COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, March 24, 2010

The Council met at 9:38 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, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal and Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Pages today we have Kayla Ruiz of Kelvin High School, resides in the Daniel McIntyre Ward. Welcome.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: I'd like to at this time welcome a special guest here today. One that I had the privilege to sit in Council as…this fine lady was a Mayor from 1992 to 1998, and Susan Thompson, welcome.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: And I'd like to say, when Her Worship Susan Thompson was the Mayor for that period of time, she was one of the best ambassadors that Winnipeg ever had as the head of Council. She never embarrassed the City of Winnipeg in any shape or form and right now she is doing very good work with the University of Manitoba, so I meant the University. Well, you'll get your…you'll be upgraded later as the University of Winnipeg and you're doing a fine job. Welcome. Thanks for coming.

Okay, right now, we have a delegation. I'd like to recognize Captain Paul Dempsey, Deputy Commander of the Canadian Fleet Pacific, Lieutenant Commander Timothy Doherty, Commanding Officer of the HMCS Brandon, Lieutenant Commander Margaret Moorcock, Commanding Officer of HMCS Chippawa, and Lieutenant Jeremy Breese, representative for HMCS Winnipeg, who will represent His Worship Mayor Katz with the Naval Centennial Honour for HMCS Winnipeg, HMCS Transcona, and HMCS of St. Boniface. Captain, the Floor is yours.

Paul Dempsey: Thank you very much. Your Worship, members of Council, distinguished guests and veterans, ladies and gentlemen. I am Captain Navy Paul Dempsey, the Deputy Commander of the Pacific Fleet and I'm here today representing the 11,000 sailors of your Canadian Navy. The Canadian Navy is celebrating its centennial year in 2010 and the theme for our celebration is bring the Navy to Canadians and that is why I am here today with this delegation. This theme is supported by our deep desire to commemorate the past, to celebrate today, and commit to the future. While our navy has a very long and distinguished past, I want to focus my comments on the course that your navy is charting into the second century.

Let me begin by recounting a tale of two photographs. Imagine right now, I'm showing you the first photograph. Picture in your mind, a caring military nurse, providing medical care to a distressed child in some far away land, an image you've probably seen in our news with recent reports coming out of Haiti. In the background, imagine a fully equipped soldier, vigilant, professional, and tough as nails. Is there anyone in the country who would not know what that soldier was doing or why indeed we need the likes of him or her in that place of need? Whose heart would not swell with pride in the fact that a maple leaf was on his or her shoulder, who would not know immediately what an army can be used for? Now, imagine, I show you that second photograph of a sleek warship at sea with little else on the horizon as their constant companion. What Canadian, other than someone like me who thinks the image of a warship under way is quite sexy but what layman, what ordinary citizen, would understand from that photo why this country has, and indeed, needs a navy? The differences between the perceptions these two images invoke is that the heart is what is…is at the heart of what is meant by Maritime blindness. Arguably, Canadians for the most part don't really think about our country's relationship to the sea and consumed by our business in Afghanistan, there seems no time or need to do so.

But, let's return to that warship. Now, include in that image a merchant one under close escort; one that was charted by the United Nations to bring relief supplies to East Africa. That was the story of HMCS Winnipeg last year when she and

her crew were warding off pirates and delivering aid to Somalia. Many of you know that the Navy's back in that region today. The Frigate Fredericton is conducting interdiction operations to counter piracy and to impede the movement by sea of terrorists, much as Winnipeg had done last year. We've been operating in this part of the world since 1991, having deployed task groups or individual frigates nearly three dozen times since the first Gulf War. Why is that? Ladies and gentlemen, answering that question is fundamental to understanding your Navy. Start by considering three basic facts of today's world. First, more than 90% of the world's trade travels by sea. Second, the oceans are available for all states to use, and when regulated by customary law or international treaty, may be used without infringing on the sovereignty of others. Third, the power of the United States and its principal Maritime allies, including Canada, still dominates at sea with all the strategic freedoms that that entails.

Sir Walter Raleigh in a far more elegant age summarized what is meant in saying that “Who so ever commands the seas, commands the trade.” Whoever commands the trade of the world, commands the riches of the world and consequently, the world itself. Today's global system has evolved markedly since Raleigh’s day, however, ever since the Portuguese edged their way around Africa to the riches of the Indian Ocean, the procession of the world's navies, Spain, Netherlands, Great Britain and today, the United States, has demonstrated how deeply sea power is connected to the global economic, legal and political system. We deploy to the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean not just to respond to Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait in 1991, or to answer the terrorist attacks of 9/11. Nor are we there today simply to address the rise of piracy or to block the movement of terrorists to areas of safe haven. The underlying reason we are there is this: an unregulated ocean is a threat to our very way of life. The great wars of the past century are a testament to that statement, and these veterans in the bleachers could testify to that fact.

As mariners, we see globalization at work every day, how crucial it is to our prosperity and our possible futures, where it is working to lift people out of poverty, and conversely where it's conspiring to deepen their desperation and globalization can do both--lift people out of poverty or deepen their desperation. Further, it is indisputable that as globalization has progressively made neighbours of all the world's people, the world's oceans no longer shield us from far distant events or threats. In this regard, I would ask you to think about the headlines many of you have been reading of the disaster in Haiti. Two warships from the east coast fleet, Athabaskan and Halifax, have just returned from this beleaguered nation as part of a major Canadian Force’s effort to render assistance to a neighbour at a time of grave and urgent need.

There is a reason why we hold our ships to high standards of responsiveness, why the motto of your Navy is, "Ready, I ready." We launch Maritime power quickly. Transit time is certainly greater than by air but no runway is required on arrival. No footprint is needed to decongest an ocean space that is law…is by law, available for our use. We are under way almost immediately upon the order of our government. While globalization has allowed us to prosper, it has also created vulnerabilities that any determined adversary can exploit. 9/11 underscores to us how complex the business of maritime security and coastal defence is becoming in a war of increasingly flattened by globalization to use the term popularized by Thomas Friesen. That is why your Navy's most important defence and security task begins at home. That is why your Navy is on station today, maintaining vigil of the approaches to this country. Also, Canada’s Navy routinely deploys abroad but the reason we exist, the primary objective of our efforts is constant. It is to govern the seas such that all may use them lawfully. When deployed, we often do so with our friends and allies. In home waters however, we must, as a sovereign nation, have the capacity to act alone. I don't believe it's too arrogant to state your Navy is accustomed to the kind of scrutiny that comes from excellence in operations. We’ve also been amongst the world's most innovative navies in the world.

Canadians figured out how to operate big helicopters from destroyers such as the Winnipeg when others said it could not be done. We were also the first to combine an ever increasing fleet train of support vessels, they being lighter for ammunitions, oil is for gas, hospital ships for medical service, into a single class vessel. Now every navy does so, but it was Canadians that pioneered this hybrid class of support ships and we perfected it in both the protector and the preserver. Canadians have built some of the finest warships in the world and have modernized them through their service life to keep them on the leading edge of Maritime technology and combat effectiveness.

Next year we embark on such a program of modernization with the Halifax Class Frigates as we begin the most comprehensive peace-time modernization program ever in our history. Notwithstanding the long term benefits of modernizing these ships with leading edge technologies, in the medium term, the readiness of your Navy will go down substantially. This is an unavoidable consequence of the cycle of boom-bust ship building in which we've been trapped since the 1950s. The naval leadership can mitigate the strategic risk of the next decade but we can not avoid the consequences of strategic decisions that were repeatedly deferred over the last 15 years, as the nation got out of the business of building warships.

Decisions deferred certainly over the last decade and a half have meant that our Fleet, as capable as it remains today, became older and more expensive to operate. Today, the fleet support vessels that I referred to earlier, protector and

preserver, remain in service as do the three Iroquois class destroyers we built in the 1970s. All these ships are significantly older than the majority of the sailors who crew them. Encouragingly, a fundamental re-evaluation of how this country builds warships is well under way but there's no doubt we face a considerable challenge in the decade ahead to recapitalize our Fleet. But in an era that's largely devoid of major battle at sea, why should any of this matter? Because, ladies and gentlemen, I would argue that the 21st century will increasingly be shaped by ocean politics. It is becoming what is referred to as a Maritime century. The Maritime domain has changed more in the past 30 to 40 years than in the previous 3 to 400. Coastal states have already enclosed the majority of the world's commercially exploitable Maritime resources while making increasingly pronounced investments in their maritime estates. Think back to the fuss that Canada made over Spanish when they were overfishing in the 1990s. Does anybody here think that turbot was a strategic resource for Canada? And yet, we took serious action including the use of our Navy. This wasn't just a dispute over resources. That was a stand that Canada took to ensure its jurisdiction would be respected by all nations. Now consider what's at stake in the arctic. This region is being propelled towards the centre of world affairs as the five arctic coastal states, including Canada, establish claims to the vast energy and mineral reserves that lie in the arctic basin seabed.

Climate change is likely to make these resources commercially exploitable much sooner than was thought possible only a few years ago and as ice melts, transit routes through the arctic will become much more viable in connecting the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. In short, there's no doubt that ocean politics will make for great strategic complexity and growing competition with a latten but ever present potential for conflict among great nation states. Nowhere are these issues more apparent than in the Indo-Pacific, a vast region of the globe where ocean politics already occupies centre stage. China, one of, not the most ambitious and capable of the emerging Maritime powers, has acknowledged this fundamental reality. Last year, China confirmed that its principal security challenge and vulnerabilities come from the sea requiring a navy aligned with its growing regional and global Maritime interests. My intent is not to compare navies today. They come in all shapes and sizes but I hope to explain why Canada operates a globally deployable navy. That is, as a quick reminder to safeguard Canada's sovereignty, to secure our prosperity by helping to keep the oceans free for all to use lawfully, to work with our allies and partners to prevent conflict where possible while ensuring that we remain benchmark for combat.

Ladies and gentlemen, the story of our second century as a navy is about to begin. Although I described to you some of the challenges that await us in the decades ahead, I can't pretend to foresee them all but neither could Sir Wilfrid Laurier looking forward from 1910 when he guided the Naval Service Act toward Royal Assent, the sovereign decision that Canada would create a national navy rather than cruisers for Great Britain. But, he held an abiding faith in what Canada stood for even then, and a vision of a country as a leading member of the community of nations, a vision that our Navy helped to secure in peace and in war, and that we continue to sustain today. That alone gives me great confidence for our next century because Laurier's vision remains undiminished, that Canadians will continue to strive to make a difference, knowing that the world will not be as we wish, but rather as we are prepared to help make it. Your Navy will be one of the leading instrument that Canada uses to make that difference. I am hopeful that the displays that I'm about to present will be a permanent reminder to the citizens of Winnipeg that Canada is a Maritime nation, dependent upon the oceans for our national prosperity. It is incumbent upon all Canadians I believe that the Canadian continues to get the resources required to stand ready, to keep watch over our nations ocean approaches, and the capacity to reach out to the world to maintain freedom of movement on all oceans. We celebrate our centennial and the start of our second century of service to country. In closing, let me pass on my recognition and full appreciation to you, and all Canadians, for your long standing support towards our sailors, our mandate and to our service. On behalf of the men and women currently serving in today's navy and more importantly, on behalf of all of those who served before us over the past 100 years including the veterans in the stands, it gives me great pleasure to present these inscribed frames, which are photographs depicting the history of the three ships of this area, HMCS Winnipeg, HMCS St. Boniface and HMCS Transcona. Thank you very much for your time.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor, Perhaps you would like to say a few words.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, it would be my pleasure. Captain Paul Dempsey, Lieutenant Commander Tim Doherty, Lieutenant Commander Margaret Morlock and Lieutenant Jeremy Breese, on behalf of all my fellow city Councillors, thank you. I would also like to thank the veterans you heard today in the Gallery, thanking them for their contributions, and their sacrifices, and helping make this great country exactly what it is today. We all appreciate what you've done. Thank you so much for participating in this event.

(Applause)

Mayor Katz: It is our honour to accept these historic gifts that commemorate the current HMCS Winnipeg, Her Predecessor, and His Majesty's Canadian Ships, St. Boniface and Transcona, and of course commemorate the Canadian Naval Centennial. Winnipeg has a long history with the Naval Reserve. During World War II, our city had the greatest inland recruitment, higher only in the eastern and western coastal cities which solidified the naval legacy in Manitoba which continues to thrive today. Our Naval connection is nation wide. We share a history with each other and with our namesake Canadian ships, and we are honoured and very proud to celebrate our country's 100 Years of Naval history, with all of you today. Thank you so much.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you to the Navy officers, congratulations. Thank you for coming here today and God be with you. I have an announcement, Bonnie Korzeniowski, MLA for St. James. Are you present? Will you please stand? Welcome. Councillors, Condolence Motion. Mr. Clerk, would you please read it out?

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Nordman,
Seconded by Councillor Clement,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor John Steel, which occurred on March 10, 2010.

Mr. Steel served the citizens of Winnipeg as Councillor for the Grant's Mill Ward from 1986 to 1988.

This Council extends to his wife Helen its deepest sympathy and condolences in her bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Would everyone in the Chambers and Gallery rise for a moment of silence?

(Moment of silence)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Also Councillors, I'd like to take a moment to note and put on record the passing of another member of our Council family, and that is Victor Peterson, who was a commissionaire in the building for several years and served both Council at the front and in this Chamber. Victor performed his duties diligently and was well liked and respected by all. Victor passed away on March 11, 2010 following a lung transplant. On behalf of Council, I'd like to offer to Victor's wife Sita and his sons, Ian and Roger our condolences in their bereavement. Thank you, Councillors. A Leave of Absence Motion for Councillor Thomas. Mr. Clerk.

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

That Councillor Thomas be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to illness.

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

MINUTES

Councillor Swandel moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on February 24th, 2010 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Delegations, we have none. Now we're going to get right down to business. Report…Executive Policy Committee, report of March 10th, 2010, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 10, 2010

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the Report and move Adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Number one.

Mr. Speaker: Number one. No further ones? On Item No. 2, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 1.

Item 1 - Amendment to 2010 Schedule of Council and Committee Meetings

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. This was evidently done on February the 3rd at Executive Policy Committee but I wasn't there. I was out of the city at the time. Nobody spoke to me about this whatsoever, and what it is is changing the dates of the Public Works meetings which I Chair, and changing the cycle which I don't agree with, A, because I've got a schedule too, and I've got things scheduled. As a matter of fact, I'm going to be here for the 6th, trying to change it because of some meeting of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities which I'm not going to be at, and I've never gone to. In fact, the only one that ever goes I think is the people that are appointed and I think Russ is one of those people. I don't know where they're meeting, I could care less where they're meeting that week. It's got nothing to do with Public Works whatsoever. If there's something on the agenda I'm sure that Councillor Wyatt or anybody else that wants to go would be happy to share with me what they might want to tell us about something that might or might not even be on the agenda that day. And April the 13th which is the following week, I'm not going to be in Winnipeg, and nobody has spoken to me. It's completely unfair for this thing to just show up and start making changes and I didn't agree to them. So I don't know whether it can be amended or whether it can be sent back to be discussed or what's the best way to deal with it? But I want to meet on the 6th. That's when we're scheduled to meet and there's no reason why not. As a matter of fact, it's talking about in here, about flipping…or not meeting during the Association of Manitoba Municipalities and then it turns around and turns and has a Property meeting the same day. So they're flipping Property and Public Works. Anyway that's what I'm saying, it's got…shouldn't have anything to do with that.

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute, Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: …and it's got everything to do with these dates. I don't want them changed. I don't want to be in the second week of the cycle. Public Works has met the same time for years and there is no reason to change it and if Property has to have two meetings, well, so what? So pick another day. You know, you don't have to change what another Standing Committee is doing because you've got a problem.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, just a clarification of the discussion for Councillor Clement's information and for all of Council. The request that came forward was a Motion that came as a Notice of Motion or a Motion that was made in January. It was referred to the Secretariat Committee by this Council, Secretariat Committee considered it and now it's coming forward for the change. In terms of the AMM issue which was the November Council meetings which was to say that we wouldn't be completed. Now the change in regards to the issue that Councillor Clement is raising, I was…I'm on the Property and Development Committee and I think I was sitting in on the Secretariat meeting as well, but maybe the Clerks might be able to shed some light on it. There was…for some reason there was a change between the two dates of P and D and Public Works. I'm not too sure why, but there was not…it's just coming forward at this time with this change because it was appropriate, because I guess this other change was happening. I'm not too sure but I'm sure there was…I'm sure there's a reason for it, Councillor Clement. But it has nothing to do with the change for the AMM Convention, so...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I will move an Amendment that the April 13th Infrastructure meeting be changed to April 6th

Motion No. 2

Moved by Councillor Vandal,
Seconded by Councillor Clement,

THAT Item 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated March 10, 2010 be amended to change the date of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works from April 13, 2010 to April 6, 2010.

Mr. Speaker: Council, you heard the Motion? All in favour? Contrary? It's carried.

You took note, Mr. Clerk? So the Clause as amended…Councillors, the Clause as amended, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Report of…Report "A" of March the 17th of 2010, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT "A" OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 17, 2010

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute. Just a minute. Councillors are you finished talking? Okay. Mr. Mayor, proceed.

Mayor Katz: Well, wait a minute. She said she guessed so I'm not sure. Can I get a more vague answer?

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mayor Katz: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I will introduce the Report and move Adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 6.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt? What number? Two? You show me those two fingers. I don't know what those fingers mean. I don't know whether it's a "Trudeau"…you're trying to give me a "Trudeau Salute" or what?

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Any further… So, Item No. 2 is stood down so Items 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 as Consent Agenda. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 2.

Item 2 - 2010 Mill Rates for the Education Support Levy and Special Levy

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, if I may, Item No. 2 is obviously regarding mill rates for the education support levy. We know this comes here every year. I will also say that Councillor Wyatt has been consistent and voted against it every single year, and I've always offered to bail him out in case he ever does go to jail which I'm still prepared to do and I believe this year from some of the talk, he may have a few people joining him and my offer extends to them as well. I just want to give you one fact, Mr. Speaker. Education taxes now represent 54.6% of all property taxes collected in Winnipeg. That's compared to 53.9 in 2009 and 53.7 in 2008. There's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, it's imperative that we have education taxes not be on our property tax bill and I will now yield the floor to Councillor Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah, it's…you know, it's very appropriate that we're discussing this today as the Mayor rightly said, we discuss this every year, and…but it's appropriate today because it's the day after, just by coincidence, a day after the Provincial Budget, which we've heard now announce that the Province is going to be taking a holiday on adjusting the Provincial tax credit for one year. So, you know, it's very appropriate that we're here discussing this today. The Mayor rightly points out that education taxes now make up basically 55% of the property tax bill. This is a significant milestone, Mr. Speaker. It's not one that we should be celebrating. It's one that we should be quite concerned about because it's clearly indicating that even in an election year, school taxes are moving in the wrong direction.

And, Mr. Speaker, I know this Council is aware of it but I just want to put it on the record again that in 2007, through the leadership of Councillor Pagtakhan, a Motion was moved which was carried by a majority, a vast majority of this Council, calling on the Province to remove education taxes from the property tax bill. That Motion was carried and that's the official policy, our position…policy position of this Council. So just to give you some updates, Mr. Speaker, in terms of

how great the problem is, and why we need to send a message to the Provincial Government, and it would be a very symbolic message I would add, because I know we legally are obliged to pass this Clause. We all know that. But the reality is, we've been sending this message not just ourselves as a municipality but all the municipalities across Manitoba have been reiterating this concern over and over and over again not just to this Provincial Government but to previous Provincial Governments as well, without any…without any great response, at least when it comes to the urban agenda. They have phased out the education tax when it comes to farms to a great extent, but when it comes to commercial businesses and residential properties, it's still well in effect. Mr. Speaker, if I can give you some statistics, that…the last statistics I had from our staff, they haven't had a chance to give me an update but from 1990 to 2005 in a 15 year period the consumer price index rose by 40%. That's compounded. That's the rate of inflation in that period of time, Mr. Speaker. Municipal taxes in that period of time, and this hasn't changed in the last five years. Municipal taxes rose by a total of 16% in that period of time, in other words, 24% below the rate of inflation. And, of course, as we know, Mr. Speaker, in the last five years that hasn't changed. If anything, the rate of inflation has been anywhere from one and a half to two percent roughly. It's a little less now, I think. The rate of inflation has been higher than all of our…each five year of municipal tax increase which has been zero.

The school division on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, has increased their taxes in that same period of time, a total of 177% from 1990 to 2005. The Provincial, and to give credit, the Provincial Government education tax credit being applied against that in that same period of time brings that increase down to 106%, but 106%, Mr. Speaker, above the rate of inflation. This is…this is huge, Mr. Speaker. A hundred six percent above the rate of inflation is actually a massive increase, Mr. Speaker, in terms of education taxes and there's no reason why we've gone from education taxes making up approximately 80% or sorry, 20% of the property tax bill, municipal taxes making 80% of the tax bill to a situation now where education taxes are making up 55% of the education tax bill. This is unsustainable, Mr. Speaker. It speaks to the very issue that the Mayor spoke to yesterday, which was in terms of diversifying our revenues and finding new revenue sources. The reality is, Mr. Speaker, until we can find new revenue sources, our main source of revenue is property taxes. It supplies 50% of our operating costs, over just over. So, Mr. Speaker, we need the source of revenue yet the education taxes continue to squeeze out our ability to do anything in terms of raising property taxes to cover our inflationary cost. We will probably have no doubt to do that, Mr. Speaker, but the fact of the matter is the comparison you saw in your Budget Book even yesterday was comparing municipal taxes as being the lowest in Canada, or probably the lowest today in Canada. In our Budget Book, it was the third lowest. Mr. Speaker, I don't have the information in front of me, but you add in the education taxes, the picture changes quite dramatically.

We need to send a strong message, Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Government, that the education taxes are still out of control. They are not…the issue is not being resolved. They're part of the solution. If I could also mention that a number of years ago, about four years ago, there was an actual task force formed with the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, that being at the table with the trustees being at the table, and they gave recommendations to the Premier of the day, Gary Doer, of what to do in terms of getting the matter in hand, concrete recommendations, Mr. Speaker, and the report was received, thank you very much, and put on the shelf. They were recommending a 80/20 split. The Association of Manitoba Municipalities official position is to go to 80/20 to bring...in other words, education taxes would still be on the tax bill but they would be making…making up 20% of the tax bill, not 55 percent of the tax bill, Mr. Speaker, that…those recommendations were completely ignored.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are here today to be asked to vote on this and as Councillor Clement rightly said yesterday, why is it even here because we have to vote for it anyway they say. We have no choice they say but to vote for it and I'm requesting, and Mr. Speaker, you have regaled me many a time when the story…when you…when Council voted in the 1970s I believe to send a message. Clearly it's been 30 years, Mr. Speaker. I think we need to send another message to the Province. There is no doubt in my mind we would have to reconvene a meeting to pass it but I think the message would be heard on Broadway, Mr. Speaker, rather than just one or two Councillors standing up or a few Councillors standing up and making a speech and pounding the table and saying that this is outrageous and knowing full well that the majority of our citizens appreciate this. I want to add also, Mr. Speaker, because this is sometimes said in this debate that our education…our school trustees I believe are not to blame. I think they're doing what they can with the resources they have to manage their affairs. The challenge they're facing, Mr. Speaker, is that the 85 or 90% or maybe even as high as 95 percent of their budget is salaries and they deal with the challenge of dealing with collective bargaining and contracts that they have to face every year or every few years and that has a direct impact on the (inaudible). The Province doesn't want to address this issue. That's the core of the issue, Mr. Speaker. That is really the heart of the issue, and until the Province is prepared to roll up its sleeves, whether it be an NDP Government or a Conservative Government, and as I said in the past is I don't see this as a Conservative or NDP issue. I think this is an issue that goes right across the board because it doesn't seem to matter who is in power, the issue doesn't seem to be getting addressed. So I appeal to all Councillors no matter what their political persuasion may be, to support voting against this, to vote against this Clause today and to send a very strong message…

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

Councillor Wyatt: To send a strong message to Broadway. I encourage the Mayor not to vote for this as well to send a strong message to Broadway. I think the time has come to send a message that this is out of control. The Mayor said it…he mentioned in his State of City speech this issue. It's not going away. So we need to send not just words. We need an action, Mr. Speaker. And the action, yes, symbolic, but the action is there for us to take. We just have to take it now. It's up to us so I encourage all members of Council to vote against this Clause and to send a message, knowing full well that we'll have to see each other again if not here, somewhere else that we would not want to be but we'll have to be back here to revote on this matter again. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support my colleague from Transcona. He is sunrise and I'm sunset as far as the city is concerned, and the issue of school divisions and the fact that there may be based on salary concerns out of control, I had a conversation last night, 14 hours ago in fact with a Cabinet Minister in the Provincial Government, who he, himself was a former teacher and those were his exact words. School divisions are out of control. And I think we as the City are the net loser because when people look at us from across the country and the bottom line of the tax, they're not separating what the two numbers are, the two columns and even with the rebate, it stands us in a very poor light when people look at the taxation and what's involved with the City of Winnipeg. I want our kids to have a good education. I still have a son in high school, so I appreciate everything that the staff and the administrators do within the different school divisions within the City of Winnipeg. But I just think it's giving us an unfair…giving our city an unfair disadvantage that would be better solved by the Province dealing with this issue. I encourage the leader of the opposition and the Provincial Government to take a look at this and make…if this government's not prepared to do something about it, that in the possible future that the opposition make this a platform that they want to run on. So, I will be supporting Councillor Wyatt's Motion today.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. I was just going to take a little bit of a different tact here. I don't agree with Councillor Wyatt on this issue. I will be supporting the Motion. I think you need to be very careful here, and I don't think it's as simple as standing up and you know, for the sake of some political points maybe, suggesting that you take these taxes off the property tax bill because there is a principle at work here. And the principle at work here is that you want to have locally elected School Board representatives and you want to give them the power and the tools to represent their local communities. Now, if you think you can do that by having the Provincial Government just dole money down and they're going to have that autonomy and the strength to deliver what their local community is asking for, I wouldn't agree with that. Is property tax the best way for the education community to get their revenues, the School Boards to get their revenues? For right now, I don't see an alternative where you get that sort of connection to the local community. As far as it being on the City's tax bill, all that does is create value. You know, you're out there, we're doing the assessment, we're creating a tax bill and instead of somebody else having to have a whole infrastructure for creating the tax bills and doing that accounting, they piggyback with us. That's all it is. You could argue that there's too many School Boards maybe that you need less of them out there and you might be able to find some efficiencies. You can argue about the cost of delivering education. You know, Councillor Wyatt mentioned the increases in taxes but it's not relative just to inflation. It should be relative to education inflation because the School Boards may be seeing different issues than general inflation is seeing. For example, the salaries of teachers or the desire to have indexed pensions for teachers and I don't think there is…one of us standing here today that would argue that teachers are not one of the most valuable professionals in our city. I mean, you know my father was a teacher and I think we all have a great deal of respect for school teachers and the work that they do. And in spending 107% above inflation or whatever the number was, you also need to ask you, "What value did you get for that? Are more children graduating? Is the level of education higher? Is there more technology? Is there less children per class?" Those are the questions that need to be asked, not as simple as whether or not education taxes should be on the property tax bill. I'll leave it at that. I mean, this…to me, it is just very much…it's a structure that works right now. It brings value in ensuring that there is the ability of the local School Boards to do the work that we as citizens should be happy that they are doing.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: There you go, yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll begin by absolving the school divisions generally, with the bulk of the responsibility on this file. I was a school trustee. In fact, I was Chair of Finance on that school division. I thought it was fairly responsible, but I'll tell you this. In our budget, teachers' salaries comprised between 80 and 87% depending on the year of our operating budget, and there was no capital budget for school divisions. The only way you could appreciatively affect your budget was by cutting teachers, which is a difficult thing to do in the context of a school division. However, it has to be said in the same breath that the Louis Riel School Division, in September of 2010, is going to have half as many kids in kindergarten as they will in grade 12. There is going to be a rapid decline and there

has been a rapid decline in school-based populations in many, many parts of this city. The reason that's relevant is because school divisions obviously have to pay for full staffing and teachers in many, many schools. That's expensive. The most cost effective school division in the history of Manitoba, at least contemporary history, has been the St. James School Division. They achieved that for two reasons. Firstly, because they were blessed with a good commercial taxation base, which was, I guess more circumstance than anything else. But, in the same breath, we have to say that they also closed 18 schools. To close a school is exceedingly difficult, but it is sometimes the right thing to do. Recognizing that they had…they have half as many kids coming into kindergarten as they will have graduating from grade 12, the Louis Riel School Division put on to the table a discussion with the residents of St. Boniface and St. Vital, four schools that they wanted to close. One of the schools was Archwood School, Dr. Penner was another school, the other two schools were in St. Boniface and I don't recall their names. As I understand it, Archwood School currently houses 40 students. Throughout the course of that debate, Mr. Speaker, the discussion, difficult discussions, the Louis Riel School Division is having with the residents of St. Vital and St. Boniface, the Province of Manitoba, the Provincial Government stepped in and passed legislation outlawing the closing of schools. This received virtually no media attention. In fact it was probably welcomed by a few local residents and things returned to as they were. The result for the residents of St. Boniface and St. Vital is that in all probability, a zero percent tax increase which was the case last year, has now moved to a three plus percent tax increase for the residents of St. Boniface and St. Vital. Lucky us Councillor Vandal. This all could've been avoided had the Provincial Government simply stepped aside and allowed the school division to have these necessary discussions with the residents that they represent. I will go to my grave and never understand why the Provincial Government made that decision. It is a decision that is going to cost city taxpayers millions of dollars over the course of the next 10 years. Again, it received virtually no media attention probably because it affected us.

School divisions have to bargain individually with teachers. That costs millions. There should be one bargaining unit where the Province bargains with teachers and they can set fair rates but that doesn't happen either. We saw yesterday, our Provincial colleagues at Broadway announced a budget that will receive a deficit of, I don't know, 500 plus million dollars or so, and in the context of that we're doing things like this. We're bringing Hydro lines down around the lake now at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. We're imposing waste water obligations on citizens of this city, above a billion dollars, with no appreciable effect on the compound that it's designed to reduce. The spending and the budgeting that is going on in that Provincial house are bordering on catastrophic, and yet it doesn't seem to ring true and I can't understand it. Across Canada, we are the only city, save for Regina and Saskatoon that are expected to carry this sort of burden on our property tax rolls. It's been correctly stated already that the average is around 20%, up to 25%. Fully, five of the 13 jurisdictions, provincial territorial, in this nation, carry none. Could you imagine if suddenly overnight that was us? You heard my stats yesterday when I was speaking about the Operating Budget, how terrible it would be if people of Winnipeg now had to pay an extra thousand dollars on their property tax rolls in Winnipeg. A thousand dollars from every household in this city, wouldn't that be awful? It actually has happened on the school tax side of things. That actually did happen. The reason we're hamstrung, the reason we're handcuffed is because the hit to our citizenry, if we at all followed suit, would be double what it is in Edmonton, what it is in Vancouver, not Regina and Saskatoon in this circumstance but Kitchener, Toronto, Montréal, you name it. I'm going to support what we are doing today. I'm going to move the report forward because I don't believe in that type of thing. I think this is what has to be done. I think it's unfairly punitive to the school divisions. But, these things, somehow, have to be addressed. And, I feel often times in this Chamber that we are railing against the wall and we are not being heard. I'm probably right about that. I am right about that, says Councillor Smith. But to look at school divisions…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy gives extension of time of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Steeves: In the context of enrolment that is declining so rapidly, to not allow school divisions now to close schools, is scandalous. It is absolutely scandalous, but no one is saying anything. During the last leadership race for the Provincial New Democratic Party, I sent my colleague, Russ Wyatt a letter. Yes, I sent it to all of you as well. It asked him to bring up the idea of removing school tax or at least reducing school taxes on our property tax rolls. Councillor Wyatt said no. He would not entertain such a thing.

(Laughter)

Right. I guess it's a little bit different when you're not grand standing in the City Hall Chamber, and you actually have to play a role in making policy. He was only too eager to bring his candidate into City Hall and criticize us about a myriad of things that we were doing here at City Hall. But would he consider the prospect of reducing the amount of school taxes on our property tax rolls? The answer, I regret to inform, was no from Councillor Wyatt. And I am outing him, Mr. Speaker. He had a chance to deal with this with then candidate Ashton, and his answer to me was no. This was not important enough. So no, I will not be standing up with this Councillor today.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have supported…I've obeyed the law as a good Manitoba citizen and supported the school divisions for 29 years. No, I ain't doing it any more. I look at my own area, Seven Oaks School Division. Last two years has had the most new houses of any ward in the City of Winnipeg. Sorry, South End rich people, North End, Old Kildonan ward has had more new houses in the last two years in each of the last two years than any other ward in the City of Winnipeg. It hasn't got one new school. Got a high school, but it's not what it's all about. Not one new elementary or middle school. Again, taxes going up 4.3%. What for? They're getting 5% more money from the Province. They're upping this. Winnipeg is holding the line. Winnipeg School Division is not taking one cent more. If they happen to have any housing starts, they've even absorbed that. But, Seven Oaks is getting a lot more school tax because of the number of housing starts, and, they're still upping 4.3%. As Gord says, 80 some percent of school divisions' budget go for teachers' salaries. What are we negotiating with our unions? Oh, two and two and a half percent. What are the…we cry…we rail against this arbitration, binding arbitration that increases police officers' and fire salaries by 4%. These school divisions are giving people 5 % raises and more and hiring additional teachers. When I went to school we had 35 kids in a class. We all went on to whatever we wanted to go on to, university or some specialized training or whatever. Our education, I think, was heck of a lot better than my kid got in the public school system, part of our education. And what are they doing? They're down to what, one teacher for every 14 or 17 kids. And what are they doing? Nothing.

But, the reason…I'm not putting up with it. The reason I'm voting against it has to do with the bandits on Broadway. These people who took the special levy off of residential property a few years back have shifted it on to commercial property at an unbelievable rate. Last year they took $76 million from businesses in Winnipeg for the "special levy". I don't know Wong's Electric has any kids in school, but 76 million...this year, 90 and a half million, an increase of $15 million or over 19%. What gives them the right? We railed against school divisions. The last reassessment when we lowered our…we lowered our mill rate accordingly so that we would balance and some of the school divisions sucked it up. Well, I'll tell you what, yesterday we passed a mill rate decrease of 40% which covers the city-wide assessment change. The Province just lowered that special levy 19.7%. We went down 40%. They went down 19.7. They are taking because you can't say they're stealing, that wouldn't be right, so I won't. The bandits on Broadway are, though, taking half that. They are taking an extra $15 million from Winnipeg businesses to support giving more money to groups who get or soon are going to have a one to one teacher/student ratio. The system is broken. Screwed. I think it's…as we know it, irreparable. This should be a Provincial department. You know, there are whole countries that don't have School Boards. You know, back water countries like Germany. This whole system, when Winnipeg School Division No. 1 can hold the line exactly to the penny, absorbing new constructions actually, maybe lowering for some people, this is not the group with the greatest track record in the world. Others are still raising it over 4%, the larger ones. These small 77 or 14%, these are anomalies because 95%t of the houses in these divisions are outside the city. But to see the Province say we're giving more money for education despite our deficit, and then taking all that money out of the businesses of Winnipeg is…got to be one of the scams of all time, and as lame as it sounds, I just ain't going to put up with it, so Russ, you got my vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor O'Shaughnessy. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was not going to speak to the issue. Councillor O'Shaughnessy, (inaudible) about 30, this our 30th time of dealing with this mess that we're in, collecting school taxes which I feel is not our responsibility, but the one thing that I learned back in the 1970s when the majority of the 50 member Council we defeated the budget, former Mayor Late Steve Juba was so furious, he called a Special Meeting of Council within two days' time and gave us the riot act. Failing to do your responsibility, you could land up in jail not only lose your seat but you can land up in jail as the oath of office that each one of us take. We'd be in violation of the oath of office, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we've taken and I just want to read to Council the Public Schools Act. Times have changed since the 70s, big time and the Public Schools Act, Section 184, states "Council to impose education support levy. Upon receiving the statement referred to in Section 183, the Council of the municipality must set the mill rate and impose a levy on assessable property in municipality other than farm and residential property, sufficient to raise the amount specified in the statement." And it states, "must set", "must" not "should", they must. That is the law. And I…it would be very unfair. I know what we've argued about in the past. I know where Councillor Wyatt is coming from. I used to come from the same…from the same spectrum of politics, but the question is, when you take an oath of office, you swear to allegiance and to carry out your responsibility.

Former Councillor that sat in these Chambers from the 70s, Gary Filmon, left the Chambers to run for public office in the Provincial Legislature, got to be the Premier of Manitoba. Jim Ernst got to be a Minister. Nordman, your father, ran for the Provincial Legislation, was elected. Ducharme was elected from Council. He got to be Minister in the Filmon Government. Jerry Mercier, also ran was elected to be as a Minister. Councillor Smith ran, was elected as an MLA, back here now. And each and every one at that time had kept saying the same thing what we're saying here now. Once…now

there's a few that I'm missing here, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Eric Stefenson also got to be the Minister of Finance, was sat in this Chambers.

Each and every one when I saw them later when they took power, they had the same reply as all of the other Provincial Governments had said you have responsibility. This is the Act and you must obey. And also, with the former school trustees, those who are gone, not with us any more, those who are still present, holding the position as school trustees know for a fact they can do whatever they want because we will carry the burden for them. We're going to take the heat. When people get their tax bill, they get to see just the bottom line. What's a tax bill is. I remember one late former trustee had told me, he said "Harry, I don't give a damn what you guys do. We do it and we know darn well you've got a job to do and this is what you must do. This is what you must collect." They took that as a joke. We never see their printout on their budget. I did one year. A former Councillor, I mean a former trustee had given me the budget book. She just about lost her seat over that because that's supposed to be confidential. They don't go on the threshold like we do. When they had talked about raising school taxes, people that opposed to it, had they…the trustees had told them, the School Division, then what we'll do is we will lay off teachers. No, don't do that, don't do that. We want our kids to be taught. Each and every year, it's never been a zero, zero, zero with them. And they know what they can do. Look, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 31 MLAs. The majority of the House in the Manitoba Legislative Assembly, the majority of the House are representatives in the City of Winnipeg, 31 of them. Can't we send a message to the 31 that control "the Ledge"? No. Because we seem to be bickering back and forth, back and forth, jumping here, jumping back and like I said before, all of those that sat in the Council Chambers went to "the Ledge" and nothing changed.

The commission that was formed, headed by former Mayor Bill Norrie came in with a recommendation that they wanted to cut the school tax trustees, I mean the school trustees like they did with Council from 50 to 29 and now to 15, and it went to the Government. The Government took no action on that commission's report. They took no action at all. As you know, majority of the school trustees, what political clout do they carry? They carry the clout right now of those who are in government. So they aren't going to rock the boat and they aren't going to ruffle feathers. Why they are going to disturb something? Because you know, the more they get, because the better for them. And, so when you're debating something like this and I would suggest, I'm standing my point because A. Law is the law, under the Public Schools Act, this is legislation. Councillors I know you can voice your opinion, you can rant and rave, you can send a message, you could put out a newsletter to your constituents, each and every one of us, especially the 31 MLAs that represent part of the Councillor's wards, send them out. Give them a loud message. The only way you can get something like this across is to get the majority of the people that will realize and those then who seek public office, they can take that to the…to the voters of Winnipeg, and then you can make those changes. Without that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we're just barking up the wrong tree. I know I was…I was part of that years back. I know we were close to losing our seats at that time and if you don't believe me, well you can check the School Act and the Legislation also. Read the oath of office that each one of us has taken. We've sworn to and we have an obligation to carry out due diligence. Our obligation is to carry out the responsibility that's been given upon us and to us for us to carry out the best we know how and this is something we must pass. We have no choice. If we fail to do that, I will suggest one thing is that if Council decides to go in that direction, I would like to see Mayor Katz take the lead role, march on to the Legislative grounds like former communist Joe Zuken used to do. He used to go march, parade up and down and send a message and get a lot of people behind him to see if he could get things changed.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. I believe we do have to send a message to Broadway. However, that message should not be in us not voting for this today. We have to legislate, but the message should be working with our School Boards going as a joint voice. I can tell you School Boards are as frustrated as the City are. School Boards have one revenue source. They…well, two revenue sources, it's property taxes and it's government grants. There are no other choices. Unlike the City, we can't charge user fees, they can't charge user fees, sorry to get my words still mixed up a little bit. They can't charge schools for water usage, they can't charge kids for bus service, they can't charge schools for electricity because they are all under the same umbrella. So they really are captured with really only two sources of revenue, and they can't even sell property any more. That was actually, that's now as we know is closed so they can't generate revenues that way. So School Boards have this very constrained ability to actually meet the demand. And why (inaudible)? Well, I know the City is doing their best but again, School Boards are our partners. School Boards are doing the before and after school programs. They want to do more. We talked about…we heard today they just do what they want. Well, I know as a past Chair of one of the most…the largest divisions in the city and past many years Finance Chair and Building Chair, that I know that we want to do a lot more. We want to make sure that every kid, when all school trustees do, and I think that we all do as a City Council. We want to make sure that kids that go to school in the morning are fed so they can actually learn that day. You know what? Sad to tell you, schools take that role on because no one else is. They have to deal with us. They also…the parents are not around, so this is just a fact of life but education is a right for all. Just because the parents aren't engaged with their children doesn't mean that we say to those children good luck in your life. It's a school's responsibility and the society's responsibility to help those children

and unfortunately the buck stops in that classroom. Teachers have to deal with these issues. There's kids coming to school with no proper clothing in the middle of winter. Well, schools have to find ways to give those kids jackets. Or what do we say? Not my problem? Well, other levels of governments can't do that, not my problem is someone else's problem but when you are sitting in the…6, 7 hours a day with those kids for a huge chunk of time, it is your problem. Is it the parents' problem? Absolutely. But the school must…that takes a lot of more resources to reach out to those parents and with social services and with other agencies to try to address some of these systemic Issues. Do they want to do that? Much more, just don't have the money.

So there's a whole list of things that school divisions would love to do, so they do not do what they want to do. What they do is they focus in on the classroom, which is our core responsibility and that's where you'll see the cuts always happening and they're happening as it's happening in the City of Winnipeg, as it's happening in School Boards. We're tightening in the reins a bit and kids are falling off to the wayside. After hour school programs are getting shut down because there just isn't those incredible volunteers that are the teachers that are staying after school. They're getting burned out. We don't have that volume of teachers now that are staying so late night as they used to. Again, that was free service by teachers who are staying after hours coaching soccer, coaching basketball, band whatever. They don't get paid for that. Some school divisions compensate hours which is a nominal token. They don't get paid for that and yes, pattern bargaining that happens in the school division is a serious problem. It is a serious problem in a place like Mystery Lake, which is up north, very distinct school division. Set the bar at four and a half, five percent and that ricochets through the whole system. Yes, we with the School Boards and other stake holders should go to the Province to say this is not sustainable. We need to help our School Board.

We should also be working with School Boards to look at ways that we can work with them better. Can we start doing more joint youth agreements, start working with our recreational facilities and our programming? Can we start looking at stuff helping in some areas of accounting? I think what we do, having a School Division do their own assessment, that's just a waste of resources. We do that very well in the City. We provide a valuable service to the school divisions and it is good money for value so I do agree with that very much. So I believe sending this message of a protest vote here, yes I know it's directed at Broadway, but I believe the message that people will hear out in the general public is this. We, the City Council do not support our school divisions. I don't believe that's true. I believe this City Council does support the fine work our school trustees and our teachers do for the thousands and thousands of children that they serve every day. So that's the message I believe this will send out, however, we do need to address the issue with Broadway. I look forward to working with my colleagues at the Winnipeg School Division to try to get that addressed. The 80/20 split, it's still in the process. Again, we have to be realistic though. We have to ask ourselves, "Where is the cash coming from?" Is it going to come from income tax or property tax? It's going to come from somewhere and that's where it's kind of held up right. So again if we want to be a part of the solution, let's be part of the solution. This statement that we are going…that's been offered today of saying no is actually counter productive to working together in a way that will be better for all our children in Winnipeg, so I'll be…I won't be…I will be (inaudible) the Motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This is a reassessment year so on top of the inequities of charging property tax owners for the system…for the education system. I mean, education has to be paid for one way or another whether it's through income taxes, whether it's based on property. I just don't feel that property assessment is an equitable way to be charging to be paying for our education system.

People this year are going to be seeing…are going to be getting a tax bill shock. Despite, you know, the special levy components, when you look at the Assessment Roll in the City of Winnipeg, the portion of the tax roll that comes from residential properties is a greater portion of the entire pie than it was previously. As a result, even if you went up the average percentage, if you went up 78% which is the average single family home assessment, your education taxes are going up substantially. Looking at our small home in North Kildonan, our assessment went up 74.7%. Our education taxes are going up over 70 dollars this year alone, just again, and we went up less than the average for property…residential properties in the city.

It's also inappropriate that this year the Provincial Government has chosen not to increase the education property tax credit. In '06, the credit was $400, in '07 it was $525, an increase of $125. In '08, the next year it went up to $600, an increase of $75. From '08 to '09 it went from six to 650, an increase of $50. This is the year where that support is needed most because of the reassessment and it's not there. Our constituents, the working families that elect us are going to be a greater hit this year than in other years past.

Anyways, we do have to pass this eventually whether it's today or tomorrow whatever. I don't care. I'll come back. I'm going to vote against it. I realize that, you know, it's merely symbolic. If you can think of another way to get attention, I'd

be…if it's more effective, we've done this before, great. But again, I'm going to vote against it today. We'll be back to vote for it tomorrow. Let's see if we can get some attention around this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be voting against this Clause, and the reason I'm going to be doing that is I want democracy to take place. I want the School Board members to realize they have responsibility and we shouldn't have it on our tax bill. Now, I appreciate Councillor Lazarenko, his suggestions, and Councillor Orlikow. You know, in effect, voting against this doesn't mean that that's the end of the action we should be taking. I'm voting this way, I'm not being critical of the School Boards. I think they do a tremendous…I'm an ex-teacher. I value the School Boards. I value what they're doing. So my vote is not anti-School Board, it's pro-School Board. It's giving them more power to communicate directly with the taxpayers and I think that's what they should be doing. I don't think I should be voting on things I know nothing about. You know, it's interesting that the two speakers that came on strong in support, Councillor Steeves and Councillor Swandel, they didn't give…you know they just talked. You know, they just gave words. They're not prepared to do anything.

Councillor Steeves: As opposed what?

(Laughter)

Councillor Smith: The fact is…the fact is, if we do not support this Clause…

Councillor Steeves: Do you want an interpretive dance?

Councillor Smith: Well, maybe with you…but the fact…like they just talk. Talk is cheap, you know, they're not willing to do anything.

Councillor Steeves: A Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. (inaudible) Parliament circular where they actually printed the number of words that each person had said. I didn't want to be one of the persons without enough words on my list at all times, so that's my fear.

Mr. Speaker: It's not a Point of Order, proceed.

Councillor Smith: I will communicate with the MP, Jim Malloway, about the need to record the number of words that Councillor Steeves gives. You know, he talked, he gave a beautiful speech but he gave no suggestion of really how to change things. You know, we should in effect not support this Clause. We should actually work out a campaign to go ahead and communicate working with the School Board so we can get some action, and that's why I like Councillor Lazarenko's…some of his suggestions. But let's…you know, why don't we be unanimous on this? It's not…I'm quite willing to be a cell mate with the Councillor from Transcona because I think we've got to act now and I think it's time to do so. So I hope that the Mayor will, in effect, be supportive of voting against this Clause. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Closing, Mayor. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, first let me tell you that I very much appreciate all the comments that have been made during this discussion. I can tell you emphatically I have expressed my own view on several occasions, as was alluded to earlier during the City, the State Address. I made the comments, and I can tell you when I listened to Councillor Wyatt speak, I didn't disagree with one thing he said. He is right. And I know that every year it's been done and it's been symbolic and it's trying to send a message. I think sometimes it's unfortunate that in order to get media coverage, you have to take these types of steps, but that seems to be the reality because no one's talking about it. And, I can tell you, as much as I want to vote against it because in my heart, I think it does send the message, in my heart, I know they need to find a new mechanism for funding education. In my heart, I totally support the School Boards and the system, and I think we all want our children to get educated. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that if I did vote against this Motion, it would be successful and would cause chaos, and as the Mayor, I do not believe it's my role, but I think Councillor Wyatt can take great satisfaction in the fact that half or maybe more of Council believes it's time for change, and I'm hoping this vote which I've already predicted what it will be, will send a message and maybe will make the front page of the paper and maybe will be the top story of CBC. There is something wrong here, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't that long ago where the Province of Manitoba offered School Boards…offered them, here is more money, don't raise the taxes, and they disregarded and did that. Can you imagine if the Province did that for us how we would embrace it? It's never happened. There is a problem and I will say this on the record, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's going to happen or who will be here in 2011, but if there is not genuine talk to address this issue and come up with a better mechanism, come up with a separate tax bill, whatever it may be, this will be the last time that yours truly will support you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors on Item 1, recorded vote. All in favour of Item 1, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Smith, and Wyatt.

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

Mr. Speaker: It's carried. Motions. There's one Notice of Motion which will be going to the April meeting of Council. That's Motion No. 1.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg had previously been involved in a Municipal Partnerships program with the City of Kampala, Uganda to strengthen local government involvement and processes and service delivery initiatives;

AND WHEREAS a Member of Parliament in the Republic of Uganda has proposed the Anti-Homosexuality Bill, 2009, that would target lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender Ugandans, their friends, families and neighbours and anyone else who fails to report them to the authorities, whether they are inside or outside of Uganda;

AND WHEREAS the proposed law:

(a) would impose criminal penalties up to life imprisonment for persons engaging in consensual same-sex relationships;

(b) might inflict the death penalty on persons who engage in homosexual activity while living with HIV; and

(c) would criminalize third parties who failed or refused to report homosexual activity of their friends, neighbours or relatives;

AND WHEREAS the international community, including the Government of Canada, the U.S. Government, human rights groups and others have expressed concern about serious potential violations of the human rights of homosexual individuals and even any unmarried Ugandan adult resulting from this proposed law;

AND WHEREAS human rights groups have identified this proposed legislation as potentially causing severe health problems, hindering the fight against HIV/AIDS by preventing those with the illness from seeking medical attention;

AND WHEREAS commentators have raised concerns about the impact of this proposed legislation on the political process and the rule of law in Uganda as it has the potential to create a political climate of fear where allegations of homosexuality are used to extort or silence government critics and stifle dissent;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg City Council join with the Government of Canada and the international community to denounce Uganda's Anti-Homosexuality Bill, 2009 and any similar legislative proposal.

Mr. Speaker: Consideration of By-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law numbered 28/2010, 29/2010, 33/2010, 34/2010, 35/2010, and 36/2010.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 28/2010, 29/2010, 33/2010, 34/2010, 35/2010 and 36/2010.

Mayor Katz: Bear with me, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I will move that By-laws numbered 28/2010, 29/2010, 33 to 36/2010, both Inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 28/2010, 29/2010, and 33/2010 to 36/2010, both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: And I will move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 28/2010, 29/2010, 33/2010 to 36/2010, both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. Councillor Vandal.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker to the Mayor. Mr. Mayor, Bus Rapid Transit is rapidly moving forward. We've approved a $2.5 million expropriation today, tunnels are being drilled as we speak, yet rumours persist that you are…do not support Bus Rapid Transit so I'm wondering if you can give this Council and Winnipeggers clarity on your thoughts on Bus Rapid Transit?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: My thoughts are very clear and very specific. I put them on the record. Mr. Speaker, with Stage 1 of Rapid Transit from downtown to Jubilee, there is very little doubt in most people's minds that we have addressed a large part of the problem that existed in the past from moving people on buses as quickly as possible and that's basically the mid-town bridge and crazy corner. It was a very good thing to do. As you know, there is Stage 2 of that as well, Mr. Speaker, and I am continuing to discuss with the Premier, going to Ottawa with a plan. As you know in the past we discussed the Transportation Authority, we're working on a transportation plan, hopefully coming up with a ten year plan if that be the case whereby we can bring Winnipeg into the 21st century and access funds from Ottawa to get Light Rail Transit. I can tell you the previous Premier, Premier Doer, after we agreed to Stage 1, basically said no more BRT, LRT, we'll fund it 50/50 and we'll go to Ottawa and bring them in for a third. I'm hoping that Premier Selinger is prepared to do the exact same thing. I believe Winnipeggers deserve the very best. I also believe if we want to get people and we truly want to get people to leave their cars at home, then let's get them something that they will use on a regular basis which would be LRT. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, if we care about the environment, would you rather use electricity and give Manitoba Hydro more business or use gas? That's my position. Hasn't changed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second Question Councillor?

Councillor Vandal: I believe several weeks ago Premier Selinger at the Chamber of Commerce event said that he thought that Phase 2 of BRT should move forward. When you do Phase 1, you should follow up with Phase 2, so my question to you is given that the Premier has given a public answer that we should move forward on Phase 2, will you commit to Phase 2 of Bus Rapid Transit?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, if there is a commitment for new funding, money coming from Ottawa and the Province that Councillor Vandal is aware of, if he shares that with us I would love to hear it because I haven't heard that as yet.

Mr. Speaker: Final question, Councillor.

Councillor Vandal: Final Question, Mr. Mayor. Will you assure this Council that Phase 2 of Bus Rapid Transit will take priority over any new roadways in the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, yesterday all I heard from Councillors was about our decaying infrastructure how it's falling apart. If there are Councillors on this floor who have changed their mind since yesterday and believe our infrastructure is fine and we don't have the current $3.9 billion deficit, I'd love to hear that. That's not what I heard yesterday. I will fight to fix our streets and I will fight to get LRT here and make sure that Winnipeg comes into the 21st century with the Transportation Authority, with a transportation plan, and we do the right thing and we stop thinking of ourselves as a second class city, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. We are seeing more and more conversions, Mr. Speaker, of rental apartments in a number of areas in the city. Corydon Avenue is a good example of conversions of rental apartments into condos at a very speedy rate. It's a real concern that it's going to become almost impossible to find affordable rental accommodation in many parts of our city. Other cities have put rules in place to restrict these conversions based on the amount of rental housing and other municipal tools that they've used. What my question is, to the Mayor, is what does the Mayor plan to do to address this problem because right now we're doing absolutely nothing?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, during delegations to Executive Policy on the budget which was only a week ago, I remember this actually came up where a couple of people did make these comments. The facts are that this is something that I think, you know, we could look into. But if Councillor Gerbasi is asking me right now, what I as Mayor am going to do, I'm going to do my homework. I would assume that Councillor Gerbasi would do the same but if she's already made up her mind and wants to share it with us I'd be happy to hear that, Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: In 2006…I'm just going to move on to another and we can discuss that later. In 2006 Council approved secondary planning priorities which included the Corydon area and pre-planning studies as you know were done which recommended further planning work was needed, and this is an issue I did raise in the budget process at Property Committee so it's not coming out of nowhere. But yet, since the pre-planning studies which recommended further planning work, nothing has been done and residents and businesses in the area have been promised, through the process of the pre-planning work, and they were certainly given the impression based on Council's approval of Corydon as a priority in 2006, that we were going to be having a neighbourhood plan such as the successful one we have in Osborne Village. And…so my…I would like to ask the Mayor what am I supposed to tell the residents in Corydon as to why their neighbourhood is no longer getting a plan, that there is no date or time lines and absolutely no actions since the pre-planning studies were done, Mr. Mayor?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Gerbasi for that question and my recommendation to Councillor Gerbasi, assuming and I don't doubt for a moment that everything that was just shared with us is accurate, I think it would be appropriate for Councillor Gerbasi and I to have a meeting with our planner and the head of the department and exactly find out so that we can give a definitive and accurate response to the residents and I would be happy to arrange for that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your final Question, Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much. I look forward to that meeting. That would be great. My final question is we've been talking for several years about having a downtown housing plan. We've also been waiting a long time for a report evaluating the Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative. Again my question is where are these reports and why has this work not been completed if it hasn't?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. I will take that under referral. I will get the information. I'll respond to Councillor Gerbasi. I am not aware of exactly the details of what you're referring to so I certainly will get back to her on that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel, your first Question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, this…the idea of the second phase of BRT that was raised earlier by Councillor Vandal, we know that in the first phase we had to do borrowing just for the City and also borrow money for the Province that will cash flow back to us over a number of periods of time. Knowing that BRT 2, the second phase is in the realm of $220 million, even at one-third of that it's a significant challenge for us to find that money. Would we be…would you be supporting using borrowing to do that second phase of BRT if that was the reality if we had to be a one-third partner in it?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Swandel, I think the Councillor's information is accurate. My understanding is that Stage 2 of Rapid Transit is $220 million. I have yet to see a commitment from the other levels of government for their total share of that, which is why I asked Councillor Vandal if he had any information that I wasn't aware of. So that's number one. Number two, for the first stage we did…the City took on the borrowing and the Province is cash flowing it back to us over a period of time, similar to what we did for Disraeli. I think I want to get input from all of Councillors, Council to decide whether or not, one, we want to do that kind of borrowing, two, if we have priorities and we've decided to borrow money, would that be the priority before anybody moves forward? Those are very valid questions and I think they need some serious discussion and debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. It was a good answer and I like the comment, priority…priorities and that. And in that vein are we using a cost benefit analysis process to establish our priorities whether it's direct capital spending or borrowing money? It would seem to me that any of the projects that we do, whether it's on roads or Bus Rapid Transit that cost benefit analysis would be a key component. Are we doing that today?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Who said that? (Laughing) Quite often on the floor of Council, there will be members who refer to cost benefit analysis. I think what we're trying to do right now is do long term planning for our infrastructure, taking into consideration the cost of maintaining the roads properly as part of that cost so we actually know what we need to maintain our infrastructure which, unfortunately, has not happened for many, many decades, and I think the short answer to Councillor Swandel's question, which I'm sure he knows. No, I don't believe we do that on a regular basis.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question.

Councillor Swandel: That leads me to my final question which is perhaps the Mayor would be kind enough to enlighten us as to what we're doing in the area of an asset management strategy to ensure that when we're spending money on infrastructure that we're spending it wisely. Do we have an asset management strategy in place? Do we have one coming? What is happening in that area?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I could be wrong but I believe in the last couple of weeks we did move forward on an asset management strategy basically outlining exactly what I was talking about. It's not just a matter of finding the capital to build new assets. You need to include in that cost the money to maintain it. Otherwise you end up in the same problem. So my specific answer is yes, we are looking and starting to proceed. I think it started a couple weeks ago, the process, towards an asset management strategy, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure it was on the Agenda of EPC.

Mr. Speaker: Is that it for questions? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, last July, reports came out about the state of our infrastructure, 380 million just for existing infrastructure annual deficit and the Mayor's now confirmed that we don't do any cost benefit analysis when it comes to new infrastructure projects, that we don't have an asset management strategy and there is clearly…we haven't seen any plan come forward. When is the Mayor going to bring forward a plan to start addressing these outstanding issues which clearly have been going on now for the last number of years? We tried to bring it to ahead with outlining the problems last July but there has been no clear report following up from then. How are we going to start to deal with the issues which quite correctly you indicated to Councillor Swandel, there is no asset management strategy in place. What are we going to do to start to address that? And when are we going to see an asset management strategy?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I did make the comment to Councillor Swandel, we are now moving forward on that strategy. One has never existed. That's number one. Number two, just for clarification, I believe my comment was is that we do not always do a cost benefit analysis in certain situations. It is done and other people ask about it. So from my point of view, we're now taking a completely different approach with our asset management and planning for the future and as Councillor Wyatt knows, once you start a process, it takes a little while before we get the feedback but it will go through the normal process and hopefully in the near future we will have an asset management strategy which I think is extremely important for our city.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question, Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's been six years as the Mayor has been in an office and we've now had a clear report last July outlining the state of the City's infrastructure. The Mayor has indicated he's agreed that there has to be a proper asset management strategy for our existing infrastructure. He is indicating a report is coming forward, but when is that report going to come forward? Are we going to see it before the election? Are we going to see it after the election or are we going to see it in a month, two months? When can we expect that strategy?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, number one, it would be impossible for me to answer that question but on behalf of Councillor Wyatt I will certainly ask the department once we move forward how long it will take. I don't have the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question.

Councillor Wyatt: In the past, the Mayor was in support of alternative revenues. Can the Mayor elaborate now what position has been taken to the Provincial Government requesting alternate revenues at this point from the Province?

Mayor Katz: I think in light of yesterday's budget, I'm sure the Councillor is very cognizant that the Province is not feeling very flush or in the mood to share what they have. They obviously have their own challenges right now, but the Councillor should be very much aware of the fact that there is still on going dialogue with the AMM and we will continue to look for new ways of getting revenue and new ways of dealing with these issues, because clearly the ones we're so dependent on today are regressive and we need a change. But it doesn't just come from one piece of the puzzle. We're dealing with the entire AMM on this issue and I know the Councillor is aware of that.

Mr. Speaker: Before I get to the second time around for…is there anyone else wants a question…ask a question of the Mayor? If not, okay. Councillor Vandal, okay now first Councillor Gerbasi and then Councillor Vandal for the second time.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To follow up on the Rapid Transit issue, given that we don't have a study or a plan yet in terms of the transportation plan that I assume we'll be…I assume we'll be looking at a number of transportation options, not only looking at an LRT study. I assume we'll be looking at an overall transportation plan which will study all the options, but given we haven't done that yet and that will probably take about a year after Plan Winnipeg is tabled, and given the knowledge that we all have that LRT is about four to six times the cost, so a 220 million project could be as much as a billion dollars for that one phase of transit, as much as we all would love to see it if it makes sense once we study it, in the short term…oh and one other thing. I just wanted to….yeah I'm allowed to do a preamble, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but not five minutes.

Councillor Gerbasi: And one other aspect that was mentioned is in terms of the technology, the current project Is being built to be adaptable to LRT in the future and you could also change the bus technology to have hybrid or electric buses so really in the short term, we have a…we are building Phase 1 of BRT and given that the pro…the Premier although he hasn't signed an agreement to fund it, has publicly stated several times that he is in support of the project. Will the Mayor talk to the Premier about his willingness to pay that cost? I mean, usually if you ask for another level of government, you have to ask them for the money and I want to know, is our Mayor asking the Premier for the money for the second phase of BRT or are you asking it for a number of other priorities instead, because some day we're going to build LRT?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, thank you for the question. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the last Council meeting, so obviously approximately a month ago, where I listed all 11 projects that were submitted to the Provincial Government regarding Building Canada Funds. I'm sure everybody here remembers that. I listed the project and the amount. That's number one. Number two, I can tell you emphatically, that in my one on one discussions with the Premier, no one has the answer for where the money is, i.e., the shortfall, for doing Stage 2 of Rapid Transit of $220 million. Bottom line is there was no more money. Number three, in the end, Council will decide. If Council is putting in money, it will be Council's decision where they believe the money should go and where it's best. Number four, Mr. Speaker, I can emphatically tell you that LRT has changed drastically, Mr. Speaker and the cost of LRT is much less than what Councillor Gerbasi was referring to. We've had these discussions and I've had discussions with Ottawa on this issue as well. Number four, Mr. Speaker, or number five I should say, if you want to get all three levels of government involved in a project, specifically, the Federal Government, and I think Councillor Gerbasi knows that there is always more funding coming for green projects on a regular basis, the idea is to go there in advance and make your position clear and what you're looking for, so when that funding is available, you are number one on the list. So you don't lose out to Ottawa, Toronto, Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver, Montréal, et cetera. I think it's time for Winnipeg to be first.

Mr. Speaker: Gerbasi, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: How long will it…

Mr. Speaker: Just hold it, hold it for a second.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh, pardon me.

Mr. Speaker: Section 14 of 6, any preamble to question poll shall be as brief as possible and excessively long preamble is not permitted. No preambles allowed in a supplementary question. That is our rules and regulations. Okay proceed to your second question. What's your second question?

Councillor Gerbasi: Throw out my preamble? (Laughing) I'm sorry I'm losing my train of thought with all that procedure, excuse me. Mr. Speaker, when…through you to the Mayor, when will we see a study showing the costs of this proposed changes of the proposed LRT because I've sat on the Canadian Urban Transit Association Board Members Committee for five or six years and they're pretty well versed in the cost of these things and they don't seem to understand what numbers we're using, like these numbers I'm using are well understood across the country by other transit experts so I'd like to know where your numbers are coming from Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, just for clarity. Number one, Stage 2, Phase 2, of the rapid transit, right now we're looking at $220 million. That's the number that's been discussed. That's the number that's on the table and all three levels of government are aware of this. So there's no misunderstanding there whatsoever. Number two, Mr. Speaker, is that there have been dialogues as Councillor Gerbasi knows. We've looked at all sorts of different options and I can tell you right now that coming from people who build these, these are the numbers that they've come up with. By the same token, Mr. Speaker, we've also never approved any specific monies to basically create a plan and to give any details at this point in time would be impossible because we don't have a plan and we never approved any funding for it. All we're doing right now is a transportation study at this stage of the game where this Council did approve a plan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question.

Councillor Gerbasi: So, Mr. Mayor, are you saying to this Council that you're prepared to put on hold any further BRT and we're not going to wait for a plan for LRT sometime. It's an unspecified future date, so we can just forget about…we can be the Phase 1 BRT city and we can just stop there. Is that what you are saying, Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, no that's not what I'm saying. That's what Councillor Gerbasi is saying. Mr. Speaker, we've approved Stage 1 and it's being built. It's not going to be finished tomorrow, and what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, if there is an opportunity, the least that any elected official should do at any level of Government, be it Municipal, Provincial or Federal, explore the opportunity for us to have the best that's available. That's what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker and hopefully that will happen.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal, your first question.

Councillor Vandal: Premier Selinger had said no to LRT Phase 2. Minister Toe has said not to LRT Phase 2, yet you want to bring Premier Selinger on a trip to fantasy island to discuss a fantasy project using fantasy dollars. Mr. Speaker, why don't you just, why does not the Mayor just commit to Phase 2 of Bus Rapid Transit and move forward in good faith?

Mr. Speaker: What's your question? What's your question?

Mayor Katz: I'll be happy to answer.

Mr. Speaker: Well, there's no question.

Mayor Katz: No, there was. I got the question. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, go ahead.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead. Councillors…Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, number one, in my dialogue with the Premier, he never, ever, ever said no to LRT. As a matter of fact, what he said to me, if there is funding, we should go, and my comment is you go before there is funding. That's number one. Number two, I have spoken to many Members of Parliament and other Ministers and Senators who basically support LRT in our city contrary to what Councillor Vandal has said. And Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting and as you said, it was hard to interpret the question. You know, yesterday I listened to a lot of rhetoric from Councillor Vandal and the gist of it is listen to what I'm saying today, ignore what I said and did when I was a Member of EPC and you know what? That's just the reality and that's the way the show continues.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, your first question, second time around.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, the…just on the issue of the asset management, we could have an asset management strategy of course but the key thing with a strategy is to actually fund the assets and to maintain them. Ultimately comes down back to an issue of revenue and the source of revenue to do exactly that. We've had debates in this Chamber in the last four years now in terms of having a municipal sales tax independent. We as a Chamber voted in favour of a Motion that went to the AMM for 1% municipal sales tax voted last summer. I'm going to get to my question. I've got a preamble!

Mr. Speaker: Yes, yes, I told you, Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: I can have a preamble, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Not five minutes.

Councillor Wyatt: We voted. We voted to…it's going to be longer as long as you keep interrupting me.

Mr. Speaker: No, don't let me put you out of order. Now, ask your question Councillor, please.

Councillor Wyatt: My question is very simple. We've made Motion after Motion on different issues asking for different forms of revenue from the Province. What is the Mayor's position? Is the Mayor in favour of a 1% municipal sales tax to control our destiny taxes as was referred to as one…from one businessman here in Winnipeg? What's the Mayor's position in terms of alternate revenues for the city?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, number one, we need alternate revenues, we need new revenues. I think everybody on the floor of Council would agree with that. That's number one. Number two, yesterday on the floor of Council during the budget debate you heard many people who were upset with user fees and as you can see, in the Province's budget they are using user fees. We're obviously trying to do something where we have cost recovery and I think we should continue to proceed. on that. By the same token, Mr. Speaker, if you are to do…if a 1% sales tax and if you recall a long time ago there was a call for 1% of the Province's existing Provincial Sales Tax and one new percent. You know that ended up going nowhere. I think Councillor Wyatt is very cognizant of the fact that probably would not get a wonderful reception today but what I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, if there is any kind of tax such as that, it has to be Provincial-wide because you have to have an even playing field. So that's the comment that I'll make to that.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question.

Councillor Wyatt: What steps is the Mayor taking then to have a coordinated Provincial-wide approach in terms of taking this issue to the Province and coming forward with a very clear proposal in terms of what our alternate revenue should be?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, with the AMM, which we are a member of, we're fully supporting the fact that they are addressing this issue and coming up with a potential, shall we say, a brain trust to come up with ideas that we can hopefully support Provincially-wide and only then would it be successful. Winnipeg alone cannot do it. It has to be everybody involved across the Province.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question.

Councillor Wyatt: On that point, Mr. Speaker, since last fall and as late as December, a letter was sent from the AMM to the Mayor attempting to assemble exactly that brain trust, that blue ribbon panel, but it's been held up here in the city. There's been no response and no action. Is the Mayor going to take action on this if he truly believes in this issue?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, it doesn't happen very often but I regret to inform Councillor Wyatt that he is incorrect. We've taken action on this and that's all I'm going to say at this stage of the game, so…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty, your first question.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week the City opened officially unveiled and officially opened the new water treatment plant. I know the majority of my colleagues weren't able to be present. Could the Mayor let us know what exactly the residents have now purchased for approximately $300 million?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: The finest quality drinking water in North America, in my opinion. It tastes best…there is no…there is no smell to it. Mr. Speaker, one of our most precious assets that we have, that we've been getting from Shoal Lake for all these years, as opposed to the way it used to be treated along the route is now treated in that plant. I don't know how many Councillors…I know there were at least two Councillors that I recall that were able to, or maybe three, I take it back, because I was on the tour with Councillor O'Shaughnessy and I know Councillor Vandal was there and I believe Councillor Orlikow was there as well. So three Councillors were able to make the time and I'm assuming they took the tour and I think you will see that we got major bang for our buck and we should be extremely proud of that new facility, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question? No further questions? Councillors once again I just want to repeat the Procedural By-law. Section 14…no, no, just a minute. Some of you are not listening. "Any preamble to a question shall be as brief as possible and an excessively long preamble is not permitted. No Preamble is allowed in a supplementary question." Please take that as a note.

Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development. No report. Motions. None. Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Swandel.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Swandel: Let me just get to my page here, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 8/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 8/2010.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I'll move that By-law No. 8/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 8/2010.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I will move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 8/2010 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. Councillor Vandal.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a report on housing and probably some Provincial housing initiatives that are in the works that are…should be complete by now. I'm wondering if the Chairperson could bring this Council up to speed with housing in the downtown.

Councillor Swandel: I believe that report…I haven't seen the report yet but I can tell you that I believe it's part of the Plan Winnipeg, OurWinnipeg process and that information should be coming forward to everybody in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal, your second question.

Councillor Vandal: Can you update us on the tax increment financing from the Provincial end where that is in the process and when we'll be seeing something tangible in our downtown?

Councillor Swandel: That's…I appreciate you asking that question. The tax increment financing piece in the Province is still in the hands of the Province. There's been some back and forth between the City and the Province as to what that will ultimately look like. We have that commitment from the Province on a project specific basis that anything that they do agree to at the end of this process will be retroactive so that maintains a level playing field retroactive back to January 1st so projects that are in-stream won't end up in an arena of unfair competition because new projects will have better incentives than the older projects. So the details of it will be announced as soon as the Province is finished through its process and hopefully we'll see that hit the street and maybe bring another two or three hundred new units into the downtown in the next year.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question? No further Questions? Standing Policy Committee, Property and Development, report of February 2nd, 2010. Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 2, 2010

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Regarding February 2nd, 2010, I'll move the Item 9 be considered at the recommendation of EPC, to file the Item, be adopted.

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

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MARCH 2, 2010

Councillor Steeves: The report of March 2nd, 2010. I'll introduce report and I move the Adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 11.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions. No By-laws. Question period. None. Standing Policy Committee on Protection Community Services. No report. Motions of any? None. Consideration of By-laws, none. Question period. No questions? Councillor Smith, you had a question?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, my question to the head of the Committee, why are we using Dursban as a pesticide? On the label, it says "This product is not to be used in and around homes or other residential areas such as parks, school grounds, playing fields." Why are we using this poison? In effect it's detrimental especially to small children.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Councillor Smith for the question. We're no longer going to be using that product in 2012 from what I understand, Mr. Speaker. It's currently in use now. It's currently an approved product and I understand we're working on some biological initiatives as well.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question, Councillor.

Councillor Smith: Can you tell me, are we using it presently?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, we are currently using the product.

Councillor Smith: Why?

Mr. Speaker: That's your third question is why? What is it? He asked you why, Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, it's an approved product currently and from my understanding, the Federal Government will probably be coming up with legislation to ban the product in 2012 from what I'm told.

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

Councillor Vandal: Why wait till 2012 to…why don't we do it right away?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, yes. It's currently…we're allowed to use it. It's not…you know there is information out there that…that says that we are going to be moving away from that product. We are actually using a biological…we're looking at biological controls right now and I'll certainly take up that question to our entomologist at the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Let's get on to the Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, report of March 9, 2010, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED MARCH 9, 2010

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll move that Clauses 1 and… well actually, I'll move Clause 1 be moved as Consent.

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

Councillor Clement: And then No. 2, I'm not sure why it actually came like this because my recollection at the Public Works Committee was we did not pass what it says here. We had a discussion about it and it was decided that it should go to EPC for discussion but we never made a Motion on it as other than that. So, what it says here is that the Standing Policy Committee approved it…approved the Administrative Report which was to delegate the authority on the Put and Pay Agreements to the CAO, I guess. But, that's not really what we did. I know that's what it says we did.

Mr. Speaker: Do you want to move a Motion to send it back to EPC?

Councillor Clement: No, no, no. I want to move what Executive Policy Committee did which says to file it.

Mr. Speaker: File it, okay. You heard that. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I was going to ask for clarification because I know when I was at Public Works a couple of months ago that the Chairperson voted for it and I'm just asking for why the change of heart? I was under the impression you had voted for it at the last Public Works as well but then voted against it at EPC so I'm asking for clarification.

Councillor Clement: Because at EPC the first time, I did vote for it. It didn't appear to be…actually, no, we laid it over. I'm sorry. We had a whole bunch of delegations there. We did not vote for it.

Mr. Speaker: No. What's your Point of Order?

Councillor Swandel: I don't think we're in question period, if the Item's been stood down, Councillor Vandal is…

Mr. Speaker: He spoke. He asked…

Councillor Swandel: Does anybody else want to speak to it would be the next business before Councillor Clement got up to…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel. Councillor Vandal…Councillor Vandal stood up. He wanted to speak. He put up his hand. He spoke but he asked a question instead so he's had his turn. You had your hand up too. You want to speak to it?

(Inaudible speaking in the background.)

Mr. Speaker: No.

(Inaudible speaking in the background.)

Mr. Speaker: No, no, no. Are there any…just a minute. Councillor Clement, hold it, hold it. Are there any, any other speakers? There's no further speakers? Now you close it.

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, my recollection of the facts are that the first time that this issue was at the Committee that we laid it over, we had quite a number of delegations there and it came back. When it came back at the last meeting, there was only three of us there including Councillor Steeves who was pinch hitting and we did not vote in favour of this at that Committee as far as I was concerned. Councillor Steeves thought that this issue should go to Executive Policy Committee and have a full discussion there and so we accommodated that. This is how the clerk wrote it but I don't recall that we voted in favour of it. I recalled that we voted to send it to EPC and Gord's nodding as well. When it got to Executive Policy Committee, it was discussed again and there were many people that showed up there at it and had a lot of discussion, and we decided to file it and the reason why was because the revenue which actually, nobody could actually guarantee wasn't that great, and it would appear that just about everybody in that business except for one company didn't like the idea. And frankly, it wasn't worth the aggravation. So we moved to file it, which is what's in front of us.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That Item 2 be filed. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions. None. By-laws none. Question period. Any questions? None. Standing Policy Committee in Finance, no report. Finance Motions, none. By-laws, none. Question period. You had to do it, right? The first question, Councillor Swandel.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday when we were debating the budget, the idea of some better long term planning on the Operating Budget side came up. I'd just like to put it here today on the floor to Councillor Fielding and just ask him what he might…how he might see that process playing out and if he will be asking the Administration to prepare a strategy so that we can sort of be looking out there in the ten year window.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yeah, I would be prepared to ask our Administration to report back on how that would work and how what the benefits and pros and cons are of the process. I do think kind of long term process is…does make sense but let's see how it plays out from what our Administration says.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Are you sure?

Councillor Swandel moves Adjournment.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 11:45 a.m.