it is my opinion that his very fine architectural style is well represented.

I want to sum up by saying that we do not believe that this house represents the dominant characteristic of the neighbourhood. If you take a walk down Roslyn Road, the trees are beautiful but if you look up, there are high rise buildings everywhere and that is the dominant characteristic of the neighbourhood.

In terms of the Dennistown name, it's ironic that only since this issue has become public has the spelling been corrected. And with all due respect to the City archives it's been incorrect for 25 years, even insofar as the documents with respect to this meeting yesterday. So, it seems to me that the Dennistown -- Justice Robert Dennistown will finally receive his due with his name spelled correctly and some very interesting facts that will come to light.

In terms of our legacy gallery, what we want to do is have it spill into the public places as well. So it's not just the people that live in the building that will learn about Justice Dennistown but also the entire neighbourhood.

Issues about traffic have been refuted by private study that we had done by MMP. I think that it's notable that we plan to spend at least $200,000 on a new sidewalk in front of the building. (beeping sound in background).

Can I stop briefly?

Mr. Speaker: Take about 30 seconds.

Susan Feldman: There is no sidewalk there but what there is, is a well trodden path in between the trees, indicating that there is a need for a sidewalk, so we're going to put a proper one in, if you will let

us go forward. Also the lane right now needs repaving. Everybody's putting their garbage in everybody else's receptacles. We plan to put in lighting and make it a lane way in the old English sense of the term so people can walk through the Safeway safely and in a pleasant environment. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Ms. Feldman. Just stay here, there will be some questions. Mr. Cody: Any questions Councillors? Councillor Nordman your first question.

Councillor Nordman: I'm sure it's probably in the binder here Mr. Speaker, but how many units are we talking about in the…Is it 12-storey condominium?

Bill Cody: Seventy-four.

Councillor Nordman: Seventy-four units, thank you.

Bill Cody: And of that 74, about 8 are ground-oriented pedestrian with a front door along Roslyn Crescent.

Susan Feldman: Roslyn Road.

Bill Cody: Roslyn Road, sorry.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Councillor Swandel: We're here to talk about the heritage, or historic aspects of this building, not the development piece that may be happening. I think it's important for members of Council to remember that. I think the question was out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. Second question anyone? Question? No further questions? Thank you.

Susan Feldman: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The second delegation is Cindy Tugwell, Executive Director of Heritage Winnipeg in opposition to Item 1, the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development regarding Historical Building By-law No. 1474/77, followed by Jennifer Lukovich, and Jennifer if you want to come behind here, also because you'll be second. Ms. Tugwell you have ten minutes.

Cindy Tugwell: Good morning your Worship, Councillors. I'm here today to speak impromptu to respond. I know we're here to speak about the historical component of this home, not the development, and quite frankly Heritage Winnipeg's mandate is to look at the historical value of this home and the character of the neighbourhood.

I just wanted to clear the air initially that unfortunately we were absent at the Property and Development Committee meeting which, as I know over the years, speaking to many of you, is a very important Committee to be at, and by being absent we found out later that there were comments from several Committee members at P&D and EPC, that the absence spoke volumes about the fact that we didn't care about this property. We didn't think it was important enough, and in all respect I think that that was an unfair assumption that because we weren't there, I was out of town with Heritage Canada and we were not cognizant of this P&D meeting, that 166 Roslyn would be on the slate.

Again, we have addressed over the years to you, some type of process. We are the only advocacy organization for built heritage in the City of Winnipeg. We understand there were open houses throughout the last several years for the residents but we certainly feel, as has happened over the past, I'm very positive that things can change. When it comes to downtown properties with CentreVenture, we have been called, we are at the table, we sit down with the developers, there's been many properties as you know, the Ryan building, the Kelly house, where we're cognizant of the heritage value but the development is still a pivotal component. I know we're not to speak about it but we are losing this heritage home to a development, so it's almost impossible to not talk about it. Something that's disconcerting to me that's happened is over the many years that I've spoke in delegation is we tend to be in a position of losing a heritage property because of neglect. So we call it

demolition by neglect and it certainly is a buzz word across Canada. In this particular case, this is demolition for development and that is very disconcerting because we are losing this property to…for the reason of development, and over the years I've also seen the way that the heritage community is sort of put to defend themselves against the developer and that we are against development and there is always a negative connotation. We are not against development. We are looking for a compromise and a marriage of both and to sit down with the developer and understand their needs, so that we can sit down also equally and tell them what our needs are, and in this particular case, I'm not at liberty to speak about the development and all the concerns the residents have because I don't live in this area, but it will impact the character of the neighbourhood, and it is very important, it is a small portion of streetscape that there has been a lot of development over the years, and there is a lot of pressure on elected officials, civic officials, to look at… we need development but why does it have to be on this property and why do we have to lose this home? Is there not another parcel of land possibly in the periphery of Osborne Village that could be utilized because certainly that is not…in real estate it's location, location, location but unfortunately, we do not want to lose this significant heritage home that represents the first suburb of Winnipeg and certainly the streetcar had a role in that. That was part of our transportation history once the streetcar was in there. They developed that area. It's an affluent area. The character of the area is very important to the residents and they will speak on their own behalf, but the open houses were mentioned by the developer. I'm getting a completely different signal that the residents of that area do not support losing this home. And I want to bring to your attention something that's really very problematic, is the City over the years has been very supportive of putting things in place. In fact, in the late 70s when the by-laws came into play in 1977 and subsequently at that time, Steven Barber and Chuck Brooks who were heritage planners, Winnipeg was known as precedent setting for their by-laws and for some of the things that were put in place for designation. I wanted to comment on Mr. Cody's remark that this home is…was not really significant to the Dennistown family. This…when a property is designated, whether it's Grade 1, 2 or 3, it is there for all Winnipeggers to enjoy, not just the Dennistown family. And quite frankly, you designate, hoping that it will be there in perpetuity, that it will be well maintained and everyone can enjoy this home and what it represented to Winnipeggers. And the vision that the Councillors have had over the years, I commend them because many tools have been put in place to protect this. We would hope designation was put in place to say, back in '84, unless this significantly changes and when we say significantly, 9 times out of 10, probably in the last 15 years, I've never seen a property that wasn't structurally unsound, potentially go up for demolition. It's when we just…it's a last resort. It's not economically viable. We don't know what to do with it; nobody wants to purchase the property. What do you do with this? It's an eyesore. It's bringing down the rest of the area. This is quite the opposite case. This is an economically viable home. Although again not part of the heritage component, it is economically viable. Modest income people live there. We're worried about gentrification. You have condos going in there where people cannot afford hundreds of thousands of dollars. We have a need for renters in Winnipeg and we again, I want to stress, are not against the development of this condo, just not in that location. So again, I don't want this to be about, is the home worthy. Is the condo development worthy? If think they both on their own merit are worthy and that's what we have to stop doing is pegging one against the other. The fact is, in your own…I guess painstakingly, the City has invested a lot of resources in their secondary plans and I've been involved. There is one under way for the Exchange. What I don't understand is when the City spends an immense amount of resources on these plans, these neighbourhood plans, they consult the residents. They want to know what everybody thinks. They consult experts. You have your own expert committee with the Historical Buildings

Committee. It clearly states that you should not demolish. It should be considered "as a last resort and only be considered when buildings are determined structurally unsound beyond repair, and that beyond repair by an independent structural engineering's report, economic viability should not be the sole determining factor." Unless someone here today can tell me what is the reason we're losing this property. It is not structurally unsound. It is economically viable. It is a very important part of Roslyn Road. There's Armstrong's Point, there's Wellington Crescent. We are talking about Roslyn Road. We are talking about the first residential suburb of Winnipeg. We understand there is heritage all over the City. We have a thousand structures that are on the inventory and conservation list. You can't justify demolishing a property because we've got some somewhere else. Atchison yes, he's been involved in a lot of other properties, but we're looking at this home and the impact that it's going to have on the character of the neighbourhood, and on its own merits, since 1984, you have to look at the facts and be fair. If you can tell us why we're losing this property, if it's not because of the development, why are we losing it? It's not structurally unsound and nothing has significantly changed since 1984, so we say do not set a precedence in this room today--demolition by development. I mean, it's very difficult to lose it by neglect but this is not the case. This is something we need to protect and we support the Historical Buildings Committee recommendations, and I did want to add that the Chair of the Historical Buildings Committee did submit a report for Property and Development that was dated back March 20th, and that report, I feel, although there was no physical presence to back it up, it was very unfair that that Councillor, although not physically present, that her report didn't speak volumes. That in fact I understand that's why those reports are submitted to the Councillors, because they read it before the meeting and certainly had the position intact, nothing had changed. It's been used, quite frankly and unfortunately as a scapegoat. If we support the development, if that's the direction you want to go, then we should be supporting…you should be saying you support the development by saying that it's not important enough, it's not historic enough to preserve because certain individuals were not there to speak about it is an un-statement. It shows the flaw in the process. Again, we've been talking about this, as many of you know, for several years about how to change the process to make it much more transparent so we can sit at the table and I'm going to tell you right now, anything that falls within the downtown's mandate, it's been happening. CentreVenture, anyone who has been involved in the last few years with some of the larger commercial properties, we sit down and it's not about is this good is this bad. It's about what are your needs, what are our needs, and how do we come together and have the marriage of both, and you're going to be setting a precedence across Canada if you vote today to delist that property and subsequently open the… and pave the way for this development. You are going to say that designation means nothing and nothing had to change. You're not saying it's structurally unsound. You're not saying anything is significantly changed and what you're going to do is tell Canadians, and more importantly Winnipeggers, that we designate properties hopefully in perpetuity for everyone in the City to enjoy and now we disregard it because we feel, as mentioned by Ms. Feldman, it's beyond its lifespan. It's not beyond its lifespan. It's not about…we appeal to you as a visionary. There's hard choices to make that unfortunately are about the economics. It's about the money we realize, but we hope today you'll reconsider your decision. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Just stay here. Ms. Lukovich also in opposition to Item 1. You have five minutes.

Jennifer Lukovich: Thank you. Thank you Honourable Mayor and Councillors. Thank you for the opportunity to speak at today's public hearing on behalf of Osborne Village and City of Winnipeg residents, and members of the Roslyn West Neighbourhood Association who are in opposition to the proposed delisting of Dennistown House.

With the decision on the fate of Dennistown House upon us, it is time to highlight once again, its architectural, historical and cultural significance to Osborne Village and the City of Winnipeg. Central also to this presentation is an emphasis on the policies outlined in the Osborne Village Neighbourhood Plan as has already been highlighted, a secondary plan and by-law established to guide development in Osborne Village and on the recognition of a movement now under way in the United States and other jurisdictions that underscores the connection between heritage preservation and sustainability.

Designed by one of Western Canada's leading Chicago score architects, John Atchison, who is also a member of the art committee of the Winnipeg School of Art from 1913 to 1924, Dennistown house provides one of the last remaining residential tributes of this style to the City's first suburbs in an age when Winnipeg was respected as a progressive and vibrant centre of cultural and business activity. Its architectural significance is outlined in the 1984 Historical Buildings Committee report, the strongest statement of Atchison style from this period.

The marble inspired by these buildings is no less evident than in the commercial buildings of the Winnipeg's Exchange District, also designed by John Atchison. Built in 1908 for the family of Justice Dennistown, who in drafting the original Workmen's Compensation Act and serving as judge of the Manitoba Court of Appeal, contribute to the commercial and legal beginnings of this City.

The cultural significance of Dennistown House resides in its beauty and is one of the last surviving manors from the early 20th century in the Roslyn Road area, most others having been demolished and replaced with high rise condos. It is this home which is a point of introduction and departure to the Roslyn Road/Roslyn Crescent area, defines the character of this neighbourhood steeped in history. The present configuration of homes amongst condos offers a mixed use approach of residential and commercial that is the envy of other cities.

Dennistown House was listed as a heritage home on December 3, 1984, when it was a five-unit dwelling based on its architectural and historical significance to Osborne Village and the City of Winnipeg. A letter issued in March 2009 by the Historical Buildings Committee, which is included in the binder that was circulated, the City of Winnipeg's Advisory Committee on Heritage Preservation to the Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Development clearly states that its architectural, historical and structural integrity have been preserved. As you will note from the photographs that have also been circulated, the interior is in excellent condition. It is well preserved and fine hard wood paneling exists throughout the structure, both reasons for which this home obtained heritage status designation in 1984, and these are enlarged photos of the interior.

The question posed three weeks ago and posed again today is, therefore, what, 25 years later, renders this home any less significant than when listed as a heritage home in 1984. It continues to be of architectural and historical significance as it was 25 years ago. Its character, condition and architectural integrity remain. What exceptional circumstances now allow this historic home and protected structure to be delisted and demolished?

As was mentioned by our previous speaker, the delisting of Dennistown House sets an unfortunate precedent for the delisting of other historic homes and renders meaningless heritage status designation, the Historical Buildings Committee and the Osborne Village Neighbourhood Plan. Moreover, the decision by the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development and subsequently EPC to delist Dennistown house is inconsistent with the Osborne Village Neighbourhood Plan. One of the key objectives outlined in the plan is to protect, maintain and encourage conservation of heritage buildings. The OVNP was established following six years of extensive consultations with Osborne Village residents to determine their concerns and vision for their neighbourhood. More specifically, the

Osborne Village Neighbourhood Plan states and includes heritage policies that, and I quote, "discourage the demolition of historic or architecturally significant buildings or structures, that demolition will be considered as a last resort and should only be considered when buildings are determined to be structurally unsound beyond repair. Economic viability should not be the sole determining factor." A decision to delist Dennistown House, if approved, would run counter to the Osborne Village Neighbourhood Plan and breach this by-law. A key element of sustainability is the preservation of historic buildings, the connection that has been recognized by English heritage in the United Kingdom and more recently in the United States in what is referred to as the Pocantico Proclamation issued in June of this year. The Pocantico Proclamation states, "The most sustainable building, community or landscape is often the one that already exists", and is based on the premise that it takes less energy and resources to preserve a building than it does to demolish it and redevelop.

The City of Winnipeg has an opportunity to set a precedent and position itself as a leader in sustainability amongst Canadian cities with the establishment of a comparable program that works to address unsustainable consumption development through the preservation of its heritage buildings. A green heritage building program and initiative that incorporate green initiatives and principles of sustainability with heritage preservation, would compliment the City of Winnipeg's ongoing plans for sustainable Winnipeg. Indeed the Speak Up Winnipeg Forum this week emphasizes the need to define the criteria for a socially, environmentally and financially sustainable Winnipeg. Green heritage building programs address each aspect of sustainability. Social sustainability is achieved through reinvestment in the culture, history and heritage of communities to create social equality amongst citizens. Environmental sustainability is achieved through reduction in greenhouse gases, energy and material consumption required in the demolition of historic buildings and construction of…

Mr. Speaker: Jennifer. Jennifer. Your…No I'm sorry but your time is up

Jennifer Lukovich: I'd like to continue please because these are relevant points.

Mr. Speaker: I'll give you another 30 seconds. Just make some notes. You've issued your report to all the members of Council. They're reading it right now.

Jennifer Lukovich: As mentioned I am speaking on behalf of numerous concerned Osborne Village and City of Winnipeg residents. Individuals with experience in heritage designation and preservation including Professor Neville who chaired the HBC Committee from 1980 to 89, Mr. Wins Bridgman, a leading architect and expert in heritage work and green architecture and Jim Blanchard, an eminent Winnipeg historian and author of "Winnipeg 1912", concur with the HBC recommendations to retain historical heritage designation. Resounding support from members of the Osborne Village area in Winnipeg is demonstrated in close to a thousand signatures for a petition in opposition to the delisting obtained over five days, and included in the package are the signatures from the residents of Osborne Village and the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Thank you. I believe there may be some questions for the both of you. Ms. Tugwell, are you in the back? Any questions of the delegation, Councillors? No questions? Oh, Councillor Thomas?

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I have a couple of questions for Cindy. You talked about the process of what happens in downtown verses the process that you occurred in this. Can you explain in a little bit more detail how the process works for your inclusion and what did not happen here?

Cindy Tugwell: Well the process is, quite frankly, not a legal process. It's done out of respect. We had spoken to CentreVenture over many years to say we are not cognizant as an organization to go to our board and find out what the needs of the developer are and things that we cannot get from a historical

report. All of those things. And so I know Ross McGowan has been wonderful over the last two years, to have us as someone at the table respectfully understanding both sides and I think that's an integral part that is not done with heritage in the past. But, you cannot look at just heritage preservation and just look at development. You have to look at both and understand the larger picture. That's been happening from a respectful position, because of Ross McGowan being part of CentreVenture. There's nothing written as a process. Outside of downtown the process is very reactive. Forty-eight hours it has to be posted online on the website. You see that it's on Property and Development's Committee. That's not enough time for to us go to our board. We've had no opportunity because we're not residents of Fort Rouge and we didn't have an opportunity to speak with the developer and understand their needs so there is a process here that's very reactive. We're coming in with all due respect, with the developer having many months of consultation and part of an educated process of what's going on in the community. We're getting 48 hours, if that.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Thomas: Yes. My second question is Halifax has an historic designation process, and they have much…many more heritage buildings than us. They have a whole plaque program and some of the issues around consultation. Are you aware of how they do that and can you explain a bit about their process?

Cindy Tugwell: I don't really know a lot about their process. I just know that when we set up the heritage historical…or the heritage by-laws and also the Historical Buildings Committee, the designation, once implemented, as I indicated to you in my earlier speech, would have to have some major reason that we would delist and demolish and that would have to be structurally unsound or, in fact, not economically viable and then we put in place the Vacant and Derelict Buildings By-laws in 2004 to protect that. So we are not adhering to the very plan and process that City Councillors put in place.

Mr. Speaker: Third and final question.

Councillor Thomas: Yes my third and final question for Jennifer, and thank you very much for coming here Jennifer…can…you're with…

Jennifer Lukovich: …the Roslyn…I'm representing….

Councillor Thomas: Pardon?

Jennifer Lukovich: I'm representing members from the Roslyn West Neighbourhood Association and Osborne Village.

Councillor Thomas: Okay. Can you tell me if you're aware of how they do things in Halifax and the process by which they have a historic designation and the steps to delist that historic designation and how this is very different from that? Are you aware of those processes?

Jennifer Lukovich: Based on the research I have done, I've looked at historic designation in Toronto and Montréal, various municipalities in B.C. where a heritage home, once a heritage home, always remains a heritage home. In terms, as Cindy has mentioned, in terms of delisting it would have to be based on the fact that the building is structurally unsound. Internationally there have been programs where groups where development has tried to proceed where heritage sites exist and it hasn't been allowed based on the fact that no exceptional circumstances warranted their destruction and the community has recognized that more is to be gained from retaining the building than from demolishing it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions Councillors? None? Thank you, ladies.

Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor Report of June the 3rd of 2009.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 3, 2009**

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

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Report of June 10th, 2009, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 10, 2009**

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

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions. Councillor Wyatt I believe this is your motion. The Notice of Motion. It's here today and also, you have an amendment to the above? Would you like to speak to it?

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS**

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,**

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

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

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

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

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

AND WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba announced on May 25th, 2009, that the annual Provincial budget for highway and bridge renewal has more than doubled since 2006, allowing the Province to project that in the first three years of their 'historic' highway plan alone, an estimated $1.3 billion will be invested;

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

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

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

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

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

THAT the Notice of Motion moved by Councillors Wyatt and Smith be amended by deleting the second resolve containing the following:

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of the motion of course. The motion before you, Councillors and Your Worship, is a motion basically calling that all municipalities should be treated equally in the Province of Manitoba. That a municipality is a municipality is a municipality, that a road is a road is a road, yet it appears we are moving in the exact opposite direction when it comes to our infrastructure. Our per capita, just a bit of background and information that's relatively new and may be new for some here…

Councillor Vandal: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Sorry. There is an amendment to this motion. I'm wondering if Councillor Wyatt is going to introduce…when he's going to be introducing it…to the main motion.

Mr. Speaker: I've asked him. I've asked him.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll introduce it right now.

Mr. Speaker: An amendment to the above. Both.

Councillor Wyatt: To save time I'll speak to both Mr. Speaker. I won't speak separately. Thank you, Councillor.

So I move it with the amendment…with the amendment moving both the matters forward and I'll speak to both to save us time.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

The motion as with the amendment coming forward, right. Yeah. It has to be voted on together, or separately.

Just a bit of background. 2009, looking at a multi-year annual average for eight cities in Canada--Edmonton, Calgary, Saskatoon, Regina, Winnipeg, Hamilton, Toronto and Ottawa, we are right now, on a per capita average, we are spending…we are last per capita with regards to expenditures on capital in our City. We are now at five hundred according…this is our staff…$526 per citizen per capita. That compares to the highest which is not surprising, from Alberta, Edmonton and Calgary. Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, is spending over $1,500 per capita now on capital improvements in their City. And there should be no surprise, we have actually also, as a bit of information for Council, we have fallen out of these eight cities, we have fallen to actually the seventh level out of the entire cities when it comes to grants coming from the Provincial Government. We are now actually number seven. We are only ahead of one other City and that's Regina. Virtually every city now, per capita, is receiving more grant money funding for capital projects, and even when comparing, Mr. Speaker, the capital with operating, we have actually…we're no longer…we…at one time we were held up as a City where we were receiving grants far and beyond other municipalities. Out of those eight cities, we have actually fallen to number four now.

Mr. Speaker, the key thing here is that it doesn't really matter who is in government and who is in power. It seems the issue is the city infrastructure seems to be taken for granted from the Province. I'll read just, if you bear with me, Mr. Speaker, I'll read to you the press release or parts of the press release that was issued on May the 25th, 2009, by the

Province, specifically the Minister of Highways and Transportation. “This year, our budget for highway renewal has increased to $545 million from $423 million, an increase of over 30 per cent from 2008 and more than triple the level of investments made in 1999.” “In 2009, the annual Provincial budget for highway and bridge renewal has more than doubled since 2006” the press release states. “In the first three years of our historic highway plan alone, we will invest over $1.3 billion, nearly the entire expenditure on highways during the 1990s”. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, we've heard of the Tale of Two Cities. We truly have here the Tale of Two Provinces where we have a Province which is able to expend literally hundreds of millions and increase their budget on their highways, bridges and their Provincial roads outside of the City. Now, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that every Provincial road, every Provincial highway and bridge outside of the City of Winnipeg is actually funded 100% responsibility of the Provincial Government, and it's interesting to note that in the press release, they identify a lot of different projects that they're funding, and one of them, for example, is continued investment in Brandon including the 18th Street bridge and eastern access and PTH 10 South. Mr. Speaker, every other municipality, every other city, is receiving funding. Now the Province has said well we fund the Perimeter Highway that's going around the City. Well, yes they do but they also fund the by-pass around Portage la Prairie and they fund Main Street running right through Portage la Prairie. They fund regional roads in every other municipality in this Province, Mr. Speaker, except the City of Winnipeg. Now, the Provincial Government has argued that they’ve increased the funding and they have. They have increased it. They’ve gone from zero, they’ve given us a year ago 29 million and now it's leveled off at 25 million for our regional infrastructure, but it's still not enough. The reality is, Mr. Speaker, If they were a hundred percent responsible for our regional Provincial highways and bridges within the regional road network, our staff estimate that that would comprise approximately 35 to 50% of our entire regional road and bridge network. In numbers terms that would work out to, on the low end, of 35%, another $61 million a year. At the high end, another $88 million a year Mr. Speaker. And keep in mind Mr. Speaker, that the Province not only maintains the infrastructure and pays for the infrastructure outside of Winnipeg, but also performs the street maintenance, even right down to the snow clearing and the sanding. So these numbers include their responsibility and their equal share of snow clearing and maintenance costs as they do, Mr. Speaker, in every other municipality here in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we're simply saying that enough is enough. That the citizens of Winnipeg are just as equal to any other citizen living in any other municipality and indeed, Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Winnipeg could be argued…could argue right now quite clearly that they are indeed subsidizing the infrastructure maintenance in every other municipality in Manitoba. Now we don't necessarily begrudge that I suppose because we are all Manitobans and we want to see our entire Province prosper and succeed, but the reality is, Mr. Speaker, is that the City of Winnipeg is a core part of the Provincial economy. If our infrastructure crumbles, so ultimately will our Provincial economy and our City economy. Our infrastructure, our roads, our sidewalks, our curbs, I can say to you Mr. Speaker, I’ve been on Council now, I got elected ‘02 and I don't take much pride in the fact in saying that I think since ‘02, I’ve seen…personally I’ve seen a decline, a steady decline in our infrastructure of the City. And it's frustrating. It’s frustrating for all of us. And I don't think it's a question of pointing fingers but it’s a question of saying, Mr. Speaker, that we all have to start finding solutions. That we all have to come to the table and that the Provincial Government has to be part of an action plan and strategy to assist the City of Winnipeg to build ourselves out of this terrible, deplorable situation. Ten years ago we had five pothole crews in the City of Winnipeg. Today we have ten pothole crews in the City of Winnipeg. What is it going to be five years from now, ten years from now? Twenty? Thirty pothole crews? Pothole crews, Mr. Speaker, are just a symptom of the problem of infrastructure that’s being ignored. And right now, the ten pothole crews can't

keep up. They're responding to complaints on 3-1-1 and from their Councillors. They literally are driving over potholes because they can't fix them because they've got to respond to the complaint on their list. If it's not on their list, they can't fix that pothole Mr. Speaker. Sorry, it ain't going to get fixed.

I was biking with the family on the weekend and driving. One pothole fixed, another one missed, another pothole fixed, another one missed, all on the same block. No rhyme nor reason, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the fact of the matter is our infrastructure is crumbling at a rate that soon we will not be able to potentially reverse. $370 million is what our staff has indicated to us, all of our infrastructure needs. That's our infrastructure deficit shortfall as of today, 370 million. That is the equivalent of putting into perspective of three percentage points of the PST collected here in the City of Winnipeg. So Mr. Speaker, another year goes by, that 370 million jumps up again. Another year goes by, that amount goes up again, and it just keeps on compounding. The wonder of compounding infrastructure deficits.

We have to start to find solutions, Mr. Speaker, and the Province clearly, the Provincial Government clearly has funds. They've demonstrated that in their highways budget outside the City. To increase their funding, in 30%, and I don't begrudge that, Mr. Speaker. I think that's wonderful that they're able to do that because we all use Provincial highways and we know they're important to the economy of the Province, but to increase their highway budget by over 30% in one year and to triple it, Mr. Speaker, over the last six years, Mr. Speaker, we have to send a strong message to the Province that they are equal partners. They are partners in this challenge. We're calling for them to be a hundred percent responsible for the infrastructure in the City as they are in every other City, town and village in this Province, Mr. Speaker. This is an extremely reasonable motion and I call on all of Council to support it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors before we get to the next speaker, Councillor Smith is the seconder. The amendment to the above, Councillor Wyatt has spoken. He has made an amendment to his original motion. Are we in agreement to treat this as one motion with the amendment that he has spoken of? Everyone is in favour? Aye. Okay it's carried. So Councillor Smith, speak to the amendment and…

Councillor Smith: …and the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Well speak to the motion because Councillors agreed with the amendment…put the amendment in (inaudible).

Councillor Steeves: He gets to speak four times on each…

Councillor Smith: Let me tell you, when Councillor Wyatt came to me with this motion, I read it and I thought my God, you know, this is wild. But then when you think about it, you know, what this will mean, equality with other municipalities seems to me worthwhile. You know we can then divert the funds to residential streets which I really think is needed. We talk about potholes. You know, I still don't understand why we don't send an employee down the street and note the potholes and fix them. Why we have to operate on a complaint basis? You know, the thing is we have an infrastructure deficit that's so tremendous, it's like a mountain of deficit and it just seems to me that we should be sending a message to the Province that we want more help with our infrastructure. I support this whole heartedly.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves, you're next to speak.

Councillor Steeves: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't sure if I was going to speak on this motion or not but I was worried that my colleague from Transcona would be standing up alone and no one wanted that. I agree with pretty much everything the Councillor from Transcona mentioned in his speak…in his talk which I thought was well presented except for, of course, the part about him riding a bike which I find (inaudible) (laughter). Yes, yes.

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Order! Order! I would ask you to call this…I would ask you to call this Chamber to order please.

I think the point that we want to emphasize here, and I have no illusions, I guess I've lost some of my idealism on where these motions go once they leave this Council floor. I think it's based on some disappointed precedent that we've had with our colleagues on Broadway, but it probably is worthwhile to spend a little bit of time reflecting on how we've done as a Chamber with respect to our Provincial colleagues over the course of the last decade. I think I'd ask some of my colleagues if they're considering whether or not to support a motion like this to harken back to our New Deal discussions. We spent a lot of time and effort and money trying to put forward a cogent and intelligent argument, which…and I thought we succeeded…to our Provincial and our Federal colleagues, and we stood together, those of us who were here at the time, regardless of political stripe, and we made that argument to the Provincial and the Federal Governments. And if we look back now on those open houses that we had, all the people that came out, all the discussions that we had, if we reflect on what we've seen from the Federal level of Government verses the Provincial level of Government, the differences are stark, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what the exact amount that we're getting from the Federal Government today is on the gas tax and other program funding in our capital budget, but it's significant. I guess part of me feels like, and I don't know if Council shares this feeling, that when we embarked on those conversations not only here but cross the Province and across the country, that to a certain extent we were listened to by the Federal Government but not necessarily by our Provincial colleagues. I listened with interest as Councillor Wyatt talked about some of the things that are going on in the difference provinces. He didn't mention things like the fact that the Alberta Provincial Government has twice, in the recent history of Alberta, bought out the civic debt of both Calgary and Edmonton. Imagine what something like that would do for a City like Winnipeg? I was in the room when Premier McGuinty in Ontario announced to AMO, all of the programs that they were uploaded from municipalities, freeing up millions, billions of dollars in the municipal sector for them to do different things in sort of their own funding envelopes. If you compare that to what's happened in Manitoba, I don't feel like there is any plan at all with respect to this City and how we're being dealt with by the Province. I do feel like every second Council meeting, we float a motion like this, asking for a plan but it is never listened to. The issue of school taxes alone has come up to this Council probably 20 different times in different forms. For heaven's sakes, every time there is a Provincial election, the two opposition parties claim they're going to get rid of the school tax to some degree, and if we rotate the parties, whoever happens to be in power just simply doesn't do it. The result is we're stuck with the same thing at the end of the day. Here we have a revenue system vis-à-vis school tax and realty taxes, civic taxes in this City that is archaic, and is absolutely ridiculous. I apologize if that language is too strong, but nobody is doing this any more. Nobody is asking the property taxpayer to pay for 54% or whatever it happens to be, on the property tax rolls. With all due respect in deference to my colleagues on Broadway, that is a ridiculous and outdated system that, at this stage, shows no sign of being changed, and it's wrong, and we can't be accused of not bringing this up to our Provincial colleagues. We've probably done so, as I said, about 20 different times in my tenure. Look at what's happening in Saskatchewan and their Provincial Government and their Provincial sales tax. I was in the room when I listened to the leader of the opposition talk about a .5 of one percent designation to municipalities, but those are the types of ideas that always seem to wind up being voiced in opposition. All sorts of ideas but nothing ever being done. What's going on currently with this new Building Canada fund, with respect to the Federal and Provincial Governments, and God knows what that is, because we certainly have not been told, but while cities like Kitchener and London, municipalities of British Columbia, Saskatchewan, right across

this country, seem to be publicly enjoying in the largesse, we aren't even being told what's being planned for Winnipeg and we are two-thirds of the population of this Province. It is ridiculous. Again, that we haven't been included in those discussions and that nothing has happened: We watch with interest as the revenue projections for this Province continue to be strong, and wonderful that they are. We watch with interest as more and more money is being pulled out of the Hydro utility and being used in Provincial expenditure. We watch with interest as Manitoba seemingly is almost standing alone in the Federal transfer payment rubric of the Federal Government and that money seems to still be flowing in at the same rate. What is going on, Mr. Speaker? What is happening to all this funding that seems to be coming in to the Provincial Government? What is happening to all of these plans that seem progressively to be floated by the Province of Ontario, the Province of Quebec, which in my tenure has gone from the least progressive to now probably the most progressive Provincial municipal relationship in Canada. Our neighbours to the west, which we compare ourselves to all the time, our friends in Saskatchewan, now have a Premier, the Saskatchewan Party, traditionally a more, I would suggest, a right wing position, has now said quite clearly, we are going to be sharing some of this revenue. Anybody who understands anything about municipal and provincial relationships in this nation, could not fairly come to any other conclusion that Manitoba is not only behind on this progression in this country, but that we are so stagnant here in terms of the relationship between us and our Provincial colleagues, that we cease to even be considered on the radar screen. I'll be supporting this motion.

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Russ, very much for bringing this motion forward. Thank you, Gordon for a most eloquent speech but I'm going to try and add a couple of things anyway.

This is a cry in the wilderness. This is, without being too melodramatic, maybe it is too melodramatic, this is desperation. I've been on this Council since one term into the creation of the City, since 1974. I have watched our streets for years and years stay the same. People gripe. We raise taxes 5% a year. We stopped raising taxes because that's what the people wanted. Among anything else that may have happened, among all the belt tightening, the good things we have done to cut our permanent staff from 17,000 to over 8,000, to cut the number of full-time employees of the City in half, we've tightened our belt, we've done all these I think wonderful things but you know what? Our streets have gone to hell. We are part of the author of this but the Province has to take its share in what has happen. I look at my ward, I look at a gold mine for the City of Winnipeg, and I mean a gold mine. Inkster Industrial Park. Costs us nothing to maintain, phenomenal taxes, thousands of employees, of jobs. What a wonderful…have you driven through there? The roads are crap! They're awful. The potholes can't be kept up with and this is trucks…this is the stuff that should be as fine as any street in the City. It's just garbage in there. Fife is an embarrassment to drive down. I look at a street, Keewatin, a regional street north of Inkster into a new subdivision. You can barely drive over. We've got this stupid one arm thing out there, dropping pebbles and tar on to the street and sticking to everybody's car. So I look at the City street condition report. It's a Regional Street. The map I've got, the list…it's not even on there. It's a Regional Street. We don't have it listed as a street in the City of Winnipeg north of Inkster on our condition…street condition report.

I thought I saw big changes coming to Winnipeg. One of my stupider moves, maybe not the stupidest, one of my stupider moves was to oppose the new Provencher Bridge. EPC of the day and Councillor Murray, Mayor Murray at the time, were strong, it happened. It's magnificent. It's paid for. It's cost us nothing. I thought it was part of a new era where what we do we're going to do first class. We do it the best. Now we've got

citizens having to do our own City park because we can't afford to keep up City park. I read the paper this morning and I see that we can't even continue a bike lane because there's some railroad crossing on Osborne. We are going to have people in their nice (inaudible) and then we've got to throw them out to a free-for-all with traffic for what, 50 yards? I mean, if we're doing things we want to do them right and we've got to do them right.

The Province of Manitoba has got unprecedented money from Ottawa. They've given us (inaudible) basically. I don't know where all this money goes. They've got what, an extra 3 billion a year or something out of Ottawa. Where did it go? Didn't go anywhere in Winnipeg. You know, the Province has a chance without taking any of the blame to shift all the blame on to us and solve our problem. The 2% leeway the Federal Government created in the G.S.T. Let us levy that 2%. Just add it to your sales tax. It's all City, it's all our fault. Eliminate the school tax. There's not many Provinces doing it any more anyway. Take your responsibility and then let us increase our taxes to fill or partially fill that void and let us be responsible for what we do. We are spending more money on roads than we ever have. The Federal Gas Tax has partly filled that void, and our streets are still turning to gravel as Councillor Smith once said about his back lanes. We are asking for help. This is the message going out loud and clear. We're not telling the Province what the solution has to be, but you know, the 2% tax, eliminate the school tax. You could go on. There are other ways here. They're getting so much money from the Feds and none of it's going…I don't know where it's going but I'll bet when we've cut our number of employees in half, they've probably doubled in that period of time. So if you double…put a shovel in somebody's hand then and let's get to work because thank you, Russ, we need this help and we're not dictating what the solution has to be but there are a handful of solutions and I just hope that the Province…and we need help with the public of course. They say this place is crap. We're telling we need help because we are not going to double with our small base everybody's property tax just to fix roads. But the Province could give us that amount of money without changing their budget one bit just with the 2% or taking on the school taxes or any other solution they may have, we would gratefully listen to. Thank you for what this is and please, I hope this is unanimous because this has nothing to do with the political stripe of the Provincial Government or of this Council. This has to do with the holes in our roads.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting. This issue first came up a little before Russ might recall when Councillor Murray was here and we had the whole New Deal discussion, and one of the repeated refrains from the former Mayor was that regional streets are paid for by the City of Winnipeg. He made the very same point that you made, and at the time we had a wide town halls and public consultation process to look at how we could address that…the need for a new deal and the need for more revenue which is the real problem. This motion puts forward one potential solution and points out one particular problem, and I applaud Councillor Wyatt for bringing this forward. But, I think what we really need to do, because this motion, you know, certainly I'll support the motion. But we need a broader strategy under the leadership of our Mayor to say we need a new deal and some of the suggestions that Councillor O'Shaughnessy just made. We should be deciding as a Council what do we want to ask for, and then we should take the leadership to go and get it, not have a Councillor putting a one-off motion. Unfortunately that's what's…it's what we've got and I certainly support it, but I think we need a plan and we need… and it will hold a lot more sway with the Province if we can come up with some more specific solutions because this doesn't really come up with a solution, it comes up with the need and the problem. We could do…I think we could do a little bit better, frankly.

We all agree we want to see the City receive more of the pie when it comes to Winnipeg's share of revenue. However, if we're going to expect more funding from

the Province, I think we have to look at what we as a City are doing in terms of our choices that are impacting our revenue right now. As long as Council is locked into a tax freeze for 12 years and a plan to cut business tax, or I should say indefinitely a tax freeze and a plan to cut business tax, it's unlikely the Province is going to be willing to give us significantly new revenue. And I've been at F.C.M. meetings recently talking with Councillors and Mayors from across Canada and even other Councillors within Manitoba, and almost everyone I've talked to thinks our tax freeze is shear lunacy at this point, and that completely eliminating revenue from the business tax is also unrealistic. There is a high price to be paid for refusing to face reality which is what this Council has been doing budget after budget. The high price is user fees, poorer services and a growing infrastructure deficit. Just ask anyone trying to have a barbecue and organize a community event in a City park since the recent fees that have been brought in in the budget. They'll tell you how much this tax freeze is costing them and they'll see how many events that's killing, or ask someone who is told that their street or back lane is unlikely to be repaired in their lifetime due to the pathetic residential streets budget. It made sense for the first five or six years to hold the line on taxes to even…to even inflation, to get us out of the position of the highest taxed City, but we're out of that position. We're in an enviable position, and nobody…and we just…I guess we don't have the courage to tell people, you know, we're going to have an inflationary increase. Other cities have 6% increases like Edmonton and Calgary, and even an inflationary one we can't do, and the Province is unlikely to ignore that fact and the fact that we want to cut…some want to cut business tax.

Another point I'd like to make about this whole debate is that if we're going to expect new infrastructure dollars from other levels of government, we ought to be making better choices about the kind of infrastructure we're spend that money on. We should be fixing existing infrastructure and the South Osborne underpass was a good point. We don't have money for projects in the…that are currently used by traffic right in the heart of our City. We're too busy building new roadways and expanding so people can get out to the new big box paradise that we're building. We should be choosing to be spending on further development of rapid transit and active transportation like almost every other major City is doing if you talk to them. They have made that choice. They made a choice. You can't do it all and that's what this Council doesn't understand. We can't build brand new expressways and widen the roads and build big box, massive new developments on the edge of the City like this and still have money left to build things right the first time and to build a rapid transit network throughout the City that's done properly.

I do appreciate the effort put forward by Councillor Wyatt, and…but I think that this Council should be putting together a plan for a new deal, even beyond this in terms of how are we going to get that message that we need more revenue. But if we're going to do that, we have to also take responsibility to commit to a financially sustainable approach and that means…I'll be very clear by what I mean by financially sustainable approach…not ducking from the necessary inflationary increases to taxes, abandoning the irresponsible plan to completely eliminate all business tax and by making sustainable and proper choices about infrastructure priorities. That's what we need to do in this City. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Swandel: Pardon me?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy. Go ahead.

Councillor Swandel: This is an interesting motion. I, you know, the intent is quite clear. It's obvious we've been spending a number of years talking with the Province about how to work with them

and also with the Federal Government to address our concerns on infrastructure. You know the unfortunate part is that we all sitting around this Chamber probably know that this amounts to no more than a shot in the dark. Not only a shot in the dark, but a shot in the dark with a silencer. We've been down this road a number of times. I personally don't believe in negotiating in the media. I learned that lesson when I stood at the Legislature during our budget processes, you know, trying to get the media drawn in to ensuring that we had a better deal, so I don't really think this will get us anywhere.

I also think at some point in time we probably negotiated ourselves into this position and I've been trying to find out why it is that we ended up in this situation and all other municipalities have it differently, and there's some rumblings there that it happened with the issues between Headingley and the City of Winnipeg. There's other people suggested it happened with the creation of Unicity, and you look at why it happened at the time and some would suggest it was because we wanted to control looking after our streets because we believed we could do a better job than the Province was doing, and I think if you drive down Main Street in Portage la Prairie, you will recognize that the Province isn't doing a very good job with infrastructure either. So, perhaps what we need to be looking at is a better way of doing this and how do we control it in our own hands?

You know, in 2002 the City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to develop this report. It's just a draft, never came out in public, there was never anything done with it, but it was a work management assessment. How do we get people doing what they need to be doing to ensure that our infrastructure is being looked after properly? Talks about life cycle management, it talks about, kind of what we do with our Fleet Management Agency now, getting the best value for money by doing maintenance and other capital projects. Hundreds of thousands of dollars, some great recommendations in here, very few implemented. It's now 7 years later, there's a couple of pieces straggling along. There's Capital Budgets have been created for a couple of pieces that haven't been completed yet to this time, specifically on asset management and cataloguing it and knowing what its condition is and being able to use modern technology to ensure that we're getting to those pieces and that we're getting value for money when we're doing maintenance, and we're life cycle managing.

And today, we sit here today in a world where construction inflation is far out-pacing the cost of borrowing, but yet at our City Council, we have a no new borrowing policy. You know, I just asked the other day for what our borrowing rates were on 5, 10 type year…5, 10 and 30 year increments. Well a 5-year terms we're at 3.79%; on 10-year terms we're at 5%; on 30-year terms we're at 5.75%. Inflation, going back to 2006, construction inflation, was 10%; 2007 12%; 2008, 12%; we're looking at 2009 again at 12% and we're forecasting in 10, 11, 12 and 13, 6, 6, 8 and 6%. And make no bones about it, as we start to catch up on our infrastructure deficit we are going to create our own inflation, so you can do it now or you can continue to let inflation grow the price of that, and absorb all the inflation that we have right now, and pay that additional cost at the end. But by doing it now, I would respectfully suggest, that if you were to go out and take our cash-to-capital money and our gas tax money, you could be borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars today at far less than the cost of inflation and actually having an impact and us having control over our own destiny, because the other thing that greatly inhibits our ability to do anything for infrastructure in a rational, well thought out strategy with proper priorities is not a P3 that we often argue about around here, but what I call a P2, and that's the political parochialization of dollars by the other two levels of governments. Dollars for infrastructure in this City do not land where they need to land, Mr. Speaker. They land where political parties need them to land. The P2 is killing us here in the City of Winnipeg more so than anywhere else in this country. You know, we don't have to look any further than what's been happening with the infrastructure announcements all around

us, and I hope to see some positive infrastructure announcements out of the Federal Government packages that have been out there that actually hit our roads and our bridges because those are the priorities of the citizens of the City of Winnipeg. Yes, community centres are also a priority but I would suggest that roads, bridges, safe and efficient movement of people and goods is just as important or a higher priority than what so far has been announced within the City of Winnipeg.

For the most part those are my comments, Mr. Speaker. You know, the numbers are there. You know I've done a little bit of work on sort of looking at the borrowing verses inflation argument, and you know, we're…you look at what we can do with just the capital dollars that we have and the tax dollars. You walk that out into 2013, the years 2013 through 17 where all of our old debt drops off and we're filling up another, I believe, about $89 million a year of operating room budget that is being used right now to pay debt, old debt when we couldn't get 30-year terms, and when we were all scared there was this big issue of risk where, you know, we got 5 years or 10 years, it's going to come up for renewal and the interest rates are going to go through the roof. Today we can lock in an interest rate for 30 years of 5.75% Mr. Speaker, and inflation exceeding that. Not only that Mr. Speaker, when you look at if you go do that borrowing, you'll probably ramp up over two years when you're bringing that kind of workload forward, so you might not actually have to spend all the money of your 40 or $45 million that you have outside of P3 payments right now in the capital side, but you would actually have some money that you wouldn't have to spend in the first couple of years and it would probably be enough money to get us over the little hump that we have to deal with right now with the pension issues that we're battling as a result of what's happened in the last couple of years in the equities market. So, you know, there is I believe some sense to what I'm saying. I won't be supporting the motion. I think it amounts to no more than a shot in the dark. Although I agree with it in principle that something needs to be done, but I think the real way is to take some action on our own, to get out there, take control of it because once we take control of this and we start doing all the infrastructure work that's required in the City of Winnipeg, I think our two political parochialization friends will be banging on our door to bring extra monies into the City so they're name can be attached to focusing on the priorities and a well-informed strategy for infrastructure in the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. I ran the first time in 1971, the formation of Unicity when I was elected first in 1974. I sat in this Council Chamber with many of the Councillors who decided to change their way of running for public office and seeked to get elected for the Manitoba Legislative Assembly. One was Gary Filmon back in 1974, or '75, when he was elected here as, on the by-election, talked in these Chambers, "we have to get after the Schreyer Administration. We need more money for the City of Winnipeg. We can't afford to keep going the way we are", and that was it. He rambled on and on. All of us felt the same way, but each time we did something it went to the Legislative Buildings, went to the Premier, went to the MLAs, and it was put into "File 13". They have a box there that's full, "File 13" "File 13", requests from the Province of Manitoba. Even so, 31 of the MLAs in the Provincial Legislative Assembly are representing the citizens of Winnipeg which is the majority of the house, in the Chambers, and I've always said let's get after their heinies. They represent the people the same as we do and the City of Winnipeg. I tried it over and over again in my neck of the woods, which to no avail because not one of the MLAs will take the bait. Even presently the MLAs are not doing anything pertaining to our responsibility. I've got in my ward right now the crime rate is so high, the MLAs are not talked to. Welfare…the Welfare Department is with the Province now. Their MLAs are not being phoned, and I keep telling people, phone them. We can't get a hold of them. So you have 31

MLAs, the majority of the Legislative Assembly, do have a say. They can make the changes but where are they now? Presently, they are not sitting in the Chambers. A lot of them are farmers now. They're doing farm work. Seeding. They wouldn't get back there until sometime in the fall. We sit here 11 months out of the year and they legislated this to us. The City of Winnipeg Act now is the Charter of the City of Winnipeg which is legislation that we have to abide by what they tell us to do. This is what we must do. The Provincial revenue in the Province of Manitoba is roughly over 8 billion dollars. We have two-thirds of the population of Manitoba and what do we get in return? Not even 2% I understand. So where is the fairness? We have the Legislative Assembly introduce the School Act which School Trustees run on the same principle as we do, the very same time, use our ballot boxes, they get elected. They impose taxes on us to collect on their behalf and we get ripped on that and, like one former late trustee told me, "Harry bark all you want. I sit back and I watch the (inaudible) take the flak because that's your bloody job and now shut up." And that was it. We have motions, like I said, have gone into "File 13". Give an example, the Provincial Government, they collect the taxes on every vehicle, for every tire on that's on that vehicle, for every ounce of gasoline, for everything pertains to the operation of that vehicle, they get their share of taxes along with the Feds. The driver of a vehicle which happens to be a delivery or a transfer truck, they collect taxes such as the payroll tax, we get nothing. We have to keep repairing our streets such as McPhillips, Main Street, bumpy because the big trucks roll through there and then they make a mess out of the street. We pay for it. They're not concerned. We have, or will today, be dealing with an issue dealing with tipping fees at our landfill site. To me it's a joke. I did not support this in the Public Works but it's coming to us now. The Provincial Government has legislated that through legislation. It comes effect on July 1st whether we like it or not. Those charges will have to be made. I stood my ground and I said no. The Provincial Government did that. That's their baby, but we're going to take the flak for it.

Infrastructure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is an issue for every municipality, every municipality in Manitoba. Percentage wise, if you take a look at the charts, Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Selkirk, Beausejour, Churchill, Thompson, what they get per capita, we're way behind. And Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Smith on your motions, I will be supporting this. I just hope that it misses that box called "File 13" and lands on the desk of the Mayor, I mean of the Premier. It will land on the desk of the Mayor too after the Premier gets through with it. It's to have that dealt with now, it has to be dealt with now because talk about fairness. Councillor O'Shaughnessy and myself are the only ones left here yet from the 50 member Council. We didn't have that kind of a problem because we did have a Mayor who was very vocal. The late Steve Juba. If he didn't get his way, he used to climb up a utility pole to give a message to the Province and he'd be painting the pole and getting all the publicity he wanted out of that. The late Russ Doern, Minister of Public Works. We were here in Council when Steve Juba went to see him about the problem we had, streets, buildings, the Province has buildings galore. They don't pay no taxes, they give us grants in lieu of taxes. It's the game they play with us and that grants is not equivalent because we cannot assess those buildings because we can't because that's the Unicity…I should say the Charter right now. So that time when former Mayor, late Steve Juba, went to the Legislative Buildings to meet the Minister of Public Works, late Russ Doern, he…Doern said, "I do not have no time to meet and talk to the Mayor of Winnipeg." Fine. Steve came back here, got hold of construction company, ordered a biffy and put the biffy right on Broadway where the Minister was planning to build an outside toilet which is not in service anymore. Steve went and put a plaque or a sign "the Official Office of the Minister of Public Works." Believe me that got attention right across Canada. At that time, Premier Schreyer instructed Russ Doern to get off his fanny and come to the City Hall to meet with the Mayor,

then late Steve Juba. Steve Juba, in return, said "I do not have time for the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Doern. Tell him to come another time." This feud kept going back and forth, back and forth, but you see, the Mayor at that time was able to get attention to the people that he was representing, which was the whole City of Winnipeg. And attention was given in such a point that the Premier of Manitoba, Mr. Schreyer, had no alternative but to meet with the Mayor and members of Council to try and get a dialogue going is what is needed, what are your priorities. Well right now, our priorities are what is on here. I doubt if they'll take this…Russ I doubt if they'll take this all that for $1 but, you know, that's a good try. But the one thing all of us have to be on the same wave length is to send a message. Forget about the political stripes. This is an issue we're talking about close to 700,000 people living in Winnipeg, two-thirds of the population of the Province, and you've got 31 MLAs, which is the majority of the House in the Legislative Assembly, that they can start doing something. Forget about sitting in their back bencher that you never hear them. They just do yes, yes, do I stand up, yes, uhm, do you want me to vote? Yes, you'd better vote. Jump, how high do I jump? We used to have some members of Council in here like that. You know, these…the Mayor would say I want you to vote that way, and they'd say jump. Why. Because the Mayor told me to jump. And some…and Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that Council members…let's be on the same wave length on this one. Let us all vote united. Team work. That's what I had mentioned about the late Tom Yauk, the Commissioner, who believed in team work and he was successful in keeping his department, to keep his team work. Let's all work together on this and to put the pressure on the Provincial Government and the Provincial MLAs to make sure that they consider the majority of them, like I said, those that are making a lot of noise, let them talk and make some noise about Winnipeg. Thank you.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I first saw this motion a month ago, I really didn't think a whole bunch about it. Didn't think it was going to do a lot of good and maybe it won't. It certainly won't if the media doesn't write about it; all of the media, and not very many of them here today, a couple. It's helpful when that happens. It's also, I guess, unfortunate the House isn't sitting right now. I don't know what MLAs do in the summer time. I don't think they're seeding like Harry said. I think they've already done that, the ones that have farms, but I often wonder…I don't really get why citizens of Winnipeg vote for the current government, and by the way, before I say anything too negative about them, I'd like to point out that when the former government was in the Legislature, that I was probably as big a thorn in Mr. Filmon's side as anybody that sat in this Chamber. I think some of them, some people that were here then were here at the time. No, I wasn't against voting Jenny, but I was…I don't think that the former government treated this City very well and I don't think that this government's treating this City very well. They've both been really consistent. Neither one of them did a bloody thing, and they still aren't. We've got a Federal situation right now where we probably should have had an election and maybe we might have got a majority government so something could happen in this country, and so what have we got? We've got a group of people running around, they're going to spend a whole bunch of money and that's going to get the economy going. Bologna. But anyway, there's a whole bunch of money coming to Manitoba, I heard. So where is it? Well, by the time that the First Minister in this Province got finished talking to the First Federal Minister, there isn't any money. It's all spent except for the part they're holding back for in case there's an election called, then they'll be spending that money all over the place.

Where did it go? Went into the floodway. We just went through a bad situation this spring. Anybody notice any difference since 1997? Not an ounce of difference. Over $600 million has been spent on that floodway and didn't change a damn thing as far as I'm concerned. And, I don't have to go any further than a report that I

know is being prepared on infrastructure, because it will tell you in that report that for it to be a 7…one in 700-year floodway, that the City of Winnipeg actually has to spend $138 million. Well some of us have been saying that for five years, six years. But they continue to say, oh it's a one in 700 floodway. Bologna. It's not a one in 700 floodway unless we spend $138 million to make it a one in 700 floodway and nobody asked us to even have a meeting about that issue when it was announced. The Provincial Government has held a gun to the head of the Federal Ministers for the last two years over that floodway and so finally some money is available. Where does it go? It goes into the floodway. What's that going to do for us based on what happened this spring? Not much.

The next thing, Centreport. Is that a good thing? Sure it is. Is the road out to the Perimeter going to be a good thing? Sure it's going to be. But is that where we needed to have the money spent right now? No. We've got roads in this City that need to be fixed and so far I haven't seen five cents in announcements dealing with the stimulus package, so I don't think anybody on Broadway is looking after our interests when they're talking to the Federal Government right now.

I don't feel guilty about talking about the Premier and some of the things that he does because I did it when other people were in power as well. You know, I heard a question one time when the Premier was on CJOB, dealing with our sanitary sewer issues and the billions of dollars that we have to spend on that, and I heard the question that was asked, and I heard what the answer was, and I'm sure 'OB's got the tapes. Now, I can tell you that if the Premier, if what he answered to the question, if he honestly believes that that was the right answer, then he has got Ministers that are completely out of control. He hasn't got a clue what they're doing, because the Clean Environment Commission didn't order us to do anything. They wrote a report and handed it to the Provincial Government. And that report said that it should be shared by three groups--the Province, the Feds and the City, and so far, we're the only ones coming to bat. They gave us some money a couple of Christmases ago after I had a little rant and everybody in the media covered it for two days and all of a sudden some money flowed. But the long and the short of it is, is that they directed that the licenses be changed and if the Premier doesn't know that then he should talk to Steve Ashton because his office directed that the licenses be changed so that we had to do this work and we had do it right now and they weren't asking us, they were telling us and I'm not sure what part of that the Premier doesn't get because his answer on 'OB was, "well the Clean Environment Commission told them to do all those things." That wasn't accurate. So if he believes it, then he's got some problems; bigger ones than we might know.

People talked about Headingley awhile ago. It's thriving. Headingley seceded. So what have they got? They had granular roadways. What have they got now? Paved roadways. Did they pay five cents for them? No. They didn't. Money came from the Province. They've got water. They didn't have it before. Who paid for it? Province of Manitoba. They've got sewer. Who paid for it? They paid for their hookups. They didn't pay for the infrastructure to put it in. They're right next to us. They were part of us. They seceded because we couldn't do that for them because it was all…it all had to be local improvements. They secede, the Province pays. Hell of a deal. I've got some people that frankly, in south Charleswood, south Tuxedo…they should be seceding. What the hell are they doing in here? They can't get Handi-Transit. Can't get bus service. Got a gravel road. They've got, you know…they don't get a heck of a lot for what they do. They pay a lot of taxes because they still build big shacks out there. I don't know why they aren't seceding. Doesn't make any sense to stay in Winnipeg because we have rules, and we have to be fair-minded with everybody. You become a municipality, no problem. Let the Province pay and they do. I don't get it, and we're sitting here with 68% of the population of this Province and they are spending nothing here as far as I'm concerned. I mean,

sure, we get money from the Province. We all understand that. They've given us a lot of money in different ways over the years, but we aren't getting infrastructure and they've had huge amounts of money coming from Federal transfer payments. They were left a huge amount of money from the legacy of the former Government to disperse as they see fit, and we're not getting our share and we all know that. I mean, let's be honest. I mean 8% of taxation comes back to the City. The other 92% stays with the Feds and the Province to do with what they want.

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

Councillor Clement: You could talk about a lot of different things. We kept getting told, get your house in order. So we did. That's what the issue was about zero taxes, trying to get control of inflation and how things were working, and maybe we have to move off that path as some people are suggesting, but it was the right path at the time, I can assure you, because we were getting ourselves to the point where we couldn't afford to manage our revenues at the time, and you get into something like rapid transit and we agreed to go into it and the Province says "oh we're in," and then guess what? You read the letter "and well, we're in but you borrow the money for us and we'll pay you over 30 years because our credit rating is frankly no good and we don't want to borrow the money and put it on our credit rating but you guys are doing really good, so you borrow the money for us and we'll pay it over the next 30 years, and we're in." What a bunch of bologna that was. And Christ, I voted for it. I can't believe it, because I wanted to see the damn thing go forward because I thought it was time. It's not going to do a damn thing for my ward. Nothing will that rapid transit route do for anybody in my ward in the short-term, but I think it's the right thing to do as a City, and we sit here as City Councillors, not parochial City Councillors I hope most of the time. And the fact of the matter is, we aren't getting a fair shake on Broadway. It's that simple. And it's time that the citizens of Winnipeg understand that. Everybody is sitting in this Chamber because they're leaders in their localized communities. Everybody here got elected by pretty good majorities for the most part because people in our areas believe in us to do the right thing here, and I think for the most part that we do. We don't always make the right decisions and sometimes we argue with each other over some minor things, but you know what? In the end, we're here because we're leaders in our community, and the bottom line is that we're not getting the leadership over there that we need and we haven't been sharing that. So if anything can come out of this, at least we should be able to come out of it in that regard and in that spirit. We won't always agree on things with each other, but I will defend the right for anybody to stand up here and say what they think is right, and if we don't agree with everybody then we don't agree with everybody. But in the end, we're not getting our share and we have to get that message out and we could do it in a lot of different ways, but I don't think we have been doing that and I think we have to. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. The last final speaker is Councillor Browaty that I have on my list. Do you want to Mr. Mayor? Okay. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of Councillor Wyatt's motion. What it effectively calls for is something very simple. Fairness. When you look at all the municipalities across Manitoba, when you have a regional roadway going through a municipality, it's paid for by the Province of Manitoba. We should expect absolutely nothing less here in the City of Winnipeg. We represent two-thirds of the people in Manitoba. We represent a majority of the seats in the Manitoba Legislature. It's only good and fair.

People in Manitoba, they pay taxes. They pay Federal taxes, Provincial taxes and Municipal taxes. One of the taxes we pay here in the City of Winnipeg is the gas tax. It's 11.5 cents per litre approximately. It is one of the lowest in Canada. That's a good thing. However, that tax in 2008 was estimated to bring in approximately $130 million for the

Province of Manitoba. $87 million in gas taxes, $43 million in diesel, $130 million. Every time you go to the pump you pay for it. Yesterday I went and filled up. I had $61 in gas, 60.2 litres. I paid $6.92 in my fill up in gas taxes. In 2008, it's estimated the City got back $76.8 million for Operating and Capital going towards roads and transit. 59%. So of that $6.92 I paid at the pump yesterday, the City gets back $4.08. $2.84 goes up to wherever in Manitoba. We don't get it back. We're not getting our fair share. Plain and simply, this is calling for fairness. This is calling for a better deal. I will be supporting Councillor Wyatt's motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It certainly has been enlightening to hear many of the speakers prior to myself express some of their, I guess, deep felt thoughts on these issues which obviously, Mr. Speaker, are old issues and haven't changed for a long time. And to be very frank with you, Mr. Speaker, if I thought we could get a fair deal for the City, I'd climb a pole this afternoon if that would make it happen Mr. Speaker. The realities are, we have continued to try to work out something that is fair and reasonable for everyone, and just to share with Councillor Gerbasi is that every time during budget period we come up with all sorts of ideas including sharing and some of the taxes that you talked about on motor vehicles, but unfortunately we've been turned down on each and every one of them even though some of them we have gotten a positive response to.

You know, Councillor Clement used the term that "get your house in order." That was something that we were told a long time ago and I very much believe our house is in order. I remember it wasn't that long ago where the Province used to complain that employees, Provincial employees would leave to come to work for the City of Winnipeg because we were the employer of choice. I think we all know that's not correct and I can name several City employees who have left the City to go work for the Province. That's the reality today. But the real issue is, and when Councillor Wyatt first came up with this motion and we talked about it the other day, I told him I was going to support it. The reason I'm supporting it is I want to know the facts. I want to know the truth. I don't know why this came to be and I think it was Councillor Swandel that said it might have come, you know, in 1972. No one seems to know for sure how this came into being. But it's here and it's reality. It's what we deal with. And if we are being treated differently than the municipalities, then I think it's time someone takes a long hard look at it. So just to bring the dialogue forward to assess the situation I think is important. But more so, what's important to me is that just recently, I guess it was yesterday or the day before yesterday, I got a phone call from the media asking what I thought about this. And I said you know what? There is some information I'd like to find out. I'd like to know what the facts are. I think this is worth exploring. And then they shared with me the response when they called Broadway and it was obviously a representative who made the response that…I believe it was approximately 83 or 86% of the money that the City spends on roads comes from the Province. And my first response was "where is this manual that's given to people when someone asks a certain question, here is your response"? It's like it's written "here is what you say". I think it's time that people understand that what you might have said ten years ago doesn't apply. First of all, it's inaccurate, Mr. Speaker, and that's what kind of offended me. I mean I have from our people here, some facts and the facts are when you take in regional roads and bridges, the City is 21%, the Province is 51%, the Federal Government is 28% and the developers are 1%. If you then add in local roads and back lanes and sidewalks, and active transportation, Mr. Speaker, the City is 23%, the Province 37%, and the Federal Government 40%. Mr. Speaker, you won't find another City, another Province that has a situation like we do. We have a major City where one City comprises over two-thirds of the population, and as you so eloquently put, the majority of people getting elected on Broadway are coming from the City of Winnipeg. It's no secret. They tried for

what they called "The New Deal" many years ago. It went nowhere. It's no secret, we have serious infrastructure deficits. That's why I asked Councillor Wyatt to basically chair and look into that and he is making some serious headway and obviously he's getting very knowledgeable and finding out many of the inequities that exist.

You know, we need to come to the table and be part of the solution for our infrastructure deficit, but we can't do it alone. The gas tax has had a major positive impact, and I believe if all the citizens just…you know, you can drive on the roads, you can walk on the sidewalks. It doesn't make a difference. You see the problems we face, and although Councillor Swandel believes this may not have any impact, I think it would be extremely gratifying to see a Council united, sending a message, and that's what this is. And this is not coming as any surprise to Broadway. They know we need a better deal. They know we need more funding to deal with the infrastructure deficit and they know that they're part of the solution. So you know what? It doesn't make a difference if this has a major impact or not. What really makes a difference to me and every citizen, is that every Councillor who has been elected by the people that they are representing today, are sending a clear message, and I very much hope that this will be totally unanimous, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Wyatt, do you want to close on your motion?

Councillor Wyatt: I'll be very, very brief. It's hard to follow on those words. Thank you, Your Worship.

I would say that the crisis is here, the crisis is now. Our regional road maintenance budget alone, Mr. Speaker, in 2003 was as a high of 23 million…or 2007 was a high of 23 million. This year it's down now to 16 million. Next year's projected to be $6.2 million, and that's because, Mr. Speaker, we have a Capital Budget with competing interests across the City in all parts of the City departments of our City and we have construction inflation which is three times the rate of regular inflation, Mr. Speaker, on average. Mr. Speaker, we should be spending 115 million on our regional roads and bridges every year, 6 million next year, that's $109 million shortfall. If the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, were a car, I can tell you right now that the trade-in date is long past us because the car is in terrible condition right now, and Mr. Speaker that's a shame to say that because this is a great City with great people and a great history and a tremendous future ahead. The citizens of Winnipeg deserve better and that's why we should all vote to support this motion. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Councillors decided…made the decision Motion No. 1 on the amendment that is before us dealing with the Notice of Motion so that Notice of Motion will be combined as amended.

Councillors, recorded vote has been called for. All in favour of the motion. 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, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt. Mr. Speaker, Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillor Swandel.

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

Mr. Speaker: It's carried. The…on Motions, EPC motions, there is a motion number 2 by Councillor Swandel and I'll move it. It will be automatic referral. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: This is a fairly timely matter, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to

move that we suspend the rules to deal with the matter here today.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Councillors you've heard that. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Swandel on your Motion No. 2.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I'll start just by reading the motion

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Swandel,
Seconded by Councillor Vandal,

WHEREAS we as Canadians hold democracy, human rights and the rule of law to be of paramount importance;

AND WHEREAS significant irregularities and fraud have been demonstrated to have occurred in Iran's June 12 presidential election resulting in widespread public opposition and demonstrations disputing those electoral results;

AND WHEREAS the Iranian Government has initiated a brutal crackdown of demonstrators leading to the country's worst violence in 30 years;

THEREFORE BE IT RESLOVED THAT the City of Winnipeg Council officially expresses its support to the people of Iran in their pursuit of democracy, human rights and the rule of law in the face of significant opposition;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg Council officially express its opposition to ongoing violence carried out by pro-government forces against demonstrators.

Mr. Speaker, the motion is pretty straightforward. I think you need look no further than the headlines that appear in our newspapers and on broadcast news. We see that the Iranian government's condemning the west for interfering in this matter. I think maybe it's time Canada was a little higher on that list. They've constantly mentioned Britain and the United States. We often talked about the Federal Government's, or the Provincial Government's downloading responsibilities to the City. I think this is something that we can upload to them, saying that perhaps this is of far greater importance than we've given it the matter to date. I'll say that with the caveat that we know that in the world of diplomacy, you're often restricted by what you can say and I think that by doing this today, that as a municipal government we might start a little bit of a noise across the country from other municipalities, and while Iran can currently shut down access to international reporters to their country or expel journalists from within their country, it's very difficult for them to stop the news and the noise coming from outside the country into the general population.

I know there was some talk about this motion being out of order when I first brought it forward and I think when you put it in the perspective of this being about democracy and the fact that we have strong economic relations and some trade that happens between Iran and Canada, and you know, we're constantly doing things around the world to better Canada. We're also, Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg, is one of the landing spots where many immigrants flee the tyranny of situations like what is going on in Iran today, and we embrace them and I think we can send a clear message starting here in Winnipeg that Canada and Canada's municipalities believe in democracy and the rule of law and certainly in peace for all of its citizens. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The question has been called. All in favour? Contrary? It's passed.

No by-laws? Question period. Councillor Gerbasi. Your first question.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Now we're back to normal. It's for you, Mr. Mayor.

In regards to the proposed water utility, I strongly believe that Councillors and the public need to have a clear idea of the time lines for when the report will be tabled on this matter. We also need to know when the Council vote will be occurring. At this point we don't know if it will be July or September or later or if there will be adequate time for the public and non-EPC Councillors to digest, study and analyze the report which is hugely significant to the future of our City. My question is will the Mayor confirm when he expects the report on the water utility model to be tabled at EPC and if a Council vote is expected this July?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Gerbasi for that. As I believe, I'm hoping Councillor Gerbasi is aware, as hopefully the rest of Council is, we have scheduled a Council seminar, if my memory serves me well Mr. Speaker, I believe it's this Monday. That's number one. Number two, just recently, there was opportunity for the public to come forward and explore exactly what the idea is to move forward. I believe approximately 200 citizens attended which is considered to be a very good approach. I can tell Councillor Gerbasi that the idea if anything moves forward at the right pace, which you never know, was certainly looking at July and I can assure her that we'll do everything humanly possible to make sure that as much information as Councillor Gerbasi or any Councillor requires, will be distributed to them as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question, Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: The public consultation process we're undergoing currently for the OurWinnipeg process has been really impressive, but the approach taken on the water utility I've been hearing from people that they feel it's more of a sales pitch than about a particular model than a true consultative process. Will there be other public consultation processes other than just the traditional report to EPC and then to Council a week later in July?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I've ever seen an issue where everybody is satisfied. I have heard some positive comments. I've also heard some negative comments. I've also heard people making negative comments that had totally erroneous or inaccurate information. That's number one. Number two, Mr. Speaker, is that I would like to think that everybody here realizes that there probably is not a more open, transparent, democratic process than here at City Hall compared to any other level of government. People have the opportunity to not only go to these public forums but also to come to committee, to come to Council. They can make their presentation any time. If they don't get there on time, as Councillor Gerbasi knows, we almost always suspend the rules and are happy to hear from the public, and I don't see that changing in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question.

Councillor Gerbasi: I understand there has been surveys taken and focus groups conducted and information going into the web site to gauge the public response to the proposed model, and I'm wondering if it was possible for this data in its entirety, not edited, to be made available considering it's been funded by the public, by Winnipeg residents, to make this data available to the public in its entirety?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen any of that type of information but I would be happy to look into that for Councillor Gerbasi.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Mayor, is your administration going to complete the cladding of the Public Safety Building as the amount already spent on it exceeded $4 million since 2006, and you promised an answer by the end of 2008. Where are we? Are we negotiating for the old Post

Office site, or are we going to finish the cladding and keep this building going?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little surprised by that question. We've already dealt with that issue. We actually have entered into an agreement with Canada Post for that facility, subject to the City of Winnipeg having, I believe it might be 60 days or 90 days to do its due diligence, and then of course coming to Council, so that is in process Mr. Speaker, and if Councillor Smith wasn't aware of that, I apologize but you should have been.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith, your second question.

Councillor Smith: I just want you to be aware that $4 million has gone out the window.

My second question Mr. Mayor, I attended the displays outlining the proposed water and waste new management model, and I'm asking you when you are going to have an open forum and consultation regarding the model. You know, all it was, was displays.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: First of all, Mr. Speaker, to the…I'll address that with the other one. When Councillor Smith referred to the $4 million, as Mayor, I agree the $4 million has been spent. I think it's my duty to make sure that another 30 or $40 million is not flushed down the toilet. That's exactly what we're doing.

As far as the second question, Mr. Speaker, I would very much appreciate Councillor Smith maybe sharing what he would like to see in a public forum or an open house. It's my understanding we've had that, and the public has attended. I've attended them in the past. Maybe specifically he can give me some details of what it is he would like to see there that hasn't taken place. And then maybe we can make those adjustments.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith, your final question.

Councillor Smith: In a pamphlet called "Flushing out the Facts" contains the following statement: "A new strategic work…a new strategic partnership is being considered for the sewage plant upgrades which will allow us to tap into world class knowledge to improve our ability to operate and maintain our system." Who are the new strategic partners that we're approaching?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there are any today. The whole motion that Council approved was to move forward and seek out strategic partners and that is something that they are doing right now. I don't know of any announcement that's been made or any…if anyone has been selected to date. I would be happy to get back to Councillor Smith and let him know, but to my knowledge that has not taken place as yet.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. Just a quick question to follow up on the water utility. I did send an e-mail recently to Brian and a few other people in our City Hall bureaucracy about what I heard when I was there, because I did go and there was some really good information. It was actually a packed house. It was quite impressive, and many people were, you know, felt some of their answers…some of their questions were answered through the Administration staff there and they are quite appreciative of that. However, what I did hear, and just in my background and change management, this is a significant change for people that's really striking at their heart and the heart for all of us, which is called water. It is a commodity that we all need, and so there is fear and concern that people have when these issues come up. So what they wanted and what I related in my e-mail was that…and I would be more than happy to help out the administration and be part of that…is an opportunity for them to have a chance to ask a question to an elected official who has, you know, good information and is

able to relate that information back and forth. They want to be able to talk to somebody in political power and maybe with the senior Administration just to get some of these questions answered. So that's my question…my question is, would that be something that we could see before July?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, on a regular basis I get e-mails asking questions on every topic imaginable. And if I were to get questions on this one I would be happy to try and answer them as well if I have the answers. Obviously, I don't believe that the expertise is sitting at this table, and it's my understanding that the expertise was there to answer the questions. What I have seen in this particular situation is many people trying to give the impression that the City was selling the utility when we all know, one, that's not the case, and, two, we wouldn't be able to do that anyway. That's been the prime concern that I've heard from people, and when they have contacted me, I've told them that, and their comment was " Well that's not the impression that I got when I read or watched" etc. So there have been many others giving the wrong impression, but those are the facts. What I can tell the good Councillor that I would answer any question if someone has it, and if there's an opportunity, it would be my pleasure, but that does happen on a regular basis where concerned citizens will send an e-mail or call the Mayor and I respond Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor. Councillor Swandel your first question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just some clarification. We tend to always end up in this conversation. We talk about a water utility and we throw the term "strategic partner" in there with "water utility". Perhaps the Mayor could clarify for all of us, is our water treatment plant already constructed and being operated by the City of Winnipeg, and if we go forward with the creation of a utility that's 100 percent owned by the City of Winnipeg, would that water treatment plant still be 100 percent owned by the City of Winnipeg and operated by the current staff that are operating it now, and in fact, are we not talking here about the sewage treatment plants that we need to do that we are seeking a strategic partner for?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the proposed utility, all its assets, whether that might be pipes, aqueducts, etc., will remain 100 percent under City ownership and control. 100 percent under City ownership and control. I hope I made it clear.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to shift gears here and then look at something that may actually have some merit for this Council to discuss. That is, currently there's a debate going on with Manitoba Hydro Public Utility Board about rate fixing for people of low income, to put a low income rate in place and the debate is whether or not that should be in the realm of Hydro and the Public Utility Board or whether it should be government policy as to how you deal with low income issues, and I think it's probably going to fall into our debate. I'm just wondering if you can clarify whether or not we will be stuck with the Public Utilities Board through this process or whether or not Council can still set the rates after this. This is still an open door to know whether or not the City can still set the rates and control the rates for the citizens of the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, the original plan was to have the Public Utility Board set the rates. Obviously there is merit in that and I think we've had, we've seen the situation that's taken place with Manitoba Hydro. In addition to that, it also protects, I guess protects us from future Councils trying to raid the water utility which you know has taken place in the past. So I can tell Councillor Swandel that at this particular point in time, the whole idea

was to have the Public Utility Board set the rates. That was one of the goals.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: If the Public Utility Board is using its position to create social policy, would you still support the utility being…the rates being set by the Public Utility Board?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, being very frank, I wasn't aware of the situation that Councillor Swandel just pointed out. I'm actually a little surprised that the Public Utility Board would be getting involved in that aspect of it. If indeed that is accurate, that is something that I would certainly look into prior to supporting something like that and making sure what takes place in the future is the right thing. We're looking at setting rates that are fair and reasonable, not getting involved in other, shall we say, services that maybe should be provided by the other levels of government.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt your first question.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Through you to the Mayor, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday May the 28th, a day after our last Council meeting, the Provincial Government, the Premier along with Minister Vic Toews announced $12 million of funding for a sportsplex just on the edge of the City, the western edge of the City, and to build a four indoor ice rinks sportsplex that would be private, not for profit, call it what you like, basically not the City of Winnipeg, but another entity running the sportsplex. Did the Provincial Government or the Federal Government at any point formally consult the City with regards…formally consult the City with regards to this decision of theirs?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I believe Councillor Wyatt is referring to the moose-plex basically at the Perimeter, and I can tell you that neither any department in the City of Winnipeg nor yours truly, nor the Department of Community Services had any knowledge whatsoever. I believe approximately two hours before the announcement was made, it was shared with a staff member who then shared it with me. So the answer is no.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Mayor. On May the 27th, this Council passed Vision 2025, the G.C.W.C.C. report for the future where ten community clubs were listed as top projects. Out of those ten, three included indoor ice rinks being built. Do we now know what the potential impact is on their ability now to raise revenue knowing that there is only so much tournament business out there, thanks to the fact that this private sportsplex has now been announced?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, Councillor Wyatt raises a very good point. I think everybody was taken by surprise, that's number one. Number two, knowing that we now have a policy in place and we now work through the G.C.W.C.C. and as you mentioned on May the 27th we're moving forward, and as you know the City is trying to figure out ways to deal with our existing arenas and to make sure that we can service the public and maybe some of the older ones, you know, close them down. You can't close something down without having something in the area. I can't answer that question. I know that it's not something that the G.C.W.C.C. or the Department of Protection and Community Services or Council was looking to do. This came as a surprise to everyone and it's now a reality and I can only assume we'll just have to figure out how to deal with it. What negative impact it may have, I can't answer Councillor Wyatt today because I just don't know.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Would…Thank you and I appreciate the fact that…would you be prepared to look into what that

potential impact will be with regards to not just the operation and the impact on future community club arenas proposed in the G.C.W.C.C. 2025 report but also the potential impact on our existing City-owned arenas across the City.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor, through the Speaker to the Mayor, we've heard a lot about infrastructure spending this morning. One of the troubles that the City of Winnipeg has in responding to the time lines put out by the stimulus funding that was announced by the Federal Government is that the deadline for completion being March 31, 2011, basically limits us to one very short building season. We are greatly affected by climate. When it comes to roads and bridges, we basically would have this year to do some sort of detailed design if it's something that's not already in our budget which I believe is the criteria. We would have to be done construction by November of next year because you're not going to be building in December, January and February and March to get to the March 31 deadline. Has there been any comment from the Federal Government taking…that they might take into consideration the climatic disparity that exists across this country and giving us an opportunity to put projects forward with perhaps the end of construction 2011?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think when these programs come out there is always deadlines. You know, that's just the nature of the beast and I guess there has to be. I'm very confident that when a project is commenced and if it's not completed by that date, there is very little doubt in my mind that they would extend that deadline, but I would be more than happy to get a more specific answer from Minister Toews, but we've seen that in the past, and I'm sure you'll see many projects that do not get completed by the deadline. If they have to extend it they will, but I certainly am happy to look into that with the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Today, it is unclear as to whether or not there is any dollars left to be spent from this stimulus fund. We haven't seen any dollars hit the roads and bridges. I know that probably there's only a couple of areas that we could put roads and bridges forward. Greensfield projects, as I would refer to them. Some don't like that term, but where there's…we're not re-habbing…those are putting new roads in like our inner beltway or, you know, in my end of the City, the extension of Kenaston through the Perimeter. I'm just wondering whether or not these projects are on the table. If there are active applications for stimulus funding in particular, that we will bring some of these projects forward into the tighter timeline and actually seize the moment where we're doing some infrastructure work today that we would normally do in the future. Are those specific projects in, or are we still in there as a global regional streets application?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Swandel. Number one, from people in the know, they have shared that the vast majority of the $4 billion stimulus has been already allocated for projects between the Provincial Governments and the Federal Government, and many of those would probably come into the category, as Councillor Swandel I think referred to as P2's if my memory serves me well. Okay? That's number one. Number two, I can most definitely share with Councillor Swandel and everybody else here that there are specific applications that have gone into the Federal Government for…whether it's the stimulus or the Building Canada or whatever other, you know, pots of funding might be out there. The answer is yes, we have put in specific projects.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I mentioned roads and bridges as a priority, as I truly believe that the efficient movement of people and goods is good for our environment and I think we need to address that concern, not just talking about active transportation or bus rapid transit. I believe those two are important. Could you let us know if there are applications in for active transportation and further stages of rapid transit in the City of Winnipeg as well?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: I can tell you that there is an application for active transportation. There is an application in for Stage 2 of rapid transit, and there are other applications in for roads and bridges as you would refer to as well.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions Councillors? Councillors it's twelve o'clock. We stand adjourned to 1:30 and we'll start with the Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Thank you. We stand adjourned to 1:30.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of June 24, 2009, at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works report of June 9 of 2009. Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED JUNE 9, 2009

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move Clauses 1 to 8 from June the 9th as consent.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Number 1 has been stood down and 2 to 8. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay. Item 1.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to raise this to give the…

Mr. Speaker: Hold it, hold it. The Clerk. Sorry.

Item 1 - Introduction of Provincial Environmental Levy and Resulting Increase of Tipping Fees at Brady Road Landfill eFile WT-3

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: There really isn't anything to introduce, Mr. Speaker. I'm not the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs for the Province who instituted this. It's just there as an item on our agenda as a result of them forcing us to raise these rates on July the 1st. So, if…I'm not sure.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I thought it would be important that we have a discussion here on exactly what this means because it comes across as the City of Winnipeg increasing tipping fees. The increase in tipping fees is actually a levy as I understand it, put on us by the Province and the monies, or a large majority of the monies, are returned to the City of Winnipeg for use in matters to do with… dealing with garbage or different waste streams so I think even there is opportunities for things like roadside composting programs that I think have been batted around and some other issues, some improved recycling in commercial and perhaps even going as far as commercial establishments. So I just wanted to make sure that I gave the opportunity to the Chair to clarify that this is in fact not a tipping fee increase by the City of Winnipeg but rather the collection of a levy imposed by the Province of Manitoba albeit for a very good purpose.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: The Councillor from St. Norbert is absolutely right.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Councillor Clement: But I'll move it anyway because I don't have any choice.

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved. Mr. Clerk would you have me recorded in opposition it Number 1? Item 1? Yes. Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Myself. Motions, none. Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Clement.

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

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law 95, 96 and 97 of '09.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 95/2009, No. 96/2009, 97/2009.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-laws 95 to 97 of '09, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 95/2009 to 97/2009, both inclusive.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 95 to 97 of '09, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.. Question period. You're right Bill, none. And he knows how to do it.

Standing Policy Committee Finance, no report. No motions. Consideration of By-laws, none. Question period. Stay away from that one.

Standing Policy Committee Downtown Development. No report. DD motions. None. DD Consideration of By-laws, none. DD Question Period. Any? None.

Standing Policy Committee Property and Development report of June the 2nd, 2009, Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JUNE 2, 2009

Councillor Fielding: Yes Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of Council Agenda Items 1 through 6 and 8 through 19.

Councillor Gerbasi: Pull up Item 1 please.

Mr. Speaker: Item 1.

Councillor Fielding: I'd also like to advise that Item No. 7 has been filed inasmuch as much as the applicant has withdrawn their application.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, so 6, Item 6 and 8 to 19. All in favour?

Councillor Gerbasi: Item 1 you've…

Mr. Speaker: Item 1, I've got that. I've got it down. Item 1. I said 6 and 18 to 19. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And also Councillor Fielding advised that Item 7 has been filed inasmuch as the applicant has withdrawn. Okay. Item 1.

Item 1 - The Historical Buildings By-law No. 1474/77 - Dennistown House – 166 Roslyn Road File G-3.1.1

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure, yeah. I'd like to introduce this…I'm going to save… reserve my comments for the very end during the close period, but very much interested in hearing the debate from fellow Councillors on the Historical Building Designation of 166 Roslyn Road.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First I'd like to thank Cindy from Heritage Winnipeg, Jennifer Lukovich and the other residents that have come out here today and I thank you for your words today. I believe they've made a very strong case, made some

very good arguments about heritage preservation today.

I'm rising to support the recommendation of the Historical Buildings Committee, which, as the Chair of that Committee, I signed the letter which is before you in your agenda. In response to the comments made by an earlier delegation, I'd like to point out that the letter before you is only a short summary of the recommendation of the committee. The committee goes through a significantly detailed process of evaluating a long list of criteria, as well as reviewing a longer research report from our Heritage Planner which, by the way, I sent to all of you. And, they also perform a site visit. I'd like to put on the record, directly from my report, "Historical Buildings Committee has been advised that a request was received from Sunstone Resort Communities…for demolition…and in considering this request, the Committee visited the house on March 19th to review its condition. At their meeting following, the Committee agreed that the heritage values have not changed since the designation of the property in 1984 as a Grade III structure. "

"The three-storey Dennistown House was built in 1908 for the Honourable Justice Robert M. Dennistown. It stands as one of the few private dwellings remaining from one of Winnipeg's early affluent suburbs, a good example of the Tudor style designed by prominent architect John D. Atchison, and is associated with a notable historic figure. It was designated for its merit as a structure contributing to the early suburban character of Roslyn Road, which is slowly being eroded, as the stately homes are lost to new development."

"The Historical Buildings Committee believes that the heritage values of the building have not changed since the time of designation. The Committee may consider a building be delisted in extraordinary circumstances where it has been entirely or substantially destroyed, or is no longer of special architectural or historic interest. However, in this case, the historical connection with Judge Dennistown gives the structure a prominence representing the career of a notable figure in Manitoba's judicial and military history. The architectural style

also makes the Dennistown House of particular importance in establishing the dominant character of the area and contributes to the historical continuity of the streetscape."

"Therefore, the Historical Buildings Committee recommends that the building not be delisted because the heritage values have not changed. The Osborne Village Neighbourhood Plan be noted as stating: 'Discourage the demolition of historic or architecturally significant buildings or structures. Demolition shall be considered as a last resort, and should only be considered when buildings are determined to be structurally unsound beyond repair by an independent structural engineering report. Economic viability should not be the sole determining factor.'"

That was the report that was before the Committee, and I'd like to just briefly say that our process in regards to these sort of matters is very difficult and confusing to citizens. There is no opportunity to argue that, look at the whole picture and balance the benefits of retaining this property against a proposed development. The development proposal is not even in front of us today, but as Councillor for the area, I have been trying to protect the integrity of the application process by trying to stick to the process by focusing on the heritage aspect here today, and that…and those other processes will be coming forward depending on the outcome of today's vote, and I know there's been various things said about where I was here, or not there and at different meetings, and I just want to make it clear what I've been trying to do is speak to the issue we are speaking to today with integrity and then if for some reason this doesn't happen today, I still want to have the integrity to be able to deal with the development when it comes forward if you choose to delist this building today, as the person that may be hearing some of those applications.

The matter before us today is very simple. Does Roslyn Road, 166 Roslyn Road, continue to have heritage value? The answer to that is clearly yes and I will be supporting the Historic Buildings Committee's recommendation. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Swandel followed by Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an interesting debate that we're having here. It's unfortunate that we didn't bring forward the information that we have on the need to really revisit our historic buildings list and maybe even get into some of the definitions of the designations on historic buildings or historic and heritage buildings. We have designations from 1 through 3 as you're well aware. When you're talking about the historic significance of buildings where your don't want to tear a building down because something of historic significance has happened there or it's had some sort of an impact on society far greater than just the building itself, we tend to use the Grade 1 designation for that because you want to preserve the entire site. At least that's what the policies as set out by the City of Winnipeg tell us.

When you get into the Grade 3 designation it's really the exterior of the building that we're talking about. We're talking about the heritage and sort of the architectural significance, and you know, here, we know that the historic significance as presented this morning is somewhat exaggerated in that this was not the Dennistown home of significance. In fact, as we heard this morning it was on Cockburn Street and the family doesn't actually recognize it as the significant home of Dennistown.

So I think that's important to understand and I think it's important for us to also understand that we're going through a process where we're trying to deal with that list and properly scope out what it is that we're doing with historic and heritage buildings because you can see on a day-to-day basis or on a month-to-month basis when we deal with these matter in this Council that we are very strongly committed as a whole, as a whole Council when we deal with matters like the King, on 104 King Street down here, the building where we've tried to protect the facade. We've gone out of our way.

We've perhaps, some would argue, spent more money than would be reasonable. We have gone a great way. When you look at Kelly House, working with Heritage Winnipeg and with the CentreVenture we were able to shape a very unique way, using a lease to help finance the preservation of that home and using some incentives by the City to ensure that that happens. So we do go out of our way when we do see significant historic value and we must be better at identifying what the heritage value of some of these pieces are.

The real argument that comes to us today is whether or not there is some continuity on the streetscape here, and I think the answer to that question comes very quickly when you realize that this is one of three buildings. The other two buildings nobody is arguing about. They are not historic. The two buildings beside it have been torn down a long time ago. So as far as the continuity argument, I would suggest that it holds no water. When you're taking down the two buildings beside it because they were built I think in the 60s or 70s. They're just sort of…they're not very attractive buildings. In behind this building is the Shopper's Drug Mart store. I mean, there is no continuity on this street…on this section of this street anyway of historic buildings. When you stand and look at it from different angles, it's not like looking through the Exchange District where you can see the continuity of buildings on the various blocks and you can see the built form that is there being preserved. In this community it's quite obvious that there is a real mix. There are some pieces that are preserved and certainly it speaks to some of the days gone by. There is some significant architecture. I think Councillor Gerbasi has got a piece right on the river, the old church of sciences. It's going to be a significant struggle to deal with that. There is…it is truly a magnificent building and one that we're going to have to find some very creative ways of protecting and preserving, and hopefully we'll be able to do that. But, I guess in submission, I think when you look at the entire scope of what this Historic Buildings By-law is intending to do and some of the guidelines that are put in front of us, whether or not this building should even be on the list in the first place, I would argue and I have no problem delisting it today because I think this is taking away from our greater focus of what this by-law is supposed to be doing for us. This is not what this by-law was intended for. There is not historic significance here. There is not, by taking this building away, you are not destroying the continuity of this street. The continuity of this street, as far as what this house represented is not there, certainly not on this block, on that side of the block at this time. So those are my comments and hopefully we'll be able to move this forward in a reasonable fashion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Swandel. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have several concerns. The first I'll talk about is the process. I think that we should develop a better process for heritage buildings, and I'm concerned to find out there is a different process for dealing with buildings in the downtown area and this is just over on the outside of that area, in one of the first suburbs but just over the Assiniboine River gets a different process than if it would have been downtown, and I think we should probably go out of our way to look at how we handle historic buildings because there are some problems with that. And we should really be giving people more notice to do their research on that. And I'd like to talk a little bit about Halifax. When I went to Dalhousie, I lived in Halifax for a time and while I was there, I lived in an older home that was 150 years, and I was quite excited to come back 25 years later when we had an F.C.M. in Halifax and look at the building where I used to live and saw this lovely little plaque on it. We don't do that for any of our historically designated buildings and they have a lot more since Halifax is a much more mature City than us. They have a lot more historic buildings to deal with, to designate, and the information that they provide on the plaque for anybody who's walking along the street to go up and look at it, why it was designated historic, and that is accessible to the general public, and we don't do that. And I think that's a problem for a building that has been

designated historic, and this has been designated historic since the mid 1980s. I think if a lot of people were aware of the reasons, if they were listed on the plaque and were familiar with some of the reasons why something was designated historic, you might find this building full of people objecting to what's happening here because it is historically significant. Part of that is the place, part of that is the structure, and part of that is the architect.

Now, the architect was a local architect, John Atchison, but he was one of the Chicago School architects, and for those of you who don't know anything about the Chicago School, Chicago School was a leading edge school for a lot of architecture, and there was a lot of premier architects who came from that school, and I don't think reducing the footprint of the number of dwellings that we have by John Atchison is in any way appropriate. There are a few items. We're a young City here comparatively. Yes, we are the gateway to the west and we are certainly not as young…not as young as Edmonton or Calgary or many…or Regina or Saskatoon, but we are significantly younger than Montréal, Quebec, Halifax, Toronto, and because of that, we have a mere thousand buildings that are listed as being historically significant, and in the many hundreds of thousands of buildings that make up the City of Winnipeg, we should be making a great deal of effort to save those remnants that honour specific pieces of our history. And this is a building that is in good condition. No one can say, oh it's been left to rack and ruin and oh it's so sad but it has to go. This is not it. It was a working building. It had tenants in it; tenants who respected it and kept it in good shape. Even though there hasn't been tenants in there for awhile it's still in pretty good shape. I went over and looked at that site on several occasions to acquaint myself with the structure and to acquaint myself with the history of the building.

Now, not only is it significant because of the architect, it's significant because of the location, and one of the reasons, ironically, that one of the delegations used to talk about, well it should be knocked down, is because well, everything else around there is turning from single-family dwellings, one of the first suburbs, to apartment blocks, so this should go too. Well, it's just because of that that this should stay, because it is a remnant. It's a remnant that's significant because of its architecture. It's a remnant that's significant because of the individual who inhabited the location, and it's a remnant that represents a period, and it was a period, interestingly enough, with the Chicago School in the time frame when we were often compared to Chicago, and we were called the "Chicago of the North." And there are very few structures around that are indicative of that period of the "Chicago of the North" period. So, it's the Chicago School who was known then and was known even up until the late 60s for their very challenging and avant-garde architectural moments, an architect that was important to us in our community, in an area that was significantly important and we're losing that. You know, there is…there's so many things that we can't go back and save any more. I mean, how many of you would like to have revisited the decision where Upper Fort Garry was blown down to make a roadway, and couldn't we have just gone around it and saved that? Wouldn't it have been good to have that structure in the middle of the City, just like Halifax has their main structure, just like St. John's, Newfoundland, has its main hill? Wouldn't it have been great to have revisited that decision? We're going to preserve a corner and boy, was that a fight on this Council, to get a corner of a gate and the surrounding area preserved to identify our heritage. And once those things come down, they can't be brought back again, and what we're doing is we're kind of reinventing the Upper Fort Garry in just a very small way and that will be important, that will be significant.

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

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. But, once you do those things you can't go back and this is a very significant step of us to delist something that's actually in good shape. We've never done that before. We have, heart breakingly torn

down a beautiful Capitol Theatre, the first movie theatre in the whole of Canada, because the people who had control of that in the private sector let it go to mould and mildew and rack and ruin, so that it couldn't be brought back to life, and it was with a great deal of sadness that we had to get rid of something like that. There have been so many of these failures in the past. Let's not add to it by hurting one of the few significant pieces of this type of architecture by this architect, representing a particular school, all of which were significant in that era for that period. And we need to start by improving our processes so that citizens who have concerns have more time to talk to us about what their concerns are. This is… this process has been very rushed, and when our small citizens' group was not able to mount an educated opposition to this because the one staff person happened to be out of town at the time, had very little notice, couldn't come, and participate, that's a problem. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith on Item 1.

Councillor Smith: Yes. I just want to get up and answer the ramblings of Councillor Swandel. You know, he takes the position that the proponents of not wanting…not wanting it delisted but how long the Justice lived there. Let me tell you this. The Historic Buildings Committee, it has architects, it has a researcher, they've gone into this extensively. This is not just a light decision making. They've established their facts. They are legitimate and so it seems to me for to you go ahead and just…

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Councillor Smith: Let me tell you Councillor Swandel, you get up and you go in all directions half the time. You know, this is not a good thing. We should be supporting the historical nature of this.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Councillors.

Councillor Smith: Well, you can tell Councillor Swandel that…you know where to go.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Address the Chair, Councillor Smith. Councillor Smith address the Chair.

Councillor Smith: This is a historic building. The Committee has looked at this extensively. They've researched it. You know, if the value of the Committee is there, they judged this should not be delisted and I support that motion, that direction.

Mr. Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Mr. Chair, I'm going to also support the fact that this building shouldn't be delisted for various reasons I'll quickly outline. One is…which went up to…order please.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors! Councillor Smith and Swandel, please. Go ahead.

Councillor Orlikow: I'm not going to reiterate many of the points. The one point is that it is a Grade III; it is a Committee that has spent a lot of time and effort and has a lot more knowledge base about these facts than I do, doesn't recommend that we do delist it. There is a system in our flaws…there is a flawed system where it almost becomes the owner's responsibility to let the house deteriorate to such a level that then they can unload it. That's a huge fundamental problem, however, I'm just dealing with what we have today, and what we have today is I need to…I don't have to worry about the development as Councillor Swandel said. That doesn't play into this factor. The factor is do we…is there a reason to delist it on its merit of the building alone? And for that reason, I don't see the merit. I don't see any changes in the building. Sure, the judge may have only been there for a little while. It doesn't really matter to me that much. You look at the streetscape. You

can look at that streetscape and yes, it doesn't have that continuity it used to have because it has been eroded, but this is a mark that's still on that street, and I really caution that kind of position as we have another incredible, I guess you would say, more of a gothic style house, Senator Rod Zimmer's place which is just half a block down the way. Now that house is absolutely gorgeous. The wood work inside is incredible. It's odd because it comes from the days past where all the houses around it are bungalows and it's odd because it doesn't really fit anymore to those old majestic estates that were there, but that house is there. So that argument will be used to the next…the Zimmer's place? I really hope not, but again, it shows that progression of that argument where I see some flaws to it.

This house is gorgeous. Yes inside it may be deteriorating but we can't get it back. When I bike through that area, I'm not a big fan. It's one of the most high density areas of all of Canada. I'm not a big fan about all these skyscrapers. I understand people want to live there and that's great, but when I bike by that little house, that Dennistown House with all the nice trees, it does actually for me personally, and that's all I can really say because I'm not an expert, it does reflect back on a time when that area was majestic, where you had beautiful homes, similar to my ward presently, that we're still trying to fight to maintain. These homes, yes, they may not be economically viable, they're a little drafty, a whole bunch of things, but they instill a sense of passion and history that we can't get back if we destroy this home. So if there's a problem with the rating system, fine, but then we go and look at the system. But we don't one-off these things and say we delist it just because we don't think it's that great. I really don't believe that's our role per se. I think our role is to empower other people to try to give us that information, and we have empowered other people to give us that information and they're telling us there really is no reason why you should be delisting this. So, for that reason alone and the fact that the area Councillor who has consulted with her community…and I have to respect that what she is telling us is what I've heard and I've heard from my own community, doesn't support it. The area plan. If we're going to have plans in our areas, we have to stick with them and sometimes we will have the gray area between development versus infill, a whole bunch of areas, but we have to stick with the theme, and I read through he Osborne Street Plan, and it does have maintaining that historical nature wherever possible. So I believe this is one area where it is possible to maintain that, Mr. Speaker, so therefore I do not support delisting it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. No further speakers? Councillor Fielding your close.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to reiterate…to go over what actually Councillor Swandel said. I think there has been a lot of positive decisions as it relates to historical buildings, really since I've been elected. I guess I've been on the Committee almost three years now. As I mentioned, there's a lot of success stories out there. You look at things like the King Street, 104 King. You look at Kelly House. You look at the new home for Heritage Winnipeg, in fact. I mean, these are all examples of where we as a City have worked with stakeholder groups, have worked to maintain the historical nature plus also make these buildings viable.

On the other side of the equation we cannot just always just live in the past. We need to make decisions that are in the best interests of our community while trying to maintain the historical presence of our neighbourhood. There has been some talk about the Historical Buildings By-law and there will be some changes that are coming up there in terms of process. I think that process has been in place for a number of years so there has been some Councillors that were around the EPC table that were before, that were involved in that same process. I don't think it's changed too much.

The house at 166 Roslyn Avenue, of course, is the Grade III, which is the lowest grade possible on the inventory list, and as we talked a little bit before, the

historical nature of the house, it was originally owned by Justice Dennistown who was apparently well respected in the justice area back in the day. The house of course is a Tudor style. But what I'd like to put on the record, Mr. Speaker, is that over the last 101 years, the house has dramatically changed over the years. The interior and exterior of the building have dramatically changed as well. The house has basically been functioning as a rooming house with five separate units for a number of years. Residents in the area had no idea that this was a historical building. There are no plaques. There is no way to designate this to show the historical nature or to show the recognition of, you know, the individual that lived in here before.

In terms of the architecture of the house, there is no less than twelve other houses in around the area that have the same sort of Tudor style design that would be there. So I would make the argument, if you look to the streetscape, it won't be destroyed by this one decision with it. We also looked at some of the stakeholder groups that were there, and we did have a passionate presentation by Cindy Tugwell, and you know, we work very well with Heritage Winnipeg and organizations before and lots of other historical designations before it. I know they had said they didn't know too much about the presentation. To be fair though there were six open house presentations from the community that were there, you know, and so I appreciate they can't come. They made their presentation here, but we're making our decision having everyone in the same room, we did see…we did hear some of these presentations. Also the Historical Buildings. We did receive a written report from the Historical Buildings Committee which I appreciate. We didn't have a verbal presentation by the Chair, and I take her at her word that she wanted to hold off because there could be some decisions if a decision on the historical nature is made on the development later on down the line. But to be fair, the decisions that would have to be made in terms of the building, there would be two decisions that would be at the Board of Adjustments, so I'm not sure a Councillor…I'm not sure that that wouldn't affect the development of it, so I take you at your word but to be fair, I'm not sure that's an relevant point.

So in my opinion, the only thing left historical in nature of this building is really the namesake. And the fact of the matter the developer has named the development after the Justice, so they named the actual development after the Justice as well as dedicated a viewing gallery to honour the significance of the Justice's participation and involvement into our community, and I can tell you that changing of the namesake will get more recognition the contribution to the community than maintain the house in itself. The family who lived in the house, I think we heard earlier on today with some new information, a very short period of time, are very supportive of the new development that is there, but I do want to maintain the historical nature of it. So in conclusion, the decision to delist I think is the right one. These are always tough decisions. We've made some very positive gains in terms of historical designations before. I'm very proud of that since being on the Committee, but you do have to look at things on a case by case basis, and this I disagree to a certain extent with our friends from Heritage Winnipeg and I think this decision that we made is the right one. So with that, I encourage you all to support the report. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The vote.

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote has been called by Councillor Gerbasi. All of those in favour of Item 1, please rise. Item 1, to delist it. Report of the Property and Development Committee is delisting.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 6.

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

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

Councillor Fielding: Sure, I'll move that By-law No. 5/2009 be read a second time.

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

Councillor Fielding: I'll move that By-law 5/2009 be read a third time at the same to be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Councillor Fielding: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 90/2009, By-law 91/2009, By-law 94/2009.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 90/2009, By-law No. 91/2009, By-law 94/2009.

Councillor Fielding: Okay, I'll move that the By-laws numbered 90/2009, 91/2009, 94/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 90/2009, 91/2009, and 94/2009.

Councillor Fielding: Okay, I'll move that the rules be suspend and By-laws numbered 90/2009, 91/2009, 94/2009 be read a third time and the same time passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. Standing Policy Committee Protection Community Services. No report. Motions? Considerations of By-laws. none. Question period. none. Councillor Pagtakhan. Councillor Pagtakhan. Do you want to come and take the Chair? Next is the Secretariat Committee report of June 15th of 2009.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE DATED JUNE 15, 2009

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, we're at the Secretariat Committee, report of June 15th, 2009. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: For June 15th, 2009, I introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Councillor Pagtakhan: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Secretariat Consideration of By-laws.

SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 92/2009, By-law No. 93/2009.

Councillor Pagtakhan: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 92/2009, By-law No. 93/2009.

Councillor Lazarenko: I move that By-laws No. 92/2009, 93/2009 be read a second time.

Councillor Pagtakhan: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 92/2009 and 93/2009.

Councillor Lazarenko: I move that the by-laws numbered…oh pardon me. I move that the rules be suspended and

By-laws No. 92/2009, 93/2009 be read a third time and that the same be passed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay and Councillor Nordman moves adjournment. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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