COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, February 23, 2011

The Council met at 9:33 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

Opening Prayer read by Councillor Orlikow.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal and Wyatt

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We're joined today by our Page, Madison Fedyck from Glenlawn Collegiate resides in the North Kildonan Ward. I hope we're not taking you away from your studies two days in a row, so thanks for being here. (Applause) And we would like to welcome the guests that are in the gallery today, and Councillor Vandal has an announcement he would like to make.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the other City Councillors and everyone in this Chamber, I'd like to invite everybody to the Western Canada's largest Winter Festival, the 42nd Annual Festival Du Voyageur. I know that last weekend we were breaking records with a number of people in attendance at Whittier Park, Voyageur Park, so I know Councillor Gerbasi, Orlikow, Havixbeck were there, so I would like to invite everyone to come down this weekend, grab your sash, put on some long johns and come to St. Boniface. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Merci.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: We would like to ask Councillor Wyatt to move the adoption of the minutes of our January meeting. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: We have two delegations with us today. I'd like to invite Dr. Sande Harlos, Medical Officer of Health for the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority. You have 10 minutes and there's a little clock right there to sort of...

Dr. Sande Harlos: Oh, okay, very helpful. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Dr. Sande Harlos: Good morning, Mr. Mayor, City Councillors and members of the audience. I'm Dr. Sande Harlos, one of the Medical Officers of Health at the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority and I'm here today to speak about the potential ban of smoking in outdoor places in Winnipeg. So I really appreciate the opportunity to come and speak for a few minutes today. I did have the opportunity to speak at the Standing Committee and Executive Policy Committee, and I do appreciate your time today because I think although some of you who have been to those other meetings have heard some of what I'm going to say today, I think it's really important for everyone on Council to be able to hear some of the reasons why we are supporting and asking Council to deal with this issue. Before I get started though, I just did want to mention that I know there are a number of other parties that had wanted to come today and to speak, and to express their support for considerations. But because there's two delegations only in respect of your time, there's a limitation to how many people could speak and I guess I was the first one to make the phone call. But did I want to recognize and some are here today but I know Canadian Cancer Society, for example and there's a number of people, but also, Sport Manitoba, the Alcoa, whose the coalition for activity, Coalition for Older Adults, and Manitoba Youth for Clean Air, there are a number of people also wanted to speak, so there's lots of support and interest amongst the health community for this. As you know, the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority has been very involved in the whole issue of smoking, first of all in indoor public places, back to the

By-law that was instituted in 2003. And since that time we've stayed in touch with the City Administrative folks who are dealing with these issues and we've been speaking to them as this issue about playing fields has been discussed. And we actually have a letter on record from October asking City Council to consider banning smoking in outdoor places, where people's health are impacted. So we are very committed to support and to help along this process. What I wanted to do today was just to go over the health effects really that underlies the request for this consideration. And I think, I don't need to talk about what the problems are with secondhand smoke, I think folks are very familiar with that, particularly with all the considerations of the By-law in the past. And we think of people like Heather Crow who came to our City and talked to us and about the risks of cancer for people who are exposed to second-hand smoke. And…but I think many of us think about second-hand smoke as being something that is a problem when you're exposed day in, day out on an indoor environment and the risks for cancer and heart disease and triggering asthma and many, many other health complications. And what might not be as well known amongst the general public, and a variety of people. In fact, it wasn't even as well understood by myself, is that really, very short exposures also have a number of health effects with them and that's what I want to talk about today is what really is the dose people are getting in an outdoor place and what kind of health problems does that cause when people are exposed for even a short period of time to that level of exposure. So that's really what I want to make sure that everybody has a sound understanding as you move forward with the important decisions ahead of you.

So, researchers have looked at the question of how much exposure do people get in outdoor places. By doing a number of things, what they can do is measure a variety of markers in the air either particular matter or variety of the toxins that the burning tobacco causes. And they can measure that concentration in the air around a smoker, in an outdoor place and compare that to the level of smoke in an indoor place where smokers are smoking. And so there's a lot of variables they need to take into consideration. For example temperature, the wind speed, number of people smoking and how long they've been smoking. So there's lots of variables. But what they found was particularly in close proximity, a meter, two meters from a smoker, and most problematically within half a meter of a smoker, the level of density of second-hand smoke in those environments is similar to and often times exceeds that of commonly smoking in indoor places like in a home or anywhere indoors that people might be smoking. So that was a surprise to many people, that the density of smoke in an outdoor environment could be the same as or sometimes more than that of indoor environments. Now, the good news is when a smoker stops smoking outside, it dissipates very quickly in the environment, so I do want to emphasize, we do recommend that if people are smoking that they never smoke indoors, that they always smoke outdoors and that's definitely the preferred location to smoke, but what we're learning now with these new studies is that even smoking outdoors, you have to be careful about where you smoke and who you smoke around and so on, and try to smoke a distance from people because even some of the outdoor exposures can be quite significant, and as I mentioned as much as or more than outdoor, indoor smoking. The other way they measured that was to look at the metabolites that people excrete when they've been exposed to smoke. So what you can do is measure a metabolite of nicotine, called cotinine and measure that in people's body fluids and saliva for example, and you can tell then that people have been exposed. So when research of studied people who have not smoked and not been around indoor smoking but have been somewhere like outside of a bar where people are smoking, they can measure those metabolites in a person's body, that means not only are they around smoke, but they have actually absorbed that smoke and the toxins that are associated with that, into their body. So we know that there is significant exposure in outdoor places. And these are things I don't think we really knew or appreciated back in 2003 when we were talking about the indoor By-law. So, the next thing I want to talk about is so what? So what if we have these transient exposures that are similar to indoor but they're short time and outdoors what does that matter for people's health? So I want to talk about both the short-term exposures that people commonly think of, symptoms of irritation that many, many people experience so scratchy, burning eyes, runny nose, cough, those kinds of symptoms are very common and they would be similar to what you experience indoors. We know that asthma is triggered by even a small amount of smoke in an outdoor environment. So even in a very short period of time, someone might have enough exposure so they're triggered with their asthma and you may not see that, for example, while children are playing on a playing field, but those children might go home, they might end up in emergency that night from the exposure that they received, and then triggering the cascading effects of an asthma attack that can get quite serious. And you know, asthma is very common in Winnipeg. So, in children between 5 to 19, about 16% of children at any given time are being treated for asthma. So if you picture a common playing field with maybe 20 to 30 kids playing at any given time, you can be sure that there is at least a handful of children, maybe 3 to 5 children that have asthma who are on that playing field and at any point they may not look sick during the game, but that could be sufficient enough for them to go home and have an asthma episode that night. So that's a very common and problematic issue.

Many people have chronic lung diseases of a variety of kinds and certainly we know that chronic cardiac disease, and even a small amount of secondhand smoke might be enough to trigger someone who has very borderline respiratory functions into respiratory failure. So again, that might be something that you might not see in the moment, but maybe from that small effect, might be something that cascades into a visit to emergency or admission to hospital after that. The problem though, that I find the most worrisome is the fact that we are recognizing the impact from a very short period of exposure on people's cardiac function that puts them at high risk for a heart attack. And whereas we were used to thinking of secondhand smoke being exposures that occurred over long periods of time and cumulative time periods, now, when researchers are looking at what happens inside the blood vessels from even a very small period of time of exposure, for secondhand smoke, some of the very important things that are happening within the blood vessels and within the heart, are happening within minutes, not within hours or weeks or months, but actually 15 to 30 minutes, have shown some very important effects. And if you picture the inside of a blood vessel for a minute, there is some important tissue that lines the blood vessels called the endothelium, and that's responsible for a lot of the effects of what the blood vessels do that can lead up to a heart attack. And it turns out that many of the chemicals in secondhand smoke are very toxic to that particular tissue, and that, it causes inflammation, it causes the disruption to that tissue, it interrupts the messages that that tissue gives for how tense the blood vessel should be so it causes constriction of the blood vessels. It can lead to plaque formation and the other thing that's very worrisome is it makes platelets more sticky and when you have all of these things happening at the same time it can actually precipitate particularly in someone who had pre-existing heart disease of course, it can precipitate an acute heart attack at that time. So these are things we didn't really know in 2003 but the evidence is mounting and the research is getting even more convincing, just to talk about the importance of the health effects. So I certainly want to then mention there are other reasons to think about smoking in public places, outside being a problem, and one is the very important role modeling it gives to children. Also important is that we know that most smokers want to quit smoking and, or many people have just recently quit smoking and when they're in an outdoor environments or any environment where there are people are smoking, it gets in the way of their best intentions to quit smoking and to stay smoke free. So, we really encourage, I know the issue came forward about smoking on playing fields but we also want to, want you to consider smoking bans in other public places, anywhere where people are in close proximity to each other. And that must be my buzzer. So I just wanted to, just to wrap up. We certainly, there are a lot of people, a lot of organizations and bodies that really want to help and support and are ready to help make this the communication around this and to help people understand the reasons for it, a success. And I just want to close by congratulating the previous City Council for its very foresight, a leadership role it played back in 2003 and I want to let you know that studies that have been done since that time looking at the effect of that, those kinds of ordinances comparing before and after those bans came into place in indoor environments, they've come to estimate that probably within the first year of a ban, 15% reduction in heart attacks occurred, and within three years of the ban, 36% reduction in heart attacks occurred. So these kind of endeavours are very important to the health and well being of our community. These are things that are very, the contribution of such a decision for City Council can make is a huge impact on the health of Winnipeg and I really call upon you to consider this and to go forward without delays. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Dr. Harlos. Mr. Murray Gibson is going to speak to the same, in favour of the same subject so we'll have all the questions at the end so if you can just wait for five minutes and we'll invite Murray Gibson, the Executive Director of the Manitoba Tobacco Reduction Alliance to come forward. You have five minutes, sir.

Murray Gibson: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, I want to thank you once again for allowing us to speak on behalf of those we represent. I'm here today to represent MANTRA, the Manitoba Tobacco Reduction Alliance. I'm here because we have a four-fold purpose. One is to prevent young people and adults from starting to use tobacco and to reduce access to it. Two to protect the health of nonsmokers, three to help smokers quit, and 4th, to denormalize or change the attitudes of Canadians towards tobacco and its use. I'm also here because over the eight years of our existence we've had the privilege of working with a significant variety of stakeholders, both as members and partners who also share our vision. These include non-government organizations, health care organizations, professional associations, regional health authorities, social service agencies, community organizations and some government departments. I'm also here today because a year ago this March, we brought together 50 stake holders from 30 different organizations to talk about smoking cessation, and one of the key discussions was a round how supportive environments could be created through policy and legislation. The kind of environments that would help people who want to quit to truly do that. It's at times like this when I ask myself my favourite question, so what? So what? What is it that we want from City Council? As I reminded EPC, your own Winnipeg smoking regulation, By-law of 2003, was prefaced with these words: "Council has

determined that tobacco smoke is a health hazard, is a nuisance, to or detriment to persons and it is necessary to protect the safety, health and well being of persons." I once heard someone rather cynically say blessed are those who expect nothing for they shall not be disappointed. I guess that's one blessing that our group is going to miss out on because we are here expecting something. None of us who are here as delegations know for sure about the outcome of this meeting will be, but we do have an expectation. We expect nothing more or less than your very best effort. We expect your very best effort to protect the safety, health and well being of the citizens of Winnipeg. That means using the powers at your disposal to ensure that to the best of your ability no one's health is damaged by secondhand smoke and that secondhand smoke is not a nuisance or detriment to anyone. We expect your very best effort to ensure that another generation is not led to believe that there is something normal about rolling up a bunch of dried leaves in paper, lighting one end and sucking on the other and blowing the smoke for everyone else to have to put up with. That is not normal. I have yet to meet one parent, either smoker or non-smoker, who would say, I sure hope my kid takes this up, and that they contribute to both the tobacco industry and to the government for the privilege of doing so. Gentlemen, it's time to demonstrate to our young people on their sports field, on their school yards, on their play grounds, in their recreation areas that this is not a normal or healthy activity. We expect your very best effort to ensure that the 76% of the respondents of our 2008 poll, who wanted smoking banned in public doorways and entrance ways are heard. I have personally received more complaints on this issue than any other secondhand smoke issue. Oh yes I've heard people say what's the harm about a little bit of secondhand smoke? Many years ago I read this statement and it said "There's plenty of good water that goes into the sewer but I would rather drink mine from the tap." This City has gone to great lengths to ensure that we have safe, clean water supply, a safe healthy food supply. What about the air we breathe? Should it not be the best quality we can provide? We expect your very best effort to ensure that 75% of smokers who would like to be smoke free are given your support through smoke-free venues. Smoking is a social, psychological and physiological thing. It's an activity that smokers have developed psychological patterns around. No one tells them when to take the next drag on a cigarette. They go into the gas station, a little trigger just says better buy cigarettes while you're here. No one tells them to light up when they're having a coffee, it just happens. They've developed psychological patterns that they need to break. Many are physically addicted, it's a brief stimulant that creates a mild euphoria and it's quickly followed by withdrawal and a depression that goes with it. Finally it's a social activity. An activity that's conducted in social settings and gatherings and we need to help break that pattern. Finally I would just say to you, so what? What can you expect from us? You can expect from us that we will do everything we can do to help you move this forward in an expeditious way and in a way that is beneficial to all the people and citizens of Winnipeg. I'm here today to pledge the support of MANTRA, and the organizations that we represent, to say we will do what we can to support City Hall if you'll make your best effort, we'll make ours. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Gibson, Doctor Harlos if you'd like to come forward, Councillor Smith has a question.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Sande, could you, how far reaching do you want this ban to be? You said close proximity. Now I can see, for example, in patios, you know the situation. But what about Assiniboine Park or…being more specific exactly what you mean by close proximity, what sort of situations you'd see where the ban would apply, you'd like to see a ban apply?

Dr. Harlos: Well, I think because of the health effects I mentioned that any circumstance where people could be in close proximity smoking would be ones we want considered so that would certainly include the playing fields and the sports facilities as were mentioned, but it would also include patios, within a given distance from any entrance to any public building. We'd also be considering school grounds and health care facility grounds both of those are covered by policy right now so they wouldn't really be new territory but the…it would make it legal, so that would give it more importance and more enforceability for all of us to do our jobs. Really, any parks, any playing field, any play ground. We've seen examples from many cities across Canada, North America and the world that have taken either some of those components or in some cases all of those components and I think what needs to happen next is have a real good review, environmental scan of what's out there and really pick the best from all of those and offer the citizens of Winnipeg the very best protection possible.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: First of all, obviously here really I appreciate you're…the science you're bringing to the debate here. One question I did have just on the clinical side of things, you said that the evidence suggests that there is effect, I guess if you will, within a foot or two, is that right of a person who is smoking?

Dr. Harlos: Well, you know it's…again, as I mentioned, there are so many conditions in the outdoor environment that are variable from moment to moment, particularly in our Winnipeg weather and conditions. But you know wind, the number of smokers, the prevailing weather and a variety of factors, the proximity to buildings and so on. But I think some of the studies have shown that really people have a noticeable effect from about six meters, experience the irritant kind of effect at about four meters and really between anything less than two meters, it's significant exposures that rivals the indoors environment and particularly within half a meter. So if you're standing right beside someone on a playing field or outdoors, outside of a, the entrance to a building, then you may well be sort of within that half meter range. So the closer you are the more dense the smoke is and it's sort of a gradient effect.

Councillor Fielding: So, but I mean, just once again, what you're saying the clinical data, the data that's there that proves, you talked about the density of the smoke, you know, is within you know, a foot or two, really that's kind of where there'd be some danger, I guess if you will of someone smoking but you're, you know I guess if you're walking in Assiniboine Park, you're by yourself having a cigarette that necessarily wouldn't have a dramatic effect on people's.

Dr. Harlos: I would say more than a foot or two. I think the most problematic ones are sort of half a metre, so that would be within a foot or two, but I think the health effects would probably go out quite a distance more than that, probably several meters at the least. But the other effects that we noticed about, just the role modeling, other things that are really not the health role but certainly issues about environmental issues and litter issues and just the sort of the normalization as Mr. Gibson mentioned, some of those things are certainly a bigger distance but from the acute health effects, I'd say probably you need a buffer zone from several meters out. And the thing is, I think in parks and spaces and trails and so on, is you never know if you're going to be the only one there or if you're going to come around a corner and find yourself within a meter or two of someone else. So that's the difficulty.

Councillor Fielding: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Thank you, Dr. Harlos and Mr. Gibson. All right we'll move into the heart of the Agenda today. Just before we do that, I just like to make a comment as the Speaker and the person responsible for decorum within our Chamber, and I won't say yesterday we were out of hand, but at times we had some rather personal comments put forward, and I first of all encourage everyone to put your comments through the Speaker and secondly, that we have to offer a degree of respect within the Chamber that we all as adults deem appropriate. So, I caution you all and ask for your consideration and participation. All right. Executive Policy Committee, February 2nd, Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 2, 2011

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

Councillor Gerbasi: I would like to stand down 2 please.

Mr. Speaker: All right. All those in favour of one? Two. Go ahead.

Item 2 - Winnipeg Parking Authority SOA - International Downtown Association – Internal Parking Institute - Advisory Panel Report

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'd love to hear the comments from the Councillor and then I'd be happy to respond.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't able to attend the EPC meeting where this issue was discussed so I didn't hear the commentary and all it says is that it's filed. So, I guess I would like to hear from the Mayor the reasons why this report, which we spent 134,000 dollars on, has not been released. We know it's been completed for some time. There's been drafts circulating around because it involved, this report involved an extensive public consultation. As a member of the Downtown BIZ Board, I'm certainly aware of that. Through all the Downtown stakeholders were very much involved. In fact even many

Councillors were very involved, Councillor Steeves and Councillor Smith and Orlikow and others attended sessions with the panel of eight or so experts that were brought in from the International Downtown Association and the International Parking Institute, the two major parking organizations in North America. This expert panel was brought together. It was really quite thrilling for those of us who were there I think and there was a lot of excitement in the room about the work they were doing, we spent significant public dollars on this report, and there was significant buy in from the community, in the downtown, downtown stakeholders, such as the BIZ and the Downtown Council which includes CentreVenture and others, and so there was sort of some excitement about this report coming forward. The other aspect of this is pretty significant, is that we sold the parkade last year that brought in $2 million in revenue, that we've lost that revenue stream and that money is sitting in a fund, while someone else is taking in the new revenue. The value of parking is going up, so you really have to question the decision of doing that and then sitting on it for apparently, a long period of time. Originally, I believe, we were expecting to have a decision on what was going to happen with the sale of the parkade last spring. And we really haven't been given any explanation what Council as a whole, has not been given any explanation of what we're waiting for and what the intention is. And I've expressed the concern all along that about half of the money from the sale of this asset is going to get used essentially as one time money to balance a budget by paying off a so-called debt, as I've explained that has to do with us using money that the Parking Authority made for operating and it's kind of complicated but I think most of you understand it. I think most of you understand that we said that the Parking Authority had a debt. As we use their profits for our operating budget and now we're saying we need to pay back that debt. It's really just a debt on paper. But my concern is that we're going to build some parkades and do some of this downtown strategy but all of the money from that asset I believe should be invested in the downtown and I've asked the Mayor this question repeatedly. He is, I believe if I'm correct, his answer has been that he personally would like to see it go in the downtown but he's, I guess, one vote on Council or whatever, or doesn't, I guess it depends on all of us here. I don't know. But I have not yet, we have not yet been told what is going to happen with the money from that asset. That's what's driving this and also what's driving this is that this is a really important issue for the revitalization of downtown. It's not just about parking. It's about using our Parking Authority as essentially an economic development tool to stimulate the investment in the downtown. And I think we all agree with that. I think the concern is, is how much of it are we going to be able to get done? We've sold off a profitable asset over a year ago and it's sitting there doing nothing and someone else is making that profit, and so, you know, we need to come up with something good like, I'd like to see a couple of parkades built, like that would be good. But I mean, this asset is gone and I really, the reason I'm being relentless on this issue is it is very, very important to the downtown. And I'm not sure, you know, I don't want to speculate on where this report is, you know that's not always taken too well. I just don't have the answers and I've been trying to get the answers for quite some time and this Motion came out of that quest to find out what has happened to this report. It's a pretty amazing report. In fact you know, the IDA and the IPI. This was a first time they've done something like this. A panel like this of experts of that caliber has never gotten together and done something like this with a City. So it's something that I wish we could be a little more excited about, and a little more, and use the work that they did and perhaps there's some plan to do that, I just, I'm in a vacuum, I don't know. And all I've been told is, you know, nothing. So that was the reason for this motion, and I don't see why that report can't be released publicly, to all Members of Council. If you don't want to act on it, if you have reasons why some of the things aren't practical or there's something in there that you don't think will work in Winnipeg, let's have a discussion about it, let's have a Council Seminar about it. Let's talk about what's our parking strategy for downtown. I mean, you guys talked a lot yesterday about wanting to work together and all this stuff. Well, here's an example of some of the alienation and frustration some of us have. We aren't given the information. We aren't even seeing the results of this report which we were part of the consultation of, those of us that wanted to participate. We were part of that and yet we can't even see the final report. And the public should see it and we should have an open discussion about what is our strategy on parking in the downtown. And I don't understand why we can't. I don't understand what is the reason, why this has to be kept in the dark. And I also think it is an operating budget issue. Because I think some of this money from selling an asset, it has been hinted that that could be used to deal with some of our operating budgets short-term problems and I don't think that's a wise use of, it's not good financial accounting to sell off an asset that not only is profitable but is getting more profitable because of the value of parking is going up as a well known fact. So, you know, and I also want to ensure and the Mayor assured me that he personally would like all the money to stay in the Downtown. But I'd like to see, the other thing that, about this report from my understanding of what I've heard is in it, some of what may be in it, is that it takes a pretty, it gives the Parking Authority an expanded role in acting as an economic development agent and stimulating downtown development. Frankly, I think that's good and frankly, I think our parking authority has been very, very successful, you know. It's won numerous awards, internationally and nationally. We won like five out of six awards I think at a recent IPI conference. You know, I don't hear people around here standing up and bragging about our Parking Authority. I don't know why. You know, it's parking so people don't always like

getting tickets and stuff, but I mean they have done some things well, and you know, we should be proud of the things that we've done well. And, I find it unfortunate that we don't give credit where credit is due to our own Administration in the case like this. I mean, they are stand alone agency but they are our agency, and I think we should give them the power to do some real things in our downtown. We should find a way to use that asset that, as you know, I didn't agree with selling but since it sold, let's use that money to its fullest capacity and I'm not convinced, well I don't have any plan in front of me to know that we're going to do that. So that was the reason I have for moving the motion and I appreciate something more than simply filing it in silence. I think we deserve more of an answer than that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to speak to this as I was the one that moved the motion to file this. The logic that I used to move the motion in filing it was Councillor Gerbasi's logic that she used during the Plan Winnipeg process when we were bringing Plan Winnipeg process forward and all this information going on. We thought we could handle it and we did but we were accused of moving far too quickly and that why does this have to move so fast? So, in order to slow this down enough so that Councillor Gerbasi can get a chance to grasp what we're getting done here and is comfortable that we've done all of the work, taking all of the pieces of information at our disposal. We're going to ensure that when our downtown parking strategy comes out that all the i's are dotted, all the t's are crossed and that anything that would be done to or anything that would be said to suggest that we hadn't given it due diligence, could clearly and easily be dismissed. So, that was my reason for moving the motion to file when it come to this Chamber. Now having said that, I think there's a couple of corrections and in keeping with the tone of what you suggested earlier, I won't get into comments like misrepresentation and deceit but there were certainly a couple of comments that need to be corrected. The City of Winnipeg hasn't given away an asset. The City of Winnipeg has an asset sitting in a bank account waiting to be reinvested. The City of Winnipeg does not have, the debt that was referred to here is debt that was taken out of the Parking Authority is not the debt that was attached to this Parking Authority. Long term debt was attached to the parking structure when we created the Special Operating Agency. We shifted the assets over to the Special Operating Agency. They were valued and they were assigned a value and that was a liability that the Parking Authority held, and the City of Winnipeg has it as a receivable. So on that long-term debt, that liability, or receivable in the case of the City, there is a need to correct that. Now if you want to move the money back after you do that you would have to find a mechanism to do that. But, we have to deal with the consolidated statements of the City of Winnipeg at some point. So we can't just stand up and start suggesting that because dividends were taken which created operating deficits that are there for several years and actually I think we're moving out of those deficits, we're already out of those deficits I think, and into surpluses in operating and it will be moving according to our dividends policy that we established for our Special Operating Agency soon, to take dividends once again from our Parking Authority. And everybody is aware that we created a new dividend policy for the SOA's in the not too distant past. I attended one of the meetings with this group of experts as Councillor Gerbasi referred to them. Did a little bit of research on them. I'll tell you there was a great deal of money they spent at this dinner that I went to everybody, to meet and to talk and everybody seemed to be very happy and celebrating and enjoying the consulting fees they were being paid and sitting at this lavish meal. And I'm sure there is some expertise in this group but we certainly went to great lengths to entertain these folks and to pay them and we will take that information and we will use it appropriately in the context of our City. We will drill it down to our City, to Winnipeg. We will do that in the context of Our Winnipeg, our new document that we have in front of us, a sustainable Winnipeg, in keeping with the transportation strategy that we have coming forward. So you know, you can throw pieces around here all you want but at the end of the day we're going to have a pretty decent parking strategy coming forward. I think it's going to impress a lot of folks in our City. Of course, there will be the naysayers. We can certainly expect that. We'll also see some strategies around, and the opportunities for new parkades. There's other pieces that are happening there that are done in conjunction with development opportunities and economic development and opportunities that are happening in our downtown, you know. You look at our downtown, I don't know if anybody saw the numbers not too long ago in the newspaper, where we put out three year plan to do multi-family residential incentives in downtown and it was $20 million split between the City and the Province. Three years looking at incremental taxes at $20 million would be incremental taxes spread out over 10, I think as high as 15 years on the rental side but 10 years on the condo side, and that we would plan that that would take us three years out. Well, within six months the program was fully subscribed and another 12 million dollars of of tax credit value sitting waiting in the wings to jump in and do development in our downtown. And with that type of development coming we need as a City to be there providing amenities like new parkades in our downtown and that's got to be a priority. We constantly say in this Chamber the importance of getting more people living in downtown in order to change the look and feel and the security of our downtown. And you will see that that will be a priority for that money as we go

forward. I think there's one for sure, maybe two that will be ready to move pretty quickly as soon as we've got all the numbers lined up and pieces done with the private partners and public partners. I mean, the Provincial Government comes to play with this and these as well and you'll see some announcements in that regard in the not too distant future. Those amenities, that's where the City needs to be in the parking business, we're bringing those amenities in because it's keeping that development going, we did it when, with Winnipeg Square Parkade. We wanted to be in the parking business there because the private sector wouldn't be there. The business model didn't make sense. We needed to go in there, create that parking asset, that amenity that helped to fuel the development of the Trizac Building and other construction that happened in that immediate zone, that parkade did run at great capacity, did make some money and another correction that should be made is there might have been two million dollars of revenue there but it was actually about a million dollars of annual income that we derived from that, from that structure. So you know, let me just close by saying that the asset isn't gone. The asset is sitting, waiting to be reinvested and changed into other assets that will fuel this drive that we've gone, got going in our downtown. This downtown of ours with the new hydro building, with the talk of new hotels, with the MTS Centre doing what it's doing, with you know, over a thousand new residential units coming in the next couple of years, plus the hundreds that we've seen in the last couple of years, new businesses, there was recently a report out on all the new businesses that were happening, it was out by the Downtown BIZ Group, how many new businesses they're seeing in downtown. This downtown is doing great, in spite of the naysayers and we will reinvest in our downtown, but we will do it in a way that makes sense, we will respect the obligations that, and the responsibilities that we have to do it responsibly and to do the proper transactions. That if there is long term debt sitting there, that you take care of that long term debt and you make the City whole and then you maintain those relationships as they should be between the Special Operating Agency and the City of Winnipeg proper. And continue to get done what we can get done. We talk about scarce resources. What we're seeing in our downtown is we're getting some good resources in our downtown because there is a drive to keep our downtown moving at the rate we've been moving. And it really is a great success story in our City. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Swandel. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I think listening to Councillor Gerbasi and Swandel and some of the other Councillors, I'm one of the few City Councillors that hasn't read at least part of this Report, and listening to the previous Councillors talk, I think they're talking about the same thing. We all realize how important parking is to the future of our downtown. It's a catalyst, it's an incentive. We want to get more people living in the downtown because we know that's really the only way to turn the downtown around, 24/7, people live, work, play in the downtown area. Parking is an incredibly important catalyst to that. And the reason I supported the filing of this at Executive Committee is that this one strategy which I haven't read and I don't particularly want to read, I want to read the grander strategy. This is one part of it. This is one small part of an overall downtown parking strategy that the Chairperson, Councillor Swandel, is working on. And, having spoken to him I'm confident that grander strategy is coming forward, very, very soon. I've talked to the Administration about this. This is one piece of the information that's needed to put the big strategy before us. And, like all of you, like Councillor Gerbasi, like Councillor Swandel and I'm sure like everybody else in this Chamber, I realize how important this is and I think if we have to take a little bit longer than what was initially anticipated, as long as the end product is there, a couple of new parkades sounds incredibly exciting to myself, especially if they can be attached to some downtown living, perhaps some more commercial buildings. I think that's worth waiting for and that's what I'm waiting for down the road. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I want to see this report. I don't know why we have to wait. You know, it doesn't make any sense. And the more I hear from Councillor Swandel, the more I'm worried. Because you know he, in effect, questions quiet criticism of the, of these, of these experts. If makes me think that there is a reason why this report is not being issued to all of us, for all of us to examine and see exactly what it says. You know, future actions can be brought forward. It doesn't have to be brought forward at the time the report is issued. Why don't we have this report? Very pure and simple, we should all have it and be able to evaluate it, and not rely on Councillor Swandel for his interpretation.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, I wasn't going to speak on this until I heard Councillor Swandel and Councillor Vandal speak on it. You know, Mr. Speaker, this is public money that has been spent. The report

is done and it should be issued. Now we're hearing that there was a huge expenses paid to consultants, lavish dinners and that there's going to be, there's a grander strategy being done. Is this another 134,000 dollars we're spending Mr. Speaker on a grander strategy? Why is this report secret? Why is this report being kept secret? I'm curious as well now, thanks to the some of the statements that have been made on this floor by the Councillors that there is something in this report clearly, that deserves to be made public. We hired these consultants, we paid them, we fed them by the sounds of it. I'd like to know why that report's not being made public, Mr. Speaker. This is public money, the report is done, make it public. Why the secrecy? Why the cover-up if I can use that term? It appears to be a cover-up. Covering up a report.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a…

Mr. Speaker: Point of Order.

Councillor Swandel: I shouldn't have to stand up and make a Point Of Order on that.

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to make a retraction, Councillor Wyatt on the issue of cover-up?

Councillor Wyatt: I will retract the term coverup but I will say this is clearly being kept secret and the question is why? Why is it being kept secret? Why has it not been released if the report is done? A hundred thirty four thousand dollars, the strategy? Let it be released. Let the report be released, Mr. Speaker. Thank you:

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Councillor Gerbasi apparently has seen this report and she suggests that the report suggests a greater role for the Winnipeg Parking Authority in terms of development, economic development. You know what, our downtown has an awesome economic development agency in CentreVenture. Look at the success they're having right now right here on Main Street. You've got the United Way, the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority, the Centre for Youth Excellence with Youth for Christ. The Bell Hotel, which is being redeveloped right now. Why do we want to create another bureaucracy and more expense to the citizens of Winnipeg for another economic development agency? It seems completely redundant to my mind. While I'm not intimately familiar with all the details of this particular report, I did actually participate, and did get access to some of these parking experts who were there. I skipped the lavish meal, but I definitely did get some benefit from my conversations with them. What I did hear though was that there's different ways of Municipalities to get good bang for parking dollars. It doesn't mean that we have to own an asset in perpetuity. Sometimes municipalities build, own or operate parkades and then a number of years later get out of the business. Sometimes they use dollars towards parking as an incentive to have the private sector build them. There's all sorts of different models to look at, to do it and I'm very committed personally and I think it's the best way to do things, to make sure that we do improve our downtown and make sure that parking isn't a hindrance to making sure our downtown is a vibrant, exciting place going forward. So again, I think we're going to…we want to see our downtown in the same place. Again, we are going through the whole Our Winnipeg process. You know, there's different things. They're still going to feed into this. I think we want to see our downtown succeed and parking is certainly going to be a key piece. There's many, many ways to get there and I think we're going in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Mr. Speaker Nordman. I also wasn't going to speak to this issue. I'm not too concerned about, well, I am concerned about a couple of things about a report and I would like to first start off though by talking about Our Winnipeg, which is an overall City plan, as I do believe and I think that it's essential that we always consider things holistically and while we do need to improve our downtown and it is going, really is going in the right direction. Parking, however, is an issue that really has extended outside of downtown. In order to bring the people quicker to downtown, what we have done is we've established some diamond lanes on Main Street, and without a parking plan for those small businesses, we've grown up on the shoulders of the downtown community and we need to be considerate of them. Today, actually at lunch time, there will be a BIZ introduction to the transportation plan that I believe falls under the Our Winnipeg process, and that that is a very important consultation but one of the biggest issues that will come up at that particular place is the issue of the diamond lanes and the inability of people to park along Main Street to go to the various shops that do exist on Main just on the shoulders of downtown. And so I would hope that when we engage in that consultations for parking for downtown, and

the implications of actually what we do in downtown, that those consultations consider the immediate effects immediately around the downtown, so we have a more holistic perspective. And one would hope that if we do have this money to invest in parking now, we need to deal with how are people parking to utilize the businesses along Main Street, just under the underpass and out to Redwood and beyond? So, when you're coming up with your plan, Councillor Swandel, you're in charge of this and I think that's very important. I think that you do need to lend some consideration to that as the Our Winnipeg and our City needs to not only deal with the downtown but make sure that while making downtown prosperous we don't take prosperity away from the shoulder communities. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Seeing none, all those in favour? Oh, sorry. I guess the Mayor would like to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just don't want to close, I want to try to address the issue and the questions that came from Councillor Gerbasi, and so I'll try and deal with that. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me try and put something to rest. The parkade. It was sold. It was sold at fair market value. As a result of that sale, we now collect, we collected the revenue or the asset now it turns into cash which is sitting. We now also get property taxes and the business tax, something we never got before. That's number one. In addition to that, for those who don't recall there could've been ten to fifteen million dollars in deferred maintenance on that asset. For those of you who may not be familiar with deferred maintenance, I ask you just go into the Public Safety Parkade. You'll get a pretty good look at what happens when you have deferred maintenance and it can be extremely costly. That's number one. Number two, Mr. Speaker. What this is all about is a downtown parking strategy. We want to develop a downtown parking strategy. It's my understanding that this process is in place, it should be coming to Council this March. I have said on many occasions before, and I ask your indulgence because I don't like binge redundant. I know exactly what my belief is. My belief is we should take that money and create parking and other areas of our downtown that will stimulate development. That's what it's about. We've talked about the potential of James Avenue, of a parkade there, and that would enhance the residential component that's going there. We've talked about a parkade on the north side of Portage and potentially the south side of Portage. Mr. Speaker, during the campaign I very specifically put forward incentives to get rid of surface parking and create parkades or potentially, residential, commercial, retail, mixed use of these situations. And I think that's what we should do. For those who travel up and down the downtown streets, we are seeing so many wonderful things happening in our downtown right now. We all want them to continue, and I'm hoping that the downtown parking strategy addresses that and at that particular point in time, every Councillor when it goes to process, will get to have their input and hopefully we'll come up with something that makes a lot of sense. So, just to reiterate, the downtown parking strategy will be coming forward in March and I thank Councillor Gerbasi for the question.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Recorded vote? All right. All those in favour of Agenda Item 2, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councilors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Sharma, Steen, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal and Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith and Wyatt.

Clerk: Vote Mr. Speaker, yeas 10, nays 6.

Mr. Speaker: Motion passed. Mayor Katz, February 16th.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2011**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I would like to introduce the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

(Inaudible Speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: One and two have been stood down.

Item 1 – Settlement with Manitoba Hydro regarding an audit of the collection of the Electricity and Gas Tax

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I'll wait to hear what the Councillor has to say and then of course, in closing I will address it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. Just when I recall looking at this debt owed. It was 15 million dollars? I know we set out at 5 million dollars, maybe in 10, I heard the number of 15, but we settled at 5, that's not as much as I had hoped and I'd just like to…I'm not sure if we can get an explanation on that if it's negotiated settlement. But could you please explain that to why we chose that level rather than the 10 or the 15 that was proposed before.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Happy to speak to this issue. First of all I'd very much like to thank our Administration, Mr. Mike Ruta, for all his work on this file. You know, last year we incorporated just over 10 million dollars in our operating budget. We truly believed that the Legislation backed us up. That this was something that… a bill that should've been incorporated as people know, this is an independent audit that was established way back in the 2000's to establish how we're collecting, and that money wasn't us making any moves from our side of things, it was an independent audit that was owed to us for a number of years. There was obviously some back and forth in the media. There's a lot of people at that time, maybe even some are around this Council table that criticized the budget for including this money within the operating budget. Well, it turns out a mere 11 months later, you know there is a lot of back and forth in terms of the court proceedings, but at that point we came to an agreement. I think the thought was that you're wasting time, money and energy when you're fighting these things through the Courts and the only people that end up winning for these things are the lawyers. So we thought a negotiated settlement was right and we can get on. We also established, I think there is an agreement that there is some loops if you own the Legislation. It wasn't us who wrote the legislation, it's Provincial Legislation. We're following suit with that and there is a small working group that's going to be established just to streamline that process to make sure that process works as we go forward. So at the end of the day, we thought this was a negotiation or a settlement that made sense for taxpayers and we need to get on with governing the City and at that point we think we're happy with the settlement that was brought forward, so, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker, just quickly first of all I do congratulate the efforts and obviously it's good news that we're getting some money here, be it not what was hoped, so I certainly appreciate that, the working group and all those things are good things. I think, I just wanted to clarify that the criticism was not going after this money and not seeking to address this issue. The criticism was including 10 million dollars that we didn't have in last year's budget, and assuming we'd have it and we ended up not having it. We don't have it in 2010. There was a 10 million dollar hole in 2010 which we're having to take out of reserves and it's just going to make the 2011 budget all that much more difficult. So, I just wanted to clarify that nobody is objecting to the idea of going after in court which we know takes time dealing with the issue. And I think that's…that was work well done. But in the ongoing operating, first of all the budget wasn't really balanced last year because we didn't have, we were told by the Province we weren't going to get the 10 million and we didn't actually get the 10 million, we got five, and it's for the

following year. So I think what the concern was to include something in the budget as money we can count on when we didn't actually have it. So again, I do appreciate the effort. I think it was a good initiative to go after it but I think our budgeting has to include money that's actually there. And going forward I remain concerned. I'd also like clarification on whether this 5 million is ongoing every year, or if it's one time money. It's one time money. So again, we do have a hole in our budget. We assumed we had 10 million last year. We don't have it this year either. So, those are my concerns but I do appreciate the effort made by our staff and politically, the effort to try to address the issue. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I feel somewhat unfairly put upon, Mr. Speaker. This was, we were roundly criticized by Members of Council, members of the community, even some members of the media for including this in our Budget. It was stated it shouldn't be in the budget. It was stated far more forcibly by Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Orlikow and their colleagues that we not only should not include this in our budget but that we had no right to the money.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: There is a statement I didn't approve the 10 million last year at all in the hydro budget, in our budget.

Mr. Speaker: Would you like to retract that Councillor Steeves?

Councillor Steeves: Fine. I'll retract it if he's taken that position. That was not my recollection I can tell you. I seem to recall people saying quite clearly they did not approve of our stats, did not approve of our direction on this matter. Now that the money has been retrieved by the City of Winnipeg, I don't see a lot of people rushing to congratulate. I heard Councillor Gerbasi say that suddenly she congratulates Administration. I would like to point out for the purposes of the record and for the history of this honourable Chamber that these are the types of things that might seem in hindsight, easy to do, but Councillor Gerbasi, we actually could have used your support at the time of inception we were going after this month. We knew this was controversial. We knew this was difficult and we knew we had to do something about it. We also knew categorically that we did not enjoy the support unanimously of this Council in doing so. And we could've used it. We could've used it and it wasn't there. And there is no nice way to say that, Mr. Speaker. If people are going to be accountable for their actions in this Chamber, then they will be accountable for their actions in this Chamber. There was a time to stand up and say yes, we believe we deserve this money but that was not done at the applicable time. So what then should we have done, Mr. Speaker? We said quite clearly and candidly, we thought that the debt was 10 million dollars. Again, round criticism from our colleagues and we said if we truly believed that it was a debt, which obviously it was, because we received a substantial payment on that debt. That it should be included in the budget. My question to other people, other Councillors, who may not have agreed with that stance, is if you genuinely believe that you're owed money, and if you genuinely believe you're going to be paid money back and you should be paid money back, why would you not include it in your budget? It's an account receivable. What about the negotiating stance of not having it in your budget? What if we had eaten this money in our operating budget and said oh well, it's not part of money we expect. It's not something we feel we deserve. So much so in fact that we are not going to put that money into our budget. How would that have affected how Hydro would have looked at the debt? If somebody comes to you and says I think you owe me money and you look at their balance sheet and see their list of receivables and your receivable is not on it, how does that affect your view of their case? I can tell you exactly how it affects it. You dismiss it. At the time, regrettably, over top of this negotiation and this discussion, we had the looming possibility that Hydro may waltz into the Legislature on Broadway and have Legislation retroactively changed to eliminate the entire debt. So while Councillor Orlikow is complaining about the amount of money that we didn't get, he would perhaps consider that. He would perhaps consider how difficult some of these things are when the party that you're negotiating with has that type of yank on you. (inaudible) Again, a Point of Privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Sir.

Councillor Orlikow: I never complained once about the money we were getting. I made an inquiry of why. That was it. Not an inquiry about the amount of money we received. A Point of Privilege. (inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: My point, Mr. Speaker, is to hold this up as a reference point. This Council has become consistently divided on issues where it shouldn't be consistently divided. There was no reason that every Member of this Chamber should not have stood up and supported this position. There is no reason that every Member of this Council on behalf of the 670 souls that they represent in this city, should not have been fully on board with our direction in this matter. And now, to have the unmitigated gall, to stand up and suggest that this wasn't enough money that you got for us, is ridiculous. It's immature and it has no place in this Chamber. The time to stand up on this issue was months ago when we decided we were going to do this. We were going to stand…try to stand united as a Council and achieve a good outcome for our citizens. I have no time for these types of complaints and yes, I'm going to call them complaints. This is sour grapes, Mr. Speaker. Sour grapes for a good outcome that was achieved on behalf of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker: Can I remind Councillors of earlier comments regarding decorum within the Chamber? (inaudible) Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. You know what you do with that reminder, Mr. Speaker. You might want to save it and bring it up one more time. Let me start by saying a little correction here again, it's a misinformation that was put out earlier in this debate. Our budget didn't run into a deficit because we put this money in the budget as revenue. We had a bunch of factors that were at play and at the end of the day the biggest contributing factor, because, even in doing the budget, we build some safety in there when there's some uncertainty. I mean we know that the amount is a receivable. We've got good legal advice saying it is. We've got good advice from an outside party, we've got advice from our CAO and CFO, so we did the right thing by putting it in our budget. But at the end of the day we had a crazy year for snowfall last year and some other streets maintenance issues and items that happened throughout the year. We came in on target with our budget. The deficit amount that we had to offset was less than one percent. I think it was less than half a percent. Last year with the budget when we had surpluses in the range of 12 million dollars, we didn't hear a great outcry and complaint that was a terrible job done doing the budget. You know, budgeting is just that, it's budgeting. I mean, if everybody could hit a budget bang on target every year, I'll tell you, there'd be some pretty successful folks out there. Whoever came up with how to do that would be quite wealthy. You know, we're often accused of being secret and you know, doing everything in back rooms but here, we have this information, we bring it forward, we put it out in public, we put it in the budget because we believe that that's the proper thing to do. That is the responsible thing to do that we're obligated to show that this revenue might come in in this year because we're going to have this argument and you are criticized for it. And not only that, you're criticized, there is an attempt to be critical today when you settle for less than what the amount you put in there. You'll just have to go on with that. So, you know, let's be clear here, you know, that putting this in the budget was the right thing to do. Going public with it helped not only to do the right thing in the budgeting process but it also helped to create some pressure on both the Legislature and on Manitoba Hydro to have this discussion in the public. You know, people could, you know, you'd say yea, nay but at the end of the day, when people knew what the Legislation said, there were few and far between that could actually debate whether or not we were entitled to some or all of this money. You know, I guess, just in closing, echoing a bit of what Councillor Steeves said here, but some of us at City Hall like to fight for this money, and fight for the citizens of the City of Winnipeg, and some of us chose to play politics with this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Eadie: Thank you…the loquacious Ross Eadie to speak on this particular issue which I…Speaker Nordman, I have no association with the past City Council in which this became a heated debate. I first I put that on the record and I think that it's always important, given my past political experience with a different School Division, that whenever there is money owed and due or a better way to get more revenue, that we should always take that opportunity to do that. We are all, of course, elected on City Council, as I was reminded in yesterday's meeting, that whenever we are looking at budgets we need to make sure that we have a sound basis in making decisions on what we should spend in order to proceed and where we have the revenue. We were lectured quite extensively on that yesterday, and I, of course, am a person who has some experience, a financial background, I've run my own business and I am a Business Admin grad with Honours, and I've, I like to say that I practice what, well, you might call me a hybrid socialist. I do believe in being frugal with money because I frankly am a, I know it's a personal information but I am Scottish and I am frugal. And, but, I like to make sure that when we are spending money on services, that we have the money to do so and to find if somewhere on essential services that we need for our citizens of Winnipeg. And so I just felt that I should stand up and talk about

that because really, it seems to me when I was out not part of this City Council, I heard a whole bunch of news releases on this issue and I always heard the issue in context to, well, how can you report that much revenue coming in on your budget, when you don't know that you're going to get that much money. This is like an extraordinary event that appears. And from my accounting background, I really don't think that we should've been depending on any particular amount coming out of a legal process. While yes, there are legal projections and ideas about how much we might gain from a particular circumstance, in which, you know frankly, the City of Winnipeg was righteous on it and it's too bad that we had to fight so hard to actually get money due. And, you know, we have a settlement and I'm really happy that we got over five million dollars. This is a great thing because that means we at least covered a good portion of our budget and, but we do have these funds that we have to pull out in order to make sure we balance the budget at the end of the year and yes, unexpected things do come, like snowfalls and costs for snowfall and we have to worry about them. That deficit, because of that, doesn't exist because we projected how much revenue were coming in but there is a deficit associated with, if you, and you know, I'm taking what was put supposedly in the revenues last year, if we were reporting 10 million dollars of revenue coming in and we received 5.65, whatever, over five million dollars, there is a difference there in which because we passed a budget based on a certain amount, the only places that I know that we might be gaining money to offset that is, new properties coming on line and you know, maybe we had an increase in that and those different things would have an effect. So there is no, we can't say that the deficit was created as a result of not getting 10 million verses you know, over five million but what we do know is when we projected budgets and as I was, again, we were lectured yesterday, you need to make sure that you're prudent in how you go forward in terms of how you're paying for things and so, I just want to finish by applauding the efforts of Councillor Steeves, the Mayor, Councillor Fielding, Swandel, all these people who worked hard at trying to push this forward. But let's not get caught up in past history. Thank goodness we've got the money, let's just carry forward as a City Council and make sure that we have the money for our next operating budget to meet the needs of the citizen of this City.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Eadie. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah. I think going forward here, Mr. Speaker, is really the crucial thing. Five…we have a wind fall here of five million dollars, 5.3 million dollars. This is one time money clearly and I hope it's budgeted wisely in our upcoming operating budget and I hope we're not doing what we did last time because the reason why, somebody said playing politics, the reason why this became political is not the issue about whether we should sue or not or whether we're in support of suing. It was the issue of putting into the cap, into the operating budget which indeed proved to be faulty. The fact that it was instead of 10.6 million which we asking for, we settled at 5.3 thus we now have a deficit at the end of 2010, because of that funny money. That was the issue and we're saying going forward here, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, I agree with Councillor Eadie a hundred percent. Let's make sure, we've got a working group set up here. I hope we're not budgeting any kind of money in the operating budget based on any kind of assumptions again being made in terms of the working group, until that work is done. Ten point six million was a convenient way to get us past the Civic Election, Mr. Speaker, that's a two and a half percent property tax increase. I've been at those budget meetings around EPC and I know 10.6 million is a huge hole to fill, a huge hole. Let's fill the huge hole. Let's not try to do that again. Let's try to have a truly balanced operating budget and let's be realistic about what we're going to obtain from this or any other potential revenues, Mr. Speaker, that are coming forward. The fact of the matter is we did settle but we settled in 2011 not 2010 and the funds will benefit us as we go forward. Let's not waste that money, let's spend it wisely and let's budget wisely, Mr. Speaker. Those are the concerns and the issues that we raised so I'm just, maybe just correcting a bit of the revisionist history we've been hearing here up in this Chamber lately. And same, going forward, Mr. Speaker, let's be realistic in terms of our budget and how we write our budget. You know, I think that's all we're asking. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I'm going to answer the very first question that was asked by Councillor Orlikow. Mr. Speaker, the number that we were looking at was 10.6 and we basically in the end, settled with Manitoba Hydro for 5.3 million dollars. So that's, that was the question. And the answer to that, and why is quite simple. If anybody's ever been in business, you've been in business long enough, sooner or later you will have a disagreement or misunderstanding with someone you do business, and that's why they have called statement of claims. And one thing that I learned, Mr. Speaker, in a statement of claim, there's really only one winner and that's the lawyers because that's who collects all the fees. In this situation, we very much believed this money was owing. We had no doubt in our minds this money is owing. I can tell you, I believe that Hydro knew this money was owing. That's why they were hoping for retroactive

Legislation, which was the talk of the town, that's what it was all about. And in the end, we settled and we're moving on. But there are a few comments that I have to, during this process, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, as Mayor, I got a lot criticism from Councillors on this, certainly got criticisms from the media, I've learned as an Elected Official, it comes with the territory. But there also comes a point in time, if you believe in something, Mr. Speaker, you have to fight for it and you have to stand up for the people. Okay. Police helicopter. We had a fight to get that. Cadets. Had a fight to get that. Five point three million dollars, Mr. Speaker and with all due respect to Councillor Wyatt, that's not funny money, that's 5.3 million dollars. And let's just talk about the budget here. I think there is a lot of misconception. The budget is a living, breathing organism, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure Councillor Wyatt is aware, in 2010 our revenue on taxes increased approximately six million from what we projected. Our budget for snow clearing for the month of November was up millions of dollars. It's changing all the time, Mr. Speaker. So if you want to blame the budget shortfall, you think there was one, you can pick any one of those other things that increased in cost. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is, we collected 5.3 million dollars that many people in this Chamber criticized us for and never thought we were going to get and you know what, we got it. Move on. End of story. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item 2, Mayor.

Item 2 - City of Winnipeg Participation in the Municipal Local Economic Development Program

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, it's been so long I think it was Councillor Eadie who stood that down so I'll wait to hear what Councillor Eadie has to say and I'll respond.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: May I, Speaker Nordman?

Mr. Speaker: Absolutely, go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman, I actually am in support of this particular item and so I stand up though because I just wanted to get some clarification. I never spoke to it when it did come up at EPC. I did, however, hear, hear Councillor Steeves speak about this economic development initiative that doesn't really…doesn't cost the City any money but I believe we're participating with an area in Ukraine, in terms of assisting them with how they might develop their economy, which is one of the things they've been focusing on for many years now is educating the population in Ukraine. And in Ukraine, they are starting to progress, but they do need people that they can speak to that might be able to assist them in moving their economic development ahead. And I've just, what I'm wondering about, Mr. Speaker, Speaker Nordman, is, I know that, I do believe, Harry Lazarenko used to be the person who handled the Leviv Sister City Portfolio and then I believe at some point Councillor Browaty who has some Ukrainian background I believe, was somehow associated with that. And I'm wondering, because this is economic development as it relates to Ukraine, I'm wondering if, like who is taking the lead on helping Ukraine proceed in a prosperous way.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to ask a quick question as well while we're on the topic of Sister Cities. Because it's sort of a topic that's been pretty quiet around here about and I know we had some very significant involvement with Uganda several years ago and I've noticed there's sort of been a change in the language, in how we talk about, we're not really using the word Sister City. Because I know I brought forward a motion about Uganda regarding the issue of the oppression of gay and lesbian people that this Council supported unanimously but at that time we didn't use the word, "Sister City", we used another, maybe it was municipal agreement or some other word. Anyway, I'm just wondering, like, are we still actively engaged with those other sister cities and if so, is there any money at all allocated for this? Or, I've found in talking to the Administration that the authority for these things seems to rest with the Mayor's office. They are more Mayor's office initiatives than CAO sort of office initiatives. And honestly, I'm just really asking, I'd like to know the status of our relationship with our sister city in Uganda and I know there's several others and I do certainly recall that we were very, very involved with Uganda in the past. So, if Council could receive an update on this, I'd really appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I'll just comment on the Motion generally. I don't know that I'm necessarily in a position to speak to the Sister Cities on this issue. It's not directly germane to this particular motion. The question is fair enough I suppose. And I don't know that I have an answer on the Uganda issue. But if it pleases the Chair, just to sort of give Councillor Gerbasi some information. I don't, I don't actually believe we have a Sister City in Uganda if I'm not mistaken, I think we (inaudible). I thought it was a twinning program that we did through CEDA, I don't, I don't actually think it was a formal Sister City but I could be wrong with that. The specific program that existed with Kampala was through CEDA through FCM in any effect, that's for certain. A program much like this at the time, so it wasn't sort of funded or developed or ran through the City of Winnipeg Sister City rubric and I am 99.9% sure that Kampala is not a Sister City of the City of Winnipeg. Regardless that program was set in place and at the time our Director of Community Services, Ursula Stelman, Ursula Selman? Stelman? Year that Ursula Stelman. She spearheaded the program. And it evolved, it went over a period of two years of formal involvement with the City of Winnipeg and then at that time, it evolved out into the community and even though I don't know the City of Winnipeg necessarily has any formal, informal involvement. I do know that there are private sector groups in our community who maintain those relationships. That was set up by virtue of the program that existed between the City of Winnipeg and Kampala, Uganda at that time. And that was the nature of the set up. That's my information. On this particular recommendation that's before Council and to answer Councillor Eadie's questions which were fairly put, in terms of the lead of the program, thus far it has been me working with Dennis Volkov out of the Mayor's Office, working with Tom Manisterski from FCM in Ottawa, setting this up. Now I want to be clear, this motion does not make the City of Winnipeg a participant in the program. All this does is it says the City of Winnipeg is able to be considered for the program. In order to be considered for the program, the Council of the Municipality has to give that direction to the program. The program is through FCM, administered and paid for by the Federal Government. Again, it's in the recommendation. There is no cost to the City of Winnipeg. It would involve some brief, relatively brief I would say, secondment from time to time of public service members to assist in the development of this program. Now, there is going to be a meeting here in Winnipeg coincidentally, bringing together some of the potential partners for the program, not just from Winnipeg but from other municipalities that are shown an interest. It's going to be April 29th-ish, somewhere in there, but Councillor Eadie, if you wish further information on that, simply come to my office and you're welcome to participate. I don't know that I personally will be the guy, quote unquote, who will be our lead on this. That decision is going to have to be made by somebody else. I'm not sure that personally this is something that I'm able to do. But, I do think that somebody is going to have to be, somebody is going to have to take the political lead at some appropriate time. We're not there yet. We haven't been selected yet. All this does is sort of get us into the mix to be considered. Once we're considered, then obviously, we have to be selected. Once we're selected and going through that process then the details of the program would be laid out. It involves six cities in the west of the Ukraine, six cities in the east of the Ukraine and there would be direct partnerships formed with a dozen cities in Canada. And again, any travel back and forth that is occasioned by anyone, any costs, hotels, meals, is paid for by the Federal Government with none of those costs be borne by the Municipality. So, I think it's a good program. It's chance for us to re-establish our relationship with the Ukraine. We do have a Sister City in the Ukraine. We do know that our Sister City in the Ukraine is one of the 12 cities that is going to be participating in the program. Whether or not will be ultimately matched up with that City, still has yet to be determined, as it is dependant on a few different factors. So I think it's an exciting initiative, I think it's interesting. I don't know where it's going to end up for the City of Winnipeg, but I hope Council is okay with us supporting this direction to see if indeed we can participate.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a…I'm not sure if I have a lot to add after what Councillor Steeves put on the table. I think he put all the facts there, and whatever involvement monetary that is covered by, it's not covered by the City of Winnipeg, which I think is important, it's an FCM initiative and I think, let's let this process roll out and see if we are one of the Cities to be part of it and obviously time will tell. At that particular point in time, I think Councillor Steeves has made it very clear that if that is the case he may not be the one leading it and then we can discuss who would be leading that initiative and I certainly would be happy to hear from anybody who has strong feelings on that. Not a problem. If anybody wants to know our Sister Cities, I invite you to go downstairs, they are all listed on a map for everyone to see, black and white. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. Report February 16th, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT "A" OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 16, 2011**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 6.

Mr. Speaker: No Items. All those in favour? One through six? Opposed? Carried. Motions. We have one motion that is for referral. Councillor Eadie, Councillor Wyatt. Automatic referral to EPC. Thank you.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS**

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

WHEREAS the sections of The Police Services Act that will change the way the City of Winnipeg runs its police service have not yet been proclaimed;

AND WHEREAS these sections of The Police Services Act may be proclaimed at any time with the City of Winnipeg needing to be prepared to undertake its responsibilities under this Act;

AND WHEREAS under section 30 of The Police Services Act, a by-law must establish the size of the police board charged to oversee the City of Winnipeg Police Service with a minimum of 7 members appointed;

AND WHEREAS two (2) members of the Winnipeg police board are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the City of Winnipeg Council appoints the remaining members;

AND WHEREAS no more than fifty percent (50%) may be employees or councillors appointed to the police board;

AND WHEREAS City Council should be acting in advance and thinking about how and who is appointed to the police board;

AND WHEREAS a City of Winnipeg police board needs to have councillors that represent all the communities across the city;

AND WHEREAS inner city representation needs to be reflected on the police board;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT to be as prepared as possible, a draft by-law be created to include the following elements:

1) *In addition to the two (2) members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the City of Winnipeg Council appoint ten (10) more members on the police board according to the following provisions:*
    - i) *Have each community committee appoint one Councillor from each of the five community committees with an emphasis on selecting inner city Councillors each time a Councillor needs to be appointed;*
    - ii) *Appoint the CAO or CAO designate as an employee representative of the City of Winnipeg;*
    - iii) *Utilizing any regulation or guidelines set out by the Province of Manitoba under The Police Services Act, through an application process, appoint four (4) members from communities around the city to be recommended to City Council by a committee made of one representative from each community committee and the Mayor struck each time new community members are to be appointed.*
2) *Designate the City employee as the chairperson and a senior city Councillor as the vice-chairperson.*
3) *As indicated by section 33 in The Police Services Act, set out a clause allowing the police board to set its own procedures within the parameters of the Act.*
4) *Set the number of police board meetings to 11 monthly meetings excluding the month of prorogue.*

Mr. Speaker: And By-laws, Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move By-law No. 6/2011, 7/2011, 8/2011, 9/2011, 10/2011, 11/2011, 12/2011, 13/2011, 14/2011, 15/2011, 16/2011 and 21/2011.

Clerk: By-Laws Numbered 6/2011, 7/2011, 8/2011, 9/2011, 10/2011, 11/2011, 12/2011, 13/2011, 14/2011, 15/2011, 16/2011, and 17/2011.

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

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws numbered 6/2011 to 16/2011 both inclusive and 21/2011 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 6/2011 to 16/2011 both inclusive and 21/2011.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the rules be suspended and the By-laws numbered 6/2011 to 16/2011 both inclusive and 21/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Wyatt.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor. Mr. Mayor, we have a Councillor colleague who, a couple of months ago, put forward a request for additional assistance in terms of the fact that he suffers from a disability. At this point in time, I believe the request is still kicking around. Nothing has been finalized on it. I'm sure you would agree with me that as individuals who have the ability of all our senses, it would be hard to imagine to be able to do the job as an Elected Official without one's sight, and simply put, would you, even though it's being kicked around right now, would you be prepared to step in and intervene to facilitate, to ensure that the necessary resources are ear-marked to assist Councillor Eadie with the job that he has to do that we all, as equal members of this Chamber, were all elected, he should have the ability to do his job no different than we do, no matter what his disability is. It's an issue of simple human rights and equality. Would you be able to assist to ensure that we don't continue to have this discussion internally; that the resources are ear-marked that he needs that is necessary to be able to do the job that he was elected to do?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Wyatt, I thank you for the question. I'm not of the opinion that if I was required to step in and assist, I would be happy to do that. I think Council as a whole acknowledges the challenges, and I think Councillor Wyatt used the term "kicked around". I think the only thing that's being kicked around is what is a fair and reasonable number to address those challenges. As we all know, every Councillor does get an allowance and I think it's just a matter of determining what the reasonable number is. I hope that addresses the question.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: It does, but in the meantime, you know, he doesn't have the benefits that we have and he is still expected by his constituents to do his duty and his job no different than we are expected to do our duty. Could we resolve this in the coming days once and for all, because it's just not fair that a member of this Council who clearly does have a disability, who is not making an issue, but I've had a conversation with him saying that this is a concern. I think that we should resolve this once and for all and just ensure that a member of this Council could do the job that he was elected to do.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, first of all I think it's incumbent upon all of us to make sure that we do our jobs. That's number one. Number two, maybe Councillor Wyatt has something specifically in mind he might want to recommend since he does have one more follow-up question. I'm not sure where he's trying to get when he says "would I specifically do what", and if he says that I'll try and answer it.

Councillor Wyatt: Well, I was going to suggest that you specifically, behind you, Mr. Ruta, if you can give direction and say, let's find the resources necessary. He gave a, he gave a statement of what the resources he felt he needed were, so he clearly outlined what his needs were and I think that request was not unreasonable knowing the challenges that, I mean I couldn't imagine doing the job without sight. I mean, it's something that we take for granted, and I'm just saying, you know, with the powers that you have, the Office that you have to do everything possible to resolve this as quickly as possible.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Wyatt. I know exactly what he wants right now. I can tell him that one, obviously this has been referred to the Operating Budget, but I will most definitely have a conversation with the CAO and see what, but also it does go through a process which Council, in the end, does vote on Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a number of occasions in the last few weeks, the City has issued press releases giving updates about the contract negotiations with C.U.P.E., and I'm concerned that the releases seem to include specific information about the negotiations, like the City's position, what we're offering, and this and that, whereas from what I've seen, C.U.P.E. has stayed out of and has respected the process of not negotiating through the media, and I'm wondering why the City, why our Administration appears to be releasing these press releases that are really negotiating in the media which is my understanding we aren't suppose to do in these types of circumstances.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, I can assure you that the City or the Administration would always act within the confines of proper protocol and I have no doubt in my mind that is exactly what they have done. Number two, Mr. Speaker, if you read reports in the media on a regular basis, you will hear, see these reports referring to "confirmed by C.U.P.E. and the City". Don't know who that is or what that is, but that's what it always says. I can tell you that any comments that I have made have been very generic. We continue to work with C.U.P.E. as most people know. We are going back to the table and that is our standard policy and our policy doesn't change. Regardless of what entity it is, you always deal in good faith and I believe that the City will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, and I'm not accusing or suggesting the Mayor has done this, but I have seen press releases that do seem to me to be essentially negotiating, laying our position out in through the media. That's what a press release is. It's for the media, and I think it goes beyond just providing the information. It's laying out our position and I don't hear. I don't even know C.U.P.E.'s position because they haven't done that. So I guess I, I don't think we should be negotiating through the media, and if our Administration is doing that, I don't know why they would do it without some sort of instruction or if it's just if I'm wrong, but that's the impression I've got and I just want to be sure that our Administration, I'm not saying politically, that our Administration has been releasing press releases that do appear to be negotiating in the media. Can you just confirm that again, that is not what's happening because that's what I'm seeing.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I happen to know exactly what the City of Winnipeg put on the table, and I can assure Councillor Gerbasi that has not appeared in any way, shape or form in any media outlet whatsoever.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, my last question is, I realize our whole position has not been released in the media, but the parts of it that sound good and that make, that win the public support towards one side as opposed to the other, have been included in press releases which is what I am talking about by suggesting that it appears that the City Administration is negotiating through the media, whereas, I don't know the good sides of C.U.P.E.'s arguments about why they got a strike mandate because they aren't doing that. So I put to you to, I realize our whole position isn't out there. Only the parts that make the public think we're the good guys and I don't know because I don't have all the facts, but we should not be negotiating through the media Mr. Mayor, and I want to be assured that we're not going to be doing that again in the future, or doing it at all.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm here to represent the City of Winnipeg, 670,000 citizens of Winnipeg. I don't represent C.U.P.E. okay? I thought I made it very clear the first time that what the good Councillor has implied is totally inaccurate. If for some unknown reason she has perceived it in a different way, I can only

tell her that is not correct. I don't know more I can say because the facts are we are sitting and negotiating. I mean I almost feel like I'm listening to the words of Mike Davidson as opposed to a Councillor for the City of Winnipeg, but the facts of life are, Mr. Speaker, we, the City of Winnipeg, have basically complied with all proper protocol. We have not breached any of those protocols to my understanding. If Councillor Gerbasi has something specific that she would like to discuss with me, I would be more than pleased to look into it, but everything that I have seen and I'm aware of, absolutely no breach of protocol in any way, shape or form.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, I'm glad to hear that there's a Downtown Parking Strategy happening. With respect to our downtown, Mr. Speaker, we're looking at trying to create more residential development downtown and more active living downtown. I'm glad to see there's a lot of new units happening as of late. I'd like to ask the Mayor, Mr. Speaker, where abouts is the Downtown Residential Development Strategy. I know it's been in the works for a couple of years and it involves homelessness, green space in the downtown, safety, tax incentives, accessibility. When can we expect to see that report coming to Council?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Pagtakhan for the question. I think for anybody who did attend the State of the City Address, Mr. Speaker, it was made very clear of the major accomplishments and the growth we've had in creating downtown housing. It's already increased by 10%. I think earlier it was Councillor Swandel who referred to the uptake that we created and, keep in mind, it was the City of Winnipeg who came to the table with basically giving 20,000 dollars per door and then the Province joined us a few years later on and I know that Councillor Wyatt was pushing for that as well. They finally came to the table and you can see the motivation right now is there to basically provide more housing downtown, rental units, as well as condo's, as well as affordable housing, because that's part of the equation. So, we are moving very quickly. I think also people are aware of the fact for the first time in two and half decades we actually have a major, major development, a 45 million dollar rental units being built in our downtown as well, so you can see that the private sector believes in our downtown. Certainly there's no question that the two levels of Government have helped the stimulation, but there's a lot of housing going on right now, everywhere you look. Drive down Portage Avenue, drive down Main Street, go through the East Exchange, etcetera, housing is being created everywhere.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yeah, I'm pleased with the Mayor's response and this Council definitely needs to be proud of what it's doing for the downtown, but Mr. Speaker, my question is akin to creating a Downtown Development, a Downtown Residential Development Strategy. I'd like to know when that strategy is coming forward. Can we expect it within the next 60 days?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I heard earlier Councillor Pagtakhan referred to poverty. I think that the Councillor would agree that poverty is an issue that needs to be addressed by all three levels of Government. Federal Government, Provincial Government, City of Winnipeg, the private sector, faith based groups, etcetera, etcetera. That's number 1. Number 2, I think the Councillor is also aware of the fact that it was when I was Mayor that we actually made the Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative a line-item in our budget. It never existed before. So we will continue to move in the right direction. As far as the specific question of when that would come forward Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that under advisement and get back to the Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, just one final question here. Is the Mayor committed to creating a Downtown Retail Strategy?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, my career began in retail. As soon as I graduated University I opened up my first clothing store in Brandon, Manitoba. Simple reason? I was taught minimize your losses and maximize your profits. In case it wasn't successful I didn't think it would be so bad. It was successful and I opened up another store here in Winnipeg. Not only am I committed to retail, but also housing, also basically multi-use. That's where this City has failed in its downtown. Every successful downtown had mixed-usage. For some

unknown reason, didn't happen, wasn't allowed in our City. You can see that is changing Mr. Speaker. We need people living, working and playing in our downtown. You don't want them here just during the work hours. When everybody else has left, you want a nucleus of people here that can create activity, and once you have enough people here, that's when the retail comes. It's the "Catch 22", and as I said many times before, there are many amenities for those who live downtown that they need, and they need them without having to have access to a car. That's what it's all about. So we are working towards that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to pick up on Councillor Gerbasi's line of questioning of the Mayor. I just want to make sure that we all clearly understand what we're doing here and what's transpired, so perhaps through you Mr. Speaker, the first think I'd like to ask the Mayor is that, with the early in the negotiating process, the two parties not being able to get anywhere and they walked away from the table, you know, it was pretty quick timing and we had lots of information in the media about a possible flood situation this year. I guess my question through you to the Mayor is for the Mayor to confirm that it's important that we communicate with our citizens that we will be looking after all matters regardless of what may happen in any labour negotiation, and in particular those that bring some serious concern to our citizens and that communication to our citizens is of utmost importance in that regard.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Through you to the Councillor, I thank you for the question Mr. Speaker. First of all, I've tried and I will continue to let everybody know that emergency services. First of all, let's put this on the table. I don't think anybody in this Chamber wants to see a strike, which is why I think it's a good thing we're sitting and talking this very week. That's number one. Number two, as you can appreciate one must always prepare for the worst, and that's what we have to do especially when they do have a strike mandate. So number one, Emergency Services. Okay? Police, Paramedics, Fire Fighters would not be impacted. Essential services okay? Such as water main breaks, etcetera. And I can tell you right now that the City is preparing to deal with the potential flood, although we don't know to what degree it may be. I can tell you last week, we started making sandbags and we certainly are using everything we have access to, to make sure that we can deal with these challenges in the unfortunate event that there may be a strike, which none of us are hoping will happen and are all working towards resolving that issue. I hope that addresses the question but if not, I guess there'll be a follow-up.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just wanted some clarity through you, perhaps the Mayor would be kind enough to clarify, I believe that there was some communications, the media releases that went out, were more generic in nature and talking about how the citizens were going to be looked after and processes that we'd put in place and had really nothing to do with the negotiations, but there was also at the same time internal communications to all C.U.P.E. members from the CAO's office and our HR folks that outlined some of what the City had put on the table which may have been the confusion that happened here that caused Councillor Gerbasi to take her position, so perhaps the Mayor can clarify that there was, in fact, internal communications to C.U.P.E. members that may have outlined some pieces, but those were not part of any public communications or public media releases.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I certainly am aware that there were internal communications from the City to the C.U.P.E. leadership, as well as I know there's communication with Councillors. I have no intention on speculating specifically what Councillor Gerbasi was referring to. I'm sure she'd be happy to discuss that with me, I would, but there's been a lot of communication going on. I also neglected to mention earlier that obviously, you know, snow clearing and garbage removal would also continue as well, so there's a lot of services and I think it's important for us to let the public know that we are preparing for this and what would be affected in the unfortunate circumstances of a strike and what would not be. And I will tell you quite often, Mr. Speaker, it's actually because of the comments that Councillor Gerbasi made, when I get asked questions on this, you know I'm trying to be very careful not to get specific so you're not negotiating in public. There are generic questions such as just came forward right now which I think is on the table and is public knowledge and we should let everybody know.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions Councillor Swandel? Good. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Through you to the Mayor, I just wanted to say that it was great to have a 15 minute meeting on an 817 million or more million dollar budget the other day on the 10th of February, and it was my first opportunity to speak to the Mayor about my platform that I ran on City Council and did talk about some of my issues, but, and, it's really good, you know, we had the Capital Budget presented to us in a Seminar and we got to ask some questions and kind of to, it was awhile, about a week or so later that I was able to get the accessible files for that Capital Budget and I did go through it with a fine tooth comb, and so there's always issues of trying to work on stuff, and for me as a City Councillor it's important that I work on the issues of the day, not on trying to deal with putting together, well, anyway I'm very busy to deal with issues related to how long it takes to process information because I'm just busy trying to get it done. But, I wanted to also point out that at Capital Budget yesterday we talked about the ability of non-EPC members to participate in the budgetary process. It's very difficult for us and we did have some public meetings, but as a City Councillor, Speaker Nordman, it's very difficult for us to give input on a budget at a community, or public consultation where the City Councillor should listen to what the public wants, and that's the purpose of those things, and so that's not an ability to participate, so through you to the Mayor, my question is, given that nobody on EPC asked any questions about the proposed motion, or information that I had suggested at EPC, my question is simply this. During the Operating Budget process, will I actually get some input, some dialogue, some discussion about any proposals that I might make to EPC.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Eadie, first of all I very much thank him for the time he spent with me and shared his, actually he gave me a little written submission on what was important to him as a Councillor for his Ward in Mynarski, and obviously, crime and safety was the big issue. Obviously he experienced that first hand when knocking on doors. I've also had the opportunity to meet with Councillor Steen as well. I know Councillor Pagtakhan and I had a meeting set up but obviously he wasn't able to make it. We re-scheduled. I will be meeting with most of the Councillors on the Operating Budget. I would like to believe, Mr. Speaker, that if any Councillor has a motion or a suggestion, I know that the Mayor's always there to listen. I believe that EP listens, I believe that Council listens. We do have a process where we do have a Council Seminar which gives everybody the opportunity to basically see it first hand and digest it, ask questions, and as you know, the Standing Policy Committees meet to hear delegations etc. So there is a process that's obviously been around for many, many years. Has been successful and continues to work. By the same token, that does not prevent any Councillor from contacting yours truly or anybody else. If certain Councillors choose not to, that certainly is their prerogative and I accept that, but I have had some very good dialogue with a few Councillors and I'm sure will be continuing in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker: Follow up?

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman, prevention is very important in safety, and that was part of our meeting, and I think that's great, and, given that our, the EPC and the people on it get to participate with the Administration on an on-going basis, hours and hours and hours and hours and hours and hours of meetings, and I would like to ask this question. If the EPC members are concerned about any negative input about any budget, including this upcoming Operating Budget, can you find a better way to allow non-EPC members to participate in the budgetary process where we can actually work with the Administration as well to, you know, try to set some priorities?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I think we found out yesterday, whenever you're dealing with the Budget, Capital or Operating, there's always going to be negative comments, there's always going to be criticisms. And as I mentioned yesterday, if you go back, you can see sometimes people vote against the budgets. That's just the way it is. You learn to live with it. We move on. In the end, Council is supreme. If Councillor Eadie has anything specifically in mind that he wants to meet with me, I'd be happy to set up an appointment that he and I can discuss whatever suggestions or comments that he may have. I would like to, I know that this Council, and what we do with the City, is we have one of the most transparent situations of just about any Council in Canada. I'd like to keep it that way. We certainly do have a process. Some people love it. Some people don't. If somebody wants to talk to me about changes, I'm all yours.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Last question.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Speaker Nordman, my third and final question, in terms of money, Councillor Representation Allowances, in order to try to meet my needs early on, I tried to look into the ability to pay my wife some money to help get some of the information accessible to me, and I discovered that through my

Councillor Representation Allowance that, Speaker Nordman, I'm not allowed to give any money to my family because, of course, I would financially gain as a result of that and my household would gain in that. So my question today, third and final question is simply, is it right that somebody should pay for, and I really appreciate eating the meal that I did at Hu's on First on Ellice and then became aware that maybe the Mayor might own that. What's the difference between that and buying, that and paying my wife some money for doing some services that I need?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, if the Councillor has any questions on the Allowance, as you know we used to have what was called the "Secretariat". We now have what is called the "Governance". I believe that is where he should be taking it and hopefully by now he would know that, and hopefully they can deal with those issues and, you know, it is what it is, I guess at this stage of the game Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Steeves: Question, Mr. Speaker through you to the Mayor on an issue that was raised by Councillor Gerbasi March 23rd, 2010. I'm just going to read her issue from Hansard and I'll ask the Mayor if this issue has been resolved. It reads, quote, "The budget includes 10 million dollars in revenue from a lawsuit against the Province related to the gas and electricity tax. Even if you think it is right to put an additional tax on the G.S.T., how can you possibly include 10 million dollars in the budget when the Province has made no commitment on this money? It is incredibly undiplomatic and unwise to sue the level of Government that we are dependent upon to fund almost everything we do over something like this. We also know that lawsuits take a long time and perhaps even years to play out which means that this 10 million, if it is ever realized, it will be long past due as part of balancing this budget. How does any of this make sense in terms of generally accepted principles of accounting?" Just wondering if this issue's been resolved?

Mr. Speaker: I was waiting for the question.

Mayor Katz: Every time I get up, they pull me back down! Mr. Speaker, you know I think I've been very clear on that. I certainly was not pleased at the time with comments made by Councillors on the money that was owing to the City of Winnipeg. I think Councillor Steeves made it very clear that if we could all basically work together, who knows what we may have accomplished and might have even happened quicker. The bottom line is there were many that, as I said, funny money, phony money, whatever the case may be. The bottom line is, the money was owed and in the end we know it was owed because they settled at 5.3. If you don't owe any money you wouldn't have paid anything. I can assure of that Mr. Speaker. So, as I've said, I do appreciate Councillor Steeves, I guess going, reading from the Hansard, and I would remind people the Hansard is there to record what you say on a regular basis, so remember what you said. The facts of life are, this issue has been resolved. We've got 5.3 million dollars. Let's make sure we use it wisely and let's move on Mr. Speaker. And, I will thank the good Councillor for the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Steeves: (inaudible) At the same meeting an issue was raised by Councillor Wyatt. I'll just read the comments to see if this issue has been resolved. "$10.6 million from Hydro. That's like going out, Mr. Speaker and buying a lottery ticket to feed your family for one month to buy the groceries." (laughter) Just asking the Mayor, how did we do on that lottery?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, for all of us who know and love Councillor Wyatt, he comes up with some great one-liners. They're great for the media. Just like yesterday comparing our road with third world countries. I heard that comment, Mr. Speaker. I think we know 5.3 million dollars worth of groceries would feed a whole lot of people. You know sometimes you just laugh and chuckle and move on, but I would say to those who believe we never get a penny? You saw the results. Thank you. And a big thank you to the Administration.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves. Last question. Councillor Wyatt, we have 27 seconds.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, quick question. The 189 million dollars that we voted on as a Council. We set priorities here in April. You asked many of us to support it. We are now reading that this May, that there's other issues that are coming forward. Can we be assured that that money, which is money we have not seen, did not have a significant amount of stimulus money for a City our size

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen moves extension.

Councillor Wyatt: We did not have a significant amount of money for a City of our size and scale to, 20 million dollars of bike paths is great, but for the stimulus this would be technically almost our stimulus. This is 189 million dollars which we're all waiting for on tender hooks and wondering the status of, of course. And then we're, I want to, and I don't believe everything I read in terms of what I see in the papers. My concern is that all of a sudden we're not going to horse-trade away money which is really money that should be ear-marked for the City based on the City's priorities that Council overwhelmingly voted for back in April.

Mr. Speaker: Good question. Thank you.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Wyatt, I thank him for the question. If I had known that I could have talked another 30 seconds, (laughter) but, Mr. Speaker, (laughter) mea culpa. Mr. Speaker, first of all there is 189 million dollars of Building Canada Funds, which are shared equally between three levels of government at 63 million dollars each. This Council did move a motion on what the priorities were. As you know the Provincial Government may not have agreed with us. I know that Councillor Wyatt does not believe everything he sees, hears, or reads in the media. If anybody for a moment thinks that we're going to be using Building Canada funds money for the Winnipeg Convention Centre, it's not in the equation, but you know what? People have the ability to write whatever they want to write. I can assure him that we are still fighting to get those done. We have spoken to the Department, verified their priorities and we are still working on that, and as you know we have till 2014, but it would be nice if something came to fruition within the next 30 or 60 days. That would certainly be my goal, and yes, we still are working on that.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Mr. Mayor. That's the end of Question Period. Report of May the 3rd from Protection and Community Services. Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED MAY 3, 2010

Item 6 – Smoking Ban in Outdoor Areas

Councillor Steeves: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm just going to make some introductory comments because I'm sure people may have some thoughts on this one. There may or may not be discussion depending on how this goes. This is on the smoking ban, in outdoor areas. We have a lot of fun in this Chamber and sometimes we agree on things and sometimes we don't agree but one thing I can say, Mr. Speaker is I do always admire the way our Council gets their hands dirty. And I always admire the way that we deal with issues, good, bad or indifferent. This is an issue that has come up from stakeholders in the Community, a couple of which you've heard from this morning. And, my sense is, and I'm going to wait for Council to comment on this issue. But my sense is, in speaking to all of my friends and colleagues on Council, is that by and large, the City of Winnipeg Council wants to do something on this issue. I think Council wants to see some action taken. I think Council feels as though this is an important enough issue where something has to be constructed by the City of Winnipeg, to give us some authority to deal with this issue. Now, I'm going to caution all of us that before Council today, no report with details exists that would allow us to move forward on this. And what I mean by that, of course, is if ultimately it is the will of this Council to move forward on this issue, we are going to have to make some decisions as to outdoor smoking in our City. Where it's going to be allowed, where it's not going to be allowed, where it's going to be prohibited. What type of signage we're going to need, if we're going to talk about athletic fields, how far away from the athletic fields do you need to be? Are we going to talk about buildings that are our buildings or buildings generally in our community? What is our authority, what is not our authority? What can we do, what can't we do? All of those pretty, I think, important questions, have not been answered in the report in front of us. So if it's anyone he is will to stand up today and say "I want to move ahead with a By-law today" I would submit that that's probably impossible unless somebody is willing to sit down right now and draft up a By-law that deals with all of those types of details which I think would be impossible and probably fairly irresponsible. Having said that, I look forward to my colleagues comments on this because I'm trying to form an opinion as to how Council feels about this issue because we really haven't had a chance to have an open discussion about this, so this is going to be important. The motion, recommendation before you sends this issue to the Province on a 30 day time line as it were, asking for the Province's position on this. Now, the Province has been in contact with us already through the Minister of Healthy Living, Jim Rondeau. I want to commend Minister Rondeau for his accessibility on this issue. He has been very accessible in terms of his response on this issue, even though the response is not a response that I thought was the proper response in the context of a Provincial Government. I mean I'll say this,

partially tongue in cheek. If the Minister of Healthy Living, I think people would understand if you came out with a hard stance against smoking in public places. We haven't seen that from the Minister in terms of his representation of the Provincial Government. Instead what we've seen is a letter coming back saying "we support the idea that this practice be banned at soccer fields " and the categoric statement thus far that there's no intention on moving ahead on this in terms of altering their By-law or their Statutes to regulate this behaviour further. This is unfortunate, I think, mostly because of the practicalities of it. We are in the capital regions, one of 16 independent Municipalities. If you have kids that play football or play soccer or play any other outdoor sport, you know it is a very common occurrence for those youngsters to play in West St. Paul, to play in Springfield, to play in other municipalities that surround Winnipeg. You'll also know, I think, some of our athletic fields, our athletic facilities, Bloomberg, I believe, is outside of the City of Winnipeg and in another Municipality. I'm unsure exactly how that would work. We were hoping for some leadership from the Provincial Government on this. I think I have to tell you at this stage that we don't expect to hear back on that leadership from the Provincial Government. Having said that, we are going to need some time here to instruct our Administration to move forward and come back to us with some ideas on this issue as to how to construct something. Now I may be presumptuous on this in assuming that Council wants to do this, but the sense I have thus far is that we do. So, assuming I'm correct on that and assuming we can, our Administration is already thinking about this and assuming that the Province is going to not come back to us within 30 days with any assurance that they are going to move forward on this, then I fully expect that at our April 4th meeting, of the Committee of Protection of Community Services, we're going to have before us, at Committee, a request from that Committee to instruct our Administration to come back to Committee in relatively short order, with these types of recommendations, for that Standing Committee to consider and obviously EPC and then Council. So there is a process that we have to follow to be responsible to get something in place. So people have some time on this. You have heard the delegations come forward with respect to their opinions on the issue and I have to admit, I am personally still surprised at the depth and breadth of the evidence on the health issue surrounding secondhand smoke in an outdoor setting. People may have different opinions on that but I was surprised to learn that that was actually a position taken by the authorities on this matter. For my part, as a citizen and more as a dad on this issue, I always thought the idea behind this type of Policy was for the example that it set. I am not a smoker, save for the occasional cigar. As a parent, I hope that my, that none of our 3 children will make the choice to become smokers. And I do believe that, the idea that they wouldn't see people smoking at things like soccer games and around play structures, would help them not to make that ultimate choice. I do think that it's probably intuitive that children and other people make the choice to smoke based on the idea that they simply see other people smoking. That was my sense of it, in any event. So, as we move forward with this I would ask for Council's support to follow that path, being today, we pass this recommendation, we formally send the matter to the Province and ask them to get back to us with the amendment in writing, as to their position. We've heard from the Minister in terms of a letter, that's something. But we would like to hear, ideally, from the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, asking if this is going to be at any time on the Legislative Agenda to make any sorts of changes. And again, if it was, that would be preferable. And we've heard that from our delegations, not necessarily today, but Executive Policy Committee, when asked, the delegations were very clear, they would like the Province to institute a Province-wide ban on this type of behavior. Again, if that is not going to be forthcoming, I would ask that this Council does deal with it. So, we'll wait for 30 days from today, by then that'll expire we will likely not have heard positively back from the Provincial Government. It will be on mine, and Councillor Eadie, and Councillor Smith and Councillor Steen's Agenda for April 4th. At that time we'll consider it and hopefully instruct our Administration to go back and consider this issue and then we will move forward from that point. I think that's the most responsible way to go about this. I think it's the way that makes the most sense and I would submit, given what's before this Council today, I think it's probably the only choice that we have in terms of trying to realistically and responsibly advance this issue. But again, I'll await comments from Council either today or throughout the course of the next month to try to get a feeling as to how my Council Colleagues feel about this issue. Because I don't want to be presumptuous and assume that we all feel the same about this, because that's my unadvised opinion at this stage.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves, could you also speak to the amendment while you have the floor. I know, we've gone.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Steeves,
Seconded by Councillor Steen,

THAT *Item 6 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated May 3, 2010 be amended by adding the words* ***"in writing"*** *at the end of Recommendation 1.*

Councillor Steeves: I briefly mentioned the amendment. It only states we add the words in writing at the end of "recommendation 1, if I'm, right?

Mr. Speaker: Within 30 days, in writing?

Councillor Steeves: Yes. In writing. So it's a simple enough amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Fair enough. Thank you. Okay. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, brilliant amendment, I think. Absolutely brilliant. You know, we're tasked with something here that's pretty obvious I think and I want to take us all back to where this came from. The Soccer Association that got a hold of the City and said you know we have this problem where folks are smoking on the side lines of soccer games while our young children are playing and we want to be able to do something, tell these people they can't do that. And I believe they were informed that in order to do that, the City needs to have a By-law, so they can kind of self-enforce. I'd like to believe that we live in a society where we should all be self-enforcing when it comes to smoking in front of children, that you would walk 50 meters away without having to have someone remind you or without having to have a sign remind you. That's where this started. And all they wanted was us to make a By-law that says around our athletic fields or around our soccer fields that the By-law said that you can't smoke. And so that a parent could say to another parent, you know, it's against the law to do that. And that simple reminder would help to reduce the incidents where people were smoking in close proximity to children. You know, and I say that because it's important to have that context. I believe that we should somehow find a way to get less people smoking on side lines. But I also caution us about being, creating too many regulations. People tend to ignore them if you're just out there creating them. So, you know, we're going to go to these lengths, we're going to the Province, fine if the Province will do something, that's great. It will come back to us. But there is a general agreement that we want to do something, but we can, what really should be the responsibility of individuals, I feel. It's difficult to put this in words that everybody could truly get their heads around. But we could actually be passing all these little laws to make it so that everybody can say to another person, don't do that, but it really takes away from the authority. So we want to do this right when we do this because I think it's going to come back. I think I'm seeing from the Province that there is not much desire to address this. Why there isn't, for the life of me, I don't know. Because it is as we've seen previously when we dealt with smoking indoors, we went to all the expense of getting the By-law, figuring out what it had to be, having our legal people work on it, putting an enforcement piece in place and dealing with compliance, only to, you know within months of the Province turned around and have an overall By-law for the entire Province. So it would be nice if the Province was at least send a signal that they…while they can't do anything right away we're going to do something within a year, within six months or something so that we wouldn't put our valuable resources to work doing this. I guess just in closing, just, as individuals, the citizens around this City, let's not smoke in close proximity where children are playing, whether it's on soccer fields or play grounds or whatever. For those of us who still smoke. I used to be a smoker and I'm probably guilty of this practice at some point in time in my life but older, wiser, hopefully, some would argue that. But you know, let's…as individuals, if you ever get the opportunity to make mention to those that are around us that still smoke, let's respect the folks around that…and especially the children around, that you can have a negative impact on their future.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. Just quickly in voting for this motion and I'm for the motion, I just, this is an opportunity to heat for me personally to publicly say that soccer season is coming up. I have been involved in an altercation that was kind of ugly on the side lines of a soccer field at Garden City two years ago. And you know, I just think that people should know that make no mistake, I think that myself, and I think that generally everybody, we are going to ban smoking from around recreational fields, I believe, so when this season starts, just because we haven't necessarily gotten a By-law into place, people should please conduct themselves appropriately and recognize that role modelling, smoking is not good because, you know, it kills people. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. And I appreciate the work that the Standing Policy Committee has been doing on this issue. I was on the Standing Committee and involved when we brought in the smoking ban in bars and in closed public spaces and those of you who were here remember how difficult that was and how it seemed so impossible to stop smoking in bars and now bars are a place that people can actually go and enjoy without the effects, and for the employees and all those issues. So you know, I think this Council should be proud of the effort we did at that time. And the other thing was the Province, I mean it would be great if they would take the lead but in that time they didn't either and then they followed with Province-Wide Legislation. Many, this does seem to be, I don't know why, how it often works but Municipalities across the Country often end up having to take the lead. The other, quickly, one point I want to make is, I understand the reason this came forward was from the Soccer Association and it's was about soccer fields but once you open this topic and once you start looking at Policy, you are then looking at other issues such as patios, smoking on patios, things like that. Those are issues that will and maybe this is not being opened up but I just…I'd advise you that I've been hearing people talking about that now, I've heard people say that there shouldn't be smoking allowed on patios, you have employees walking through there. You have children eating and at restaurants on Corydon Avenue and you have smoke in your face. So it is an issue that will come up whether we want it to or not. If we are going to examine this policy issue and open it up which I believe we are, and we should, those issue will have to be looked at. And last time we looked at this issue it was really necessary I think to give the public a chance to have input. And we had, as you might remember, two full days of public consultations in this Chamber. We had delegations for two full days to talk about, there was businesses that had an interest, there was residents, there was different organizations. Councillor Pagtakhan was involved I remember, and Councillor Smith and myself as well as Councillor Lubosch. So you know, it might sound like well, this is going to come to the Standing Committee and we're going to whip off a Policy on Soccer Fields which is a little more obvious because you're talking about children and it's right there. But I also think we need to look at some of these, this issue of patios and we have to give the public, the business community, the residents and people, a chance to really be heard like we did last time. Because it takes, you're talking about behaviour, and if you're going to just bring in Legislation where nobody's really been included, what always happens is other things we haven't thought of come up, that the public raises. The health issues can be clarified by the Cancer Society and other experts. Sandy Harlos and people like that can come forward. And I think we have to have a bit of a rigorous process if we're going to do this, rather than whipping off a quick By-law that deals with one aspect of the smoking in public places issue. So you are opening up a can of worms. I applaud you for doing it because I think that's the political courage that we need, and I think you're doing the right thing but I just wanted to put those thoughts on the table about how we might want to consider proceeding and I do expect in the long term it will end up, if we show the leadership and take the action in our City, the biggest city in the Province. You know, the Province will again follow like they have here and like they do in most other Provinces when they're in big cities, like Toronto and other cities do this it follows Provincially afterwards. I don't know why. But that seems to be the way it is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This one is a no brainer for me and in fact if the Chairperson had a motion in front of us today to ban public smoking in athletic fields, I would certainly support it but having said that, having lived through the 2002 smoking ban, where the restauranteurs, the Hotel Association, everybody was against it, even the Premier and then the Mayor, actually, initially. I know that when you're developing policy, especially, well good public policy, it takes time and Councillor Gerbasi is right, we even had public hearings at one point, with former Councillor Lubosch held public hearings throughout the City of Winnipeg to kind of air out this issue with the public and hear both sides of it. And there were all sorts of detractors who were "the sky is falling" sort of reaction to an indoor public smoking ban. And of course, as we know, that didn't happen, in fact one of our largest hoteliers was dead set against it and immediately after built a new hotel in the City of Brandon with the smoking ban. So this is something that's coming. Secondhand smoking is a carcinogen. It's common sense on athletic fields. It's going to be a bit longer struggle for patios and outdoor drinking establishments, restaurants, but that's coming as well. I've been in Vancouver, I've been in Victoria. I understand New York City, Toronto, not Montréal but that's coming. Even for the Quebecoise. So I support this Motion and I support the leadership of the Councillor, the Chairperson of the Committee. I hope the Province come along because way back when they were kicking and screaming every step of the way and shortly thereafter realized that there's actually votes here if we do this. So I think that it's something that's coming and we have to make sure we do it right.

Mr. Speaker: October 4th. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I would like to use the term no brainer in terms of the sports field that has been brought up. I tend to agree with that. I don't think anyone as you mentioned in Council has an issue with that. The Provincial side of things, there's a lot of common sense I think that was brought forward in terms of the Provincial, doing a Provincial-wide, I guess, changes in terms of their Legislation, and I wasn't here for the smoking ban that was there but it sounds like there was a lot of duplication that was being a part of it. So I will be interested to see how the response comes from the Province and if we need to take a look at how we're going to address this in the future. I'm open to that. I might remind you this was brought forward just from the Soccer Association around the soccer fields. I asked the doctor before what is the clinical data that is there and I think she spoke of one or two feet of…we talked about the density of the smoke and what have you and that's I guess where the clinical data is where there would be some sort of impact for it. So that does resonate with me. If something does come through Council, you know, I am supportive of a limited change to our By-laws. I personally am not interested in looking at the patio issue or someone's walking in Assiniboine Park, minding their own business, and they're having a cigarette. You know, I'm not a smoker but I don't necessarily see a problem with that personally. So I will support that on a limited basis but I'm not really interested in getting involved in any debates on outdoor patios or anything else like this. For me, this is just about the recreational soccer component that's there, recreational facilities. So that's my position on the subject. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. I'll be supportive of this Clause. Let me tell you this. Why don't we be on the cutting edge? Why don't we ban smoking period? Outdoors, in the City of Winnipeg. You can smoke in your home but you can't smoke anywhere else.

Councillor Swandel: Turn the cameras off! (Laughter)

Councillor Smith: Now, I hear Dr. Harlos today, I heard at the Committee level and after I hear her today it seems to me that a ban like that might be worth while. But I think we, and also the point clearly made by Councillor Steeves (inaudible) about the influence on young people in our community. They see people smoking. Wouldn't a ban, a complete ban, you can't smoke on the sidewalk, can't smoke outside City Hall, wouldn't that be appropriate?

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Smith. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I will definitely be supporting the Motion. Mr. Speaker, we've heard from professionals, we've heard from people who unfortunately got addicted at a young age and the impact, the negative impact, it's had on their life. We all know how many people die from smoking, etcetera. The realities are, Mr. Speaker, during the presentations to EPC, I specifically asked a question of Dr. Harlos, would you be supportive of a Province-wide ban and we were talking at that point in time and…you know soccer fields, etcetera and the answer was yes. I listened very carefully to what Councillor Steeves said and the response he's received from the Minister. I am hopeful that it appears when this Motion is approved and they respond to us, they will show some leadership and be proactive. And I think hearing from other Councillors you can see that if they don't, once again, this Council is prepared to do the heavy lifting. But I think at some point in time there needs to be some initiative and this would be a good initiative for the Province to advance and do something provincially-wide, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Paula Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: I think it's very refreshing that we all agree on the what, it's just a matter of the how and I just…bring our attention, I know Councillor Steeves had commented on Minister Rondeau's letter, but in the Free Press last week, sorry I can't get my notes right here, Healthy Living Minister, Jim Rondeau said Thursday, he has told City Officials the Province does not plan to enact on an outdoor smoking ban. Rondeau said he doesn't think passing a City By-law is arduous or costly and that he would be happy to help the City of Winnipeg pay for the costs of erecting no smoking signs in some outdoor places. He said current Provincial Legislation allows municipalities to pass their own non-smoking By-laws and the City could choose to play a part or a…or hand it off. He goes on to say that he sent a letter to Steeves dated February 17th saying the Province would be happy to contribute to the cost of a public awareness campaign on an outdoor smoking ban. If there are any…and he quote…he's quoted if their biggest issue is the public awareness campaign or the amount of money it costs to print 50 or a hundred signs, we can definitely talk about it because we do believe in this. It is an important issue, he said. So I just gathered some quick information and I learned that we have 1000 to 1100 tot parks. We have 228 schools in the City

and we have over three hundred, three fifty-ish soccer fields. So total of that is somewhere in the 16 to 1,800 dollars open public spaces that the City is responsible for. So it's more than just a couple hundred. I think there are larger issues to address here, such as the larger parks like Assiniboine Park, Kildonan Park, Harbour View, other public spaces, patios that other Councillors have raised. There are many more questions than answers and in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I wonder why we waste so much time in waiting for the Province when they have publicly spoken and said where they stand. I think that for once, we all agree, and that perhaps maybe, it may be time for our own administration to provide a report back through Councillor Steeve's Committee. So I leave that on the table. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers. Councillor Steeves would you like to close?

Councillor Steeves: Thanks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, everybody for your comments and for your help. As I suspected, I think we're moving towards some type of idea and consensus on this, on the Province, just one final, I don't…I'll say this as a citizen, Mr. Speaker, perhaps on behalf of Council. And this is what's difficult. I think this is what, if anybody at the Province is listening, this is what this City Council is struggling with. It's a bit hard to understand how a Province can say we are against something but we're not willing to play a role in regulation of it. I mean to take that argument to its ridiculous logical conclusion, what other things would a government body be against but they're not willing to regulate? Imagine governments saying they are not against other types of things they deem criminal for example, we're not willing to take a regulatory stance against it. It just seems to me that governments exist for these purposes. If you are against a practice that you feel is damaging to your community. I would suggest you have an obligation to take some sort of action. If your position is that you're not against it, well, then fine, that's your philosophical position. I commend you for not taking action on it, if that's what you agree. But if we're now evolved to a point where our Provincial partners are telling us that, yes, we're against this but we don't want to endure the political fallout of having to actually deal with it, then I think we've reached a point in our relationship that is pretty difficult. I'll just make those comments, Mr. Speaker. I've heard my colleagues comment and the one thing I do certainly want to speak to is the issue of what this might ultimately entail. I think Councillor Fielding's comments are well taken. I think at this stage, I would advice Council, and of course, it's only my advice, people can take or leave it when the relevant time comes, but if we are going to ever get into a discussion about patios and private businesses and those types of things. That is, as Councillor Gerbasi suggested, rightfully a much longer and involved process. What our stakeholders have said at this stage, I've heard is that they're interested in certain areas where the city could step in and play a role and regulate it and the examples have been reasonably limited, to things like City-owned spaces, playing fields. The original genesis of this idea as Councillor Swandel suggested, came from the youth soccer groups in the community. So, I want to, quote unquote, just sort of set the stage for what we probably are going to see over the course of the next couple of months and that's a discussion about a limited purview for an ultimate By-law. Councillor Gerbasi's comments are well taken but there is, I would respectfully suggest, no way that we would want to entertain jumping into discussions about private businesses and patios in the near term. I think that would be very unfair to the business community that we represent. I think that would be very dangerous and would set off sort of a chain of panic in our community that might not be something that we want to deal with. So even though they are the same issue in a lot of ways, I think there is enough difference here where I want to be clear about where I believe as a City we're going to be going. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All those who have the…you have the Motion with the additional wording, so we'll be voting on that version. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. (inaudible) I'm sorry. The clause is amended. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. (inaudible) I'm sorry. Adjournment to 1:30? All right. We'll take an adjournment to 1:30 folks and we'll see you back here then. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
February 23, 2011, at 1:33 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: I'll give you the two minute warning here, folks. We have a quorum? All right, Councillors, we'll recommence our meeting here. Okay. We were with the Standing Policy Committee and Protection Community Services, and there's no Report for January 31st. There are no Motions and no By-laws but we do have a Question Period. So Councillor Steeves, do you want to open? (inaudible) All right. Councillor Swandel.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Just a quick question to the Chair of Protection and Community Services. In 2010, I believe January 2010, there was a completion of the pilot project on the use of closed-captioned television cameras in high crime areas. Some of them were in downtown. Some of them were outside of our downtown area. Anybody hear that loud buzzing sound or is it in my, nobody else hears it? Just wondering if Councillor Steeves could give us a bit of an update on where that's going. As you might recall, the old program was just to have the cameras there. They weren't really monitored. We weren't using them as a crime prevention tool in the moment. They were sort of being used to gather evidence if a crime was committed. I'm wondering if there's been any indication or perhaps recommendations coming forward that might see us using cameras but having them more monitored in high crime areas on a regular basis.

Councillor Steeves: Thanks for the question. We were chatting about this about a couple of months ago I believe. I think we're expecting the report back, gosh I'm trying to recall the date, I'll have to get back to you on the exact date but it wasn't too far along where our folks were going to come back with an assessment of how the program has worked out. Things we're going to be looking at is, I guess, an assessment of how effective the cameras have been from a crime suppression and a prosecution standpoint. Hoping that the eventual report is going to look at how often, for example, any of our evidence gathered, any date it gathered, on our cameras, has been used in prosecutions at the Provincial Court and the Court of Queen's Bench. And how often we've seen the Crown Attorney's Office access the information and for what purposes. So we're going to be interested, we're going to be interested to see that. What's going to be a little bit more difficult to discern, ultimately, I expect, with respect to this report, is how people feel about these cameras in terms of the public safety component and if they make people quote, unquote, feel safer. That is going to be decidedly a more difficult measurement. If the report comes back and says that well, there's been some prosecutorial benefit in terms of evidence provided, then that'll be fine. I don't know if I would expect it to be overwhelming, at least at this stage. It hasn't been around long enough for a lot of these things to have worked their way entirely through court, etcetera, but perhaps some things could be gleaned from it. What's going to be more difficult to discern, I expect, when the report comes out, is do cameras make people feel safer and as a result, as such, do people then sort of conglomerate around certain areas. That's the part that we'll be interested in seeing. Won't be too long though I don't, I don't Mr. Speaker and I'll try to find an exact date.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Steeves got a little bit off where I was going there, you know, and knowing that we have monitored cameras, particularly right here in City Hall and many other buildings around our community. This issue of privacy and the invasion of privacy by having monitored cameras, it came up in the original debate. I wonder if the Councillor could put on record his feelings on whether or not these cameras should be monitored on a regular basis to ensure that there is greater safety and a greater sense of safety brought to our citizens.

Councillor Steeves: You know, a good question, and one of the things in the original report with our public consultation that it said "categorically" was that people who we surveyed and people who we discussed the report with, although they were very comfortable overwhelmingly, percentage wise, with the idea of the cameras existing, a majority of people interestingly were not comfortable with somebody sitting behind a desk watching the goings on a live TV feed. Interesting. I guess people were comfortable with the idea that yeah, if something bad happens we can retrieve the information for prosecutorial purposes, for evidence purposes etcetera, but when the question came, do you want to be walking through the park with your girlfriend or your boyfriend holding hands, are you interested in somebody sitting behind a TV screen watching that, people said no at that stage. Now, I will say this though. Twenty years ago, or fifteen years ago, our evidence, our polling indicated that people didn't even want public cameras at all. People said they thought it was too "Big Brother", it was too invasive, there were privacy concerns, and then Mr. Speaker, do you recall the one incident in the United Kingdom where the attempt, it was an abduction or an attempted abduction of the one child out of the shopping mall in the United Kingdom which was caught on closed-circuit camera in the mall, and prevailing wisdom now indicates that it was that one incident, which was broadcast around the world, which in essence changed people's public opinion about this incident to a point now where people overwhelmingly are very, very comfortable with the idea of being recorded publicly. I guess it's probably something we're all getting a little more used to with cell phone cameras and the like, so, I personally, no. It's okay with me if we don't have somebody sitting behind the TV monitor watching people live on screen while the goings on are going on in the park. But I guess I'll wait and see what the evidence, what the report says back as to how other people feel.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Swandel: Just looking for the procedure piece there that suggested that "answers to questions should be brief and to the point", but.

Councillor Steeves: That's not possible. (laughter)

Councillor Swandel: I couldn't find it. Mr. Speaker, through you, I just, my final question is, the Councillor made reference to the fact that there was some sampling done in the public before of what their position was. He went on to state that, you know, through time, people's opinions on these types of things have changed with the proliferation of cameras everywhere, whether it's on cell phones or whatever. We're seeing great changes. Is there any polling that will be done as far as this process to see where public opinion is right now in the moment as far as the use of closed-caption television cameras in high crime areas to ensure public safety?

Councillor Steeves: I don't know Mr. Speaker. I hope so. I'd sure like to see as part of the report process back some sort of measurement as to how people feel the program is working and certainly part of that measurement would be, do you like the program, and what do you think. I'll guess to say this. I wouldn't expect that people's opinion on whether or not the cameras should exist will change. I fully expect that it will come back and say the same thing, that people will say I want the cameras there. I don't expect to see any change in that. That was an overwhelming majority then. I think it will be an overwhelming majority now. Not sure if the issue of the live camera monitoring will make, will change either. But I think the more important question beyond that that this Council is going to have to make is if indeed it does change, what if our public does tell us, well yeah, we actually do want somebody sitting behind a desk watching this camera 24 hours a day or for a certain set period of time. There's going to be expense and cost to that and our Police Service has kind of warned against that issue and said we have to be very, very careful here. As to resources, what exactly do we want our people doing? Do we want them watching the camera or do we want them out on the streets? Those are tough choices that we're going to have to make.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: (inaudible) Question. Councillor Steeves. You could ensure that the Winnipeg Police, during their analysis, I know part of the cameras were in the Central Park area. I know was under heavy construction last year with renovations that were there, so if they could try and factor that out because there probably be no one in that Square during that year, nine months or however long it was that was, that under construction, because I know when I initially had some conversations with the Police, you know, they identified that as a bit of an issue, so if they could somehow factor that out, or factor it in, or at least have that a part of it, so I'll put that question to you and if I could ask you just to respond in fifteen seconds or less please.

Councillor Swandel: (laughter) Again, not possible. (laughter)

Councillor Steeves: The idea of discussing reports with our Administration is an idea with which I have a great history Mr. Speaker. (inaudible) I'd be pleased to do that. And I'll ask, I'll make that suggestion to our Winnipeg Police Service.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for the Chairman of Protection and Community Services? Seeing none. We'll move onto Standing Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2011

Item 1 – Financial Assistance Program for Homeowners – Installation of Backwater Valve and Sump Pumps

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce Item 1 and briefly speaking to it, it's an Item, it's a subsidy program for home owners, installation of backwater valves on sump pumps. It's an incredibly positive program. It was brought forward, I believe, by Councillor Browaty, Councillor Wyatt, during the spring floods of last year. This is an overall subsidy of 60 percent for installation of sump pumps

and backwater valves to a maximum subsidy of 3,000 dollars. Total funding for the program is 1.2 million dollars with the Province of Manitoba contributing half a million dollars. There is an entire process laid out in the report that's in front of you and there's going to be, I'm sure, all sorts of communications coming out for how our citizens can access this. And I just want to focus Councillors' attention to two sentences on page eight because I know a lot of you have questions representing the questions of your constituents. And I quote "if the number of applications exceeds the funding available from the Water and Waste Department, the Water and Waste Department will seek it to increase the annual funding or hold applications until future annual funding is approved." So I know there's all sorts of concerns out there that what if there's not enough money? What if too many people apply? What if the retroactive applications expend all the money? What if? What if? And I think it's incumbent on us to let the Administration do their work, implementing this program. Undoubtedly, there's going to be all sorts of recommendations and ways that we can make this some more effective and efficient program going forward, but I think it's a great news story for the City and when the report comes back to the Public Works Department, there's going to be ways to make it an even better program. So I'd like to move this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you for that report, Speaker Nordman. I should start off by saying that I'm going to support this program. I think that a lot of people have already committed substantial amounts of money in order to proceed with protecting their basement and there is a whole host of issues around the kind of program that we might have established and I thank the Councillor for reading out the statement about the potential for future funds, because, well, I just wanted to say, I kind of came into the process with this Motion, I think the first time I heard about it was in December, it was referred back to Public Works I believe, and then to see you put together a plan and negotiations with the Province and I think that that was a good example of how the Province and the City can work together to try to come up with a program that's going to try to help people mitigate any problems that they might have with flooding. But, I do have a number of concerns and as I was late in the process, the Mynarski Ward has a lot of people who don't have a lot of money and some who do have money, have taken their savings and gone ahead and done this, and they will hopefully get their subsidy and under that Clause it sounds like they'll eventually get their money. But there's a lot of people in the Mynarski Ward, who are just going to places like Pollock's Hardware and they are buying devices, that, well they're scared frankly, and they are buying devices that they can afford and it's not really going to protect them, and what I was hoping to find in a program such as this, while the subsidy is good for some people, 2 to 3 to 5,000, we hear different numbers. One of my constituents just recently had it done and had the backup, inline backup valve done and had the sump pump, sump pit installed and it cost of him a little over 3,200 plus the 300 dollar extra charge to make sure that he had one circuit for the sump pump because you can't run a sump pump off a circuit that has more than one…that device on it. But, what I believe, and I think if we're looking at funding in the future, what we should really do is do a good program where we can provide home owners with the possibility of, like Hydro, you can get a loan to put in windows, a very low interest loan. You make very small payments on your bill, so that you can actually afford to go ahead and do this. And they're…well, they're not totally lenient about whether or not you can afford to make payments, they do allow that. And so, I think that what we need to do is if we want to protect places where, from flooding, and there are certain sections in lower income areas of West Kildonan that face this kind of overland flooding. There's a little bit of inline backup valve stuff happening, on my street, a lot of people who have experienced, have already installed this many years ago to protect their basements, my house including, but, so I'm hoping that we can see a better program if we're going to extend further because…and the Councillor had mentioned it here and I'm here to say today let's come up with a fuller program to help people protect their homes and I'll just finish off by saying I am going to support this even though it does have a number of problems, because people have committed their money, they are moving ahead to protect their homes and there is a lot of fear about flooding this year and some places, well, some will experience it and some won't. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Last year at the end of May, beginning of June, northeast Winnipeg saw unprecedented levels of rain. Rain that you just can't imagine. No sewer system on the planet is designed to handle the volume of rain we had there. That was legitimately an Act of God. The devastation that it caused many families in northeast Winnipeg, Transcona, North Kildonan, East Kildonan, was devastating. People who've always felt that you know what, we've never ever, ever had basement flooding. We've been here for 20 years, we've been here for 30 years, they've never had a problem. The City has been encouraging people for a long time to install sump pumps, sump pits and back-flow valves. A lot of other cities have programs to provide an incentives to do this work. One evening, after a very

heated evening at Gateway Rec Centre last summer, Councillor Wyatt and myself were sitting around and we were going, what can we do to encourage people to actually do this? Our Department was frustrated because not enough people have done this already. So we left it open, we left our motion that we moved forward in July, very open. The motion I moved and Councillor Wyatt supported. Going back to some of the comments Councillor Eadie brought up. We wanted to provide either a grant, or an incentive or perhaps even a financing option. We sent it off to the Department. We asked it to be sent to the Department. I'd really like to thank Mayor Katz for taking the fire on this one, sending it to the Department to see what could come up, what they could come up with. I'd like to thank the Province of Manitoba. We send a lot of things over to the Province of Manitoba, most of it lands on deaf ears. This one we were actually able to negotiate something and come up…they came to the table. In fact, it's so popular; I read that they've just emulated a similar program. It's now being implemented in Brandon, Manitoba's second largest city. I'm absolutely thrilled they're going to have this protection as well. Some people ask, what is the public good of protecting an individual's own property? Well, when there is excess water and sewer, water coming in from overland, go out through a sump pump, for example, a lot of the water end up in the sanitary sewer system. It helps prevent other basements from flooding that don't have this protection. So there is a public good for doing this work. So again I'd like to thank our Department. I know they took the brunt of an unhappy public last summer and in July at Gateway Rec. Centre. I would like to thank Councillor Wyatt, Mayor Katz, the members of the previous EPC that moved this forward to the Department to work at. And again, I know Councillor Vandal is Chair of Public Works that suggested because of the extreme moisture content right now, people are jumping on this program, probably bigger than you would ever expect and I think there is certainly an opportunity to look at either moving claims out of the previous year and be moving some of that money out of future years. If you look at the report before you today, the financial implications, it's recommended that this program be an on-going program, as it it is in many cities throughout Canada, Ontario, Alberta, you name it. There might be an opportunity to either forward money from future years or in fact, you know, pay the claims out in subsequent years. So again, I'm very excited that we are able to offer this program and I think it's a huge public benefit. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm rising in support of the program as well and thank Councillor Browaty for moving the Motion in support of the Mayor and EPC. I'm sure, pushed hard to make it happen. Thank you. It was a very, very tough year last year in terms of those rains. We actually had two motions at that time. This was one of the motions. The other motion was Council supported unanimously, if you recall, was to call the Provincial and Federal Governments to live up to the obligations set out in their own DFA Program, Disaster Financial Assistance Guidelines to help people who were affected. And that issue is still outstanding. Just…this Council should be aware. In October, during the Civic Election Councillor Browaty and I, and the President of the EMN, Doug Deberowski, and the Executive Director, Joel Massey went and met with Vic Toews who said, "Absolutely it makes sense." We should do this though we take our lead from the Province. The EMN then met with the Provincial Government in their lobbying during the convention, EMN Convention, and at a meeting which I attended as well with the entire Board of Directors of EMN, the Premier, at the breakfast meeting, said point blank, I agree a 100 percent, this should be done. But it's not being…nothing has come together. Both governments are pointing fingers at each other but neither are doing anything. The EMN, the Minister has sent a letter now to Minister Ashton, sent him a letter to Vic Toews asking for would the government be prepared to support this position if the Province went down this road. There hasn't been a response that I know of. Today the EMN sent a supporting letter. And what it comes down to this, Mr. Speaker, we're heading towards another flood year coming up. If we get hit with the same kinds of rains or rains at the same time when we have high waters there is no doubt that we're going to have home owners affected and the challenges of course under the Disaster Financial Assistance and I've read the guidelines now, the guidelines are being interpreted in such a way by those involved both Provincially and Federally that they don't have to pay in terms of people who have had overland flooding combined with, and insurable…what they call an insurable claim. The insurable claim, in their view…it takes precedence over the overland flooding even though…that even if they've had managed to stop the water coming in through a sewer by plugging it up completely, by preventing it coming through the weeping tile or through a toilet and if it still poured in through weeping, cracks in the walls or through window well or through door like it did in many cases, that's still would be denied because of the fact that this was a…seen as an insurable loss that you should have insurance for. And even when you read the guidelines, the guidelines specifically say that they will still cover items insurable as long as it's not well subscribed. And they haven't settled on well subscription. The majority of Winnipeggers purchase insurance up to a maximum limit of 5,000 dollars by large, they'll sometimes increase that to 10. But beyond that we have many home owners whose damage is well beyond 10,000 dollars. We're arguing, the EMN's arguing, the motion we made argues that the insurance, insurable portion should be deducted in terms of the

damages home owners suffer and there was no way that many of these home owners would've been able to prevent damage. I mean our system itself was completely overwhelmed. We, as a City, rebuilt the entire northeast sanitary sewer five years ago. We rebuilt the whole thing. And you know, when our engineers rebuild something, we kind of wince when they do this but they overbuild. They put in, they spend more money than they need to and they overbuild these sewers. And I watched the sewers being installed and it's a sewer starts in Transcona, works all the way up through East Kildonan and into the North Kildonan, underneath the Red River and into the North End Treatment Plant. Those storms were so severe, in our end of the City, that the entire sanitary sewer was backed right up and shot like a cannon up into the community of South Transcona, which kind of feeds down into it, right into the people's basements. It was so high that people said our pumping stations failed. The pumping stations never failed, Mr. Speaker. The pumping stations were pumping in a circle. It was this…the water in the sewers were so high that they had nowhere to pump them to. As soon as it ran into the pumping station they packed it…pumped it back out into the storm, into the sanitary line but it'd just come right back in. So, there was no where to pump it to. So that what we tried to express to the other two levels of Government…this was a disaster. This was an Act of God that was a disaster greater than a disaster we can ever appreciate. This last time we had rains like this was in the early 1960's. This doesn't happen all the time indeed the Provincial Government declared it as a disaster, the Premier himself flying down to Emerson. Emerson is one of these communities now they're being denied this coverage under their interpretation. He went down there only to now…to tell them that you're denied coverage. So that issue is still outstanding and I'm raising and I realize and I appreciate Council's patience on this because I'm not speaking necessarily, but it's the overall issue. But clearly this is something that could come back and hit us as a City this year. We really have to stress and if the Mayor has an opportunity to stress to the Province and to the Feds and to Mr. Toews and Mr. Selinger, this has to get resolved. The amount of money that we're talking about here in terms of dollars is a pittance in terms of what they would've have to pay in terms of this loss. Compared to 1993, it's not…it's nowhere compared to 93 which was the last great rains we had. All right. We're talking in the order of five hundred to a thousand claims. It's not huge, huge dollars. They're not prepared to step forward and to honour these claims even though the DFA guidelines I've read them, they are being interpreted in such a way to deny these claims, and it's a wrong interpretation. It's a wrong interpretation. The guidelines were interpreted the right way in 93 and then after that they slowly, slowly, slowly started to change their interpretation and now we're hitting this wall because of their gradual change in the interpretation of the guidelines and this is wrong. So that's where we're at right now and it's not over. And the Minister has to…Minister Toews and Premier Selinger have to come clear with this and come forward and give a clear statement to the people in Manitoba, where is the DFA Program at in terms of this issue? This is why we have a National Disaster Financial Assistance Program. That's why this program was created across this country, that when the claim is big enough 90 percent of the dollars are Federal. But we have a program like this for disasters like this and that program is being abused right now. It's being ignored and senior civil servants are running it instead of the elected officials who are interpreting the guidelines in certain ways just so they don't have to pay a claim here or there. This is something which, above insurance should be covered, separate from insurance should be covered after the insurance is deducted. There's no issue if they have insurance, it should be deducted. And keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that on the claim basis, the DFA only pays, it doesn't pay for luxuries, doesn't pay for TVs, it doesn't pay for many the luxuries that people even don't think are luxuries and it does it on an actual cash value basis. There is at least a 20 percent deductible in place, so it's not like this is huge money in terms of what they're going to be facing. But they have to fess up and honour their program and they're not doing that Mr. Speaker. So I'm just putting that on the record. Hopefully they do what they're saying to us separately and privately. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Start with I'll say that I'm certainly supportive of this program but I want to take this opportunity to remind all citizens and our fellow Councillors in who is paying for this. There is a great deal of homes in the City of Winnipeg that were built after 1979 that By-law. They had to have inline valves and those built after 1990 By-law also had to have sub pits in place. You know, I've made the argument before and sort of answered the argument for myself on combined sewer overflows. You know most of the south end of the City or the newer part of the south end of the City is all on combined sewer systems or on twin sewer systems. Whereas much of the inner City or the older part of our City is on combined sewer systems but it's all of those people that are paying for it even though they paid for a twin sewer system in their lot purchases or they've paid for backwater valves and sump pumps in the cost of building their houses because they're newer. They all paid because it's for the greater good. And I just want to remind people about that because it's somewhere when we talk about things like new development, we get into arguments about cost benefit. But this is one of those benefits that you get out of new development. You have the ability for the new homes that don't have to have this stuff installed to participate

in projects that are for the greater good. And both this program and our combined sewer overflows program are for the greater good. So you know, there are people here that are putting money out of their pocket that if it was on a straight equity basis they wouldn't be putting this money out. I'm glad that Councillor Wyatt brought up the disaster financial assistance (inaudible). It's something that whenever we get the opportunity we should draw attention to it. You know, whether it's river flooding, this type of flooding that occurred in the event that Councillor Browaty and Councillor Wyatt referred to. There's always these bits that come up to interpretation and when you're doing things for the greater good, we are there to protect the people, that interpretation, I believe should be somewhat liberal rather than getting into an argument of the nuances of what qualifies as overland flooding or sump failure or sewage back up, figure out a way to protect the people, you know, within reason. I've seen with some of the flood fighting work that we've done out in St. Norbert during the river floods where people suffered great loss only to find out down the road that the way they, the disaster financial assistance rules were being interpreted, they weren't going to be eligible for some of that assistance. And that being said I think one of the biggest messages that has to come out of this is that people need to protect themselves first and foremost. Yes, the installation of these products are one piece of it but the biggest piece is having the proper insurance in place and managing your space well. If you've got 5,000 dollars worth of insurance on your basement against sewer back up, don't build 100,000 dollar addition or renovation into your basement. People have to take some personal responsibility in these matters as well. This program is very generous to get our system with these increased protections. And these protections in these houses, they serve the whole system as well as just the houses as well, so it's important to keep that in mind. But really, really people need to be talking to their insurance agents and understanding what their coverage is. Most people, they just take it for granted that when they go and they buy some sort of comprehensive home owner's policy or home renter's policy that they have all of this coverage. And insurance agents need to be giving the proper information to their clients, and the clients, our residents, need to be asking to ensure that they have the proper coverage because there's only so far that government can go in helping. This is, this is, I forget how many millions of dollars here, but when you play it out, it averages 6,000 dollars per home. It's not going to do a lot of homes and there are a lot of older homes that haven't got these products in place. Some have one, some have none. So hopefully this will bring about some positive change and improvement and reduce, perhaps, even the burden on disaster financial assistance as we go forward so they'll be able to be a bit more generous. I'll leave it at that.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's just about all been said but first of all, I fully support this initiative. I want to make sure that I pat on the back to Councillors Browaty and Wyatt for bringing this forward. There is no doubt that we're doing the right thing and also thank you to the Province, this whole project is, I believe, 1,180,000 dollars. The City is in for 680,000 and the Province for half a million dollars. But most importantly, I also want to address something else. I had…I was out there in the northeast part of the City when this took place and I believe Councillor Wyatt was quoted at that point in time that there is no sewer system in North America that's designed to handle this amount of water. And when he talked about the disaster, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that disaster is going to happen again. If you had seen the rivers and the lakes and the water, the overland flooding, there was nothing they can do about it and because of where they are, it's going to happen again and I believe it would be incumbent upon all levels of government to address this issue and I just want to echo what Councillor Wyatt said. I think it's extremely important and I fear once again, for those people, who I saw. It was not a pretty sight to say the last, Mr. Speaker. I thank them for that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Sort of quickly, Mr. Speaker. I just…I did just want to clarify on the record because there were some comment or an implication attributed to me in the Free Press that wasn't really accurate about what I had said at Public Works Committee. I know that's quite shocking. But implying that I implored people not to partake in the program, which was not true at all. What I'd…one of my comments were and what I'm saying today is that I was a little concerned that people needed to be aware that they might have to wait to get their rebate if the program is subscribed…oversubscribed and that they might…they need to make…you know, some people might find that onerous if they don't have the money. But I was not in any way speaking against the program and I'm also very supportive of it. So I just wanted to clarify those comments. Apparently I had a bad week one week if anyone saw that article. Because, the only reason it was a bad week was because my comments were misinterpreted. So I just wanted to also say that I'm supportive of the program and I do hope I appreciate Councillor Eadie's comments to that we might want to look at in the future tweaking the program a little bit next year

perhaps when it come back, we have more time to consider it to make it a little more accessible to people. But I will be supporting it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal, you want to close?

Councillor Vandal: (inaudible) Good comments by all. I think we're all on the same page. This will be unanimous, and it's my pleasure to move it.

Mr. Speaker: Very good. Question? All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. February the 14th, Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED FEBRUARY 14, 2011

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll move Item 1 and like to introduce Item 2.

Councillor Swandel: Yeah, we should have a lengthy debate on that one.

Mr. Speaker: Manual of Temporary Traffic Controls in Works Areas, the City of Winnipeg. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item 2. Councillor Vandal.

Item 2 - South End Water Pollution Control Center Design Criteria

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Item 2 is something that was brought to our Committee a few weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry Carlos.

Councillor Vanda: Received. It's a…its' to do with the South End Water Pollution Control Centre and as everybody knows we're in discussion with the Province of Manitoba on all our pollution control centres, water pollution control centres in the City, and I want to ask the Councillors or everybody to focus in on the recommendations because they are…Recommendation 1 is the key one. The South End Water Pollution Control Centre be designed, A for a future projected population of 270,000 people, B to provide treatment removals based on a 30 day rolling or monthly average rather than a never to exceed daily limit, and C to include reduction of nitrogen in addition to ammonia. For 1B, Mr. Speaker, if we were to provide treatment removals on a never to exceed daily limit rather than a 30 day or monthly rolling average it would cost the City of Winnipeg an extra 60 million dollars. And there would be no additional environmental benefit to doing that. So, the Administration over a year ago sent a letter to the Department of Conservation asking that they consider a 30 day rolling or monthly average rather than the maximum daily limit. A year ago, a year went past and nothing was received in return as information. So the Administration had no choice but to bring this report forward because we had to move forward on the South End Water Treatment Centre to meet the deadlines and so they did. The Administration recommended that we amend the licence requirements. Committee agreed. Executive Committee agreed. And since the Executive Committee has agreed, our Administration have received a letter from Manitoba Conservation and that letter, I not going to read it, but that letter clearly states that based on the design brought forward that it will not be a problem to amend the requirements for the minor…for the 30 day rolling averages rather than the daily limits. So essentially, Mr. Speaker, through that letter we are saving 65 million dollars on the South End Water Pollution Control Centre. I think it's an incredibly, obviously in this case there was some sort of miscommunication. I don't know why it took a year to actually communicate that back to the City of Winnipeg, but it's good news for Winnipeggers. It's good news for ratepayers. It's good news for the Province, because the bottom line, Mr. Speaker is that we're all concerned about the quality of our water, we're all concerned about the environment and we have to balance what we need to do to protect our water and our environment with the ability to pay. In any time there is an opportunity to save 60 million dollars to get the same environmental benefit, I think we have to do it. So I want to thank the Province and the Administration for working hard and getting this done at the end of the day. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope when Councillor Vandal speaks again, that he could give us some clarity on whether the 30 day rolling average is just applicable to the South End Treatment Plant or whether it's going to be applied to a North End Treatment Plant as well. There was some confusion I think when it first came out…the statements by the Province as to what exactly they were including in that 30 day rolling average. I don't want to get into it but you know, there's ammonia, there's nitrogen, there's phosphorus, all of those things, and it gets complicated and it's difficult to articulate. But I just want to make sure what they're doing is in keeping with where we've always been, in saying that these types of monies like this 65 million dollars in, and of course the 350 million that we've referred to in the other project or other projects. I know we're talking the same thing here, because when I go back to the beginning and people talk about the amount of contribution, the percentage of contribution, into the river that the City makes compared to agricultural practices along those rivers, we're a pretty minor player in all this. And, you know, when you take 350 million dollars if you were to use 10 million dollar, or 10 thousand dollar breaker calculation, going 200 feet along the river and 200 feet back from the river. You can do approximately…you can acquire approximately 1300 miles of river frontage, 200 feet back, with 350 million dollars. So, you know, if you go from here to the US Border, how many times could you go there on both sides and go out that 200 feet from the river and deal with that riparian zone and get some kind of natural filtration that will stop some of the major contributors to the river and ultimately to the lake. That would be a much better place to be spending that type of money, I would think, than going to a minor contributor and having little, no, none or perhaps even a negative impact with what's being put in front of us when you listen to the leading scientists. So it's good news that we've got the 65 million in savings here. Hopefully we will see additional savings coming down the road when we're dealing with the licensing in the North End plant and I think there is one other plant in play in this argument as well. But I'll let perhaps Councillor Vandal give us a little bit more detail on what exactly that means and whether this is an acceptance of our argument in total or just specifically to this plan.

Mr. Speaker: No other comments? Questions? Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'm the first to admit that I'm not an engineer or a chemist. I'm a pretty…I'm a politician and I'm a generalist as Councillor Mike O'Shaughnessy used to say. So I'm lead to believe that the South End is a completely different animal than the North End. The issues are different and that is based on water flows. The North End has a lot more vigorous water flow because of the Assiniboine River coming in and through a much lesser degree, the Seine River which affects the limits of what is considered appropriate to emit from the Waste Water Treatment Plants. I'm not going to get into too much more detail than that without Barry MacBride around me. But I think the principles are the same. If there is no added environmental benefit to spending hundreds of millions of dollars of extra dollars on improvements that aren't going to add anything to the Red River or to Lake Winnipeg, then obviously we don't want to do them. And we have some good science behind us that clearly stated that there is no additional environmental benefit to spending 350 million dollars. The Province at this point have a different opinion. And I think it's incumbent on myself and Mayor Katz and everyone in this Council for that matter to communicate with the Province and try to talk about what those issues are, and how can the science be so diametrically opposed when our interests are the same essentially. So, that's going to be a priority for myself as Chair of the Committee in the upcoming year and that's my take on North and South. So once again, this is the South End Plant. I'll move this Motion, these recommendations and hope it passes unanimously. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Call the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no motions for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. We do have some By-laws for consideration. Councillor Vandal.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. I will move that the following By-laws be read a third time. By-law 19/2011, By-law 20/2011.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Sorry. You want…All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 19/2011 and 20/2011.

Councillor Vandal: That By-laws numbered 19 and 20/2011 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws 19 and 20 /2011.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that the Rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 19 and 20/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period. Councillor Orlikow.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Orlikow: Now that we have passed the sump pump…sump pump backwater valve drainage for residential properties, does, can I get some indication because I know there is quite a few people who will be calling me and are waiting because they are afraid that they're not going to get into that first lineup, when that application will be available so they can get their application in right away?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, Chair through Council, I would expect it would be ready tomorrow morning, so I would…let me talk to the Administration. I'll send out an e-mail to everybody before the end of the day on where we go from here on the sump pump issue.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Seeing none. We'll move onto the Standing Committee of Finance. There's no report, no motions, no By-laws. Question Period for Finance? Seeing none. Standing Policy Committee for Downtown. Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 15, 2011**

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will move the report of February 15th and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Quick question. Is this the appropriate time? Mr. Speaker. I'm excited to see a positive project such as this being proposed in the downtown and the hard work of Mr. McGowan and CentreVenture bearing fruit. In reviewing the Lease Agreement, I noticed there was no requirement to the tenant to actually build a hotel. I would like to ask the Chair to clarify what assurances the City has that the tenant will construct the hotel and in what time frame. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions or comments? (inaudible) Closed. Go ahead.

Councillor Swandel: Just…thank you for the question. Fair comment. I know that there's some history to this property. Just to make it clear to everybody, what we're dealing with here is just this lease that is in front of us. It's conditional on a rezoning, so I won't get into the merits. The old project didn't require rezoning because it was an event centre and a restaurant. Both of which are considered accessory to the current zoning of river bank under the Downtown Zoning By-law. But to the question, there's a couple of clauses in the Agreement. One is the first…first Clause is an eight month period to get the rezoning done and that's in Clause, under Conditions, Clause 1. Where it says multi-storey boutique hotel associated parking area and redevelopment of the Harbour Master building for commercial purposes within eight months from approval of this agreement. That's when the rezoning has to happen. In addition to that, the Department has insisted on a 25,000 dollar deposit payable to the City immediately upon agreement, and that deposit is held and if those time lines aren't met that one and then a further time line for construction to begin within 12 months of them gaining the full authority of the rezoning. The construction has to commence. If that, if those two clauses aren't kept it then it goes to the Cancellation Clause, where the tenant would be in default and we would keep the 25,000 dollars, I wish it was 250,000 dollars. But it's 25,000 dollars. And so that's basically where the protections are. This is a little bit odd. Usually we do these things, there's sales conditional on approval. This is a lease conditional on approval. So they've done the best they can to put these terms in

place to ensure that there is the protection and that the land isn't just being tied up by this particular applicant or developer.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further comments. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. There are no motions. No By-laws. Are there any questions for the Chair of Downtown? Seeing none, we'll move on to Standing Policy Committee for Property and Development. Councillor Browaty.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2011

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of February 8, 2011. I'd like to advise first of all that Item 8 has been laid over by EPC for 30 days. And I'd like to move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 to 7.

Councillor Eadie: Stand on one.

Mr. Speaker: Any others? All right. We will do…put forward 2 through 7. All in favour? Opposed? carried. Item No.1.

Item 1 – Street Name Change – Ord Street to Marymound Way

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. I would be pleased to hear the Councillors' comments.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. I'd like to thank the Standing Committee and it's Chairperson for moving this particular Item along and I'll be very short. This street name change was requested by a facility called Marymound. It used to be school for girls, started by a religious group of people, and they are celebrating their hundredth year of providing services to not only young women but also to young men now and youth struggling along having troubles. It is great that they are celebrating this hundred years and in doing that they will rename this street Ord, which I'm not sure, but I think its derivative is from the word ordnance, so Marymound Way is a great street name and I'm glad that we had the opportunity to provide them the ability to do a dedication by renaming this street.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. I just echo the comments from Councillor Eadie and it's a pleasure to make this change.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further comments, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And there are no motions with Property and Development but we do have consideration of several By-laws.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 17/2011, 23/2011, 24/2011, 25/2011, 26/2011, 27/2011, 28/2011, 29/2011.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 17/2011, 23/2011, 24/2011, 25/2011, 26/2011, 27/2011, 28/2011, and 29/2011.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-laws numbered 17 and 23/2011 to 29/2011, both inclusive be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried

Clerk: By-laws numbered 17/2011 and 23/2011 to 29/2011.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered number 17/2011 and 23/2011 to 29/2011 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: (inaudible) By-law?

Mr. Speaker: Okay you're opposed to it, all right.

Councillor Orlikow: Recorded in opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded in opposition. Okay. Any…no further By-laws? Councillor Browaty, Question Period?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: My question to Councillor Browaty is about electronic sign erected on the Boyd Building by the owner without a permit. I know his appeal before your Committee was turned down. What action has Property and Development taken to have this sign taken down? Are they going the legal route or are they going to take the sign down and put it on his taxes?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My understanding is that the City is going to be going in now and enforcing the Order that's been issued by the Standing Policy Committee and that if that work hasn't commenced already, it will be in the immediate future. I believe there is a process where a letter has to be issued but compliance with it is expected basically (inaudible).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Second question Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Well they have a choice between taking legal action or taking the sign down, the City taking the sign down itself and putting the cost on his taxes. I'd like that option. What is your thinking? What is the Committee's thinking?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor?

Councillor Browaty: The Administration, I believe, is ready to proceed on this immediately. Whatever method it takes it should be down immediately. If things take on too, if things drag on in any way, shape, or form, I think the City should be going in there and removing it themselves and as Councillor Smith has suggested, billing the person who broke our laws knowingly, to have that done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Any other questions? Seeing none. We'll move on to the Councillor Secretariat Committee of February 14th. Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

REPORT OF THE
COUNCIL SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 14, 2011

Item 1 – Committee Name Change – Council Secretariat Committee (changing to Governance Committee of Council)

Councillor Nordman: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to put this forward. As the most recently elected speaker, I've had the pleasure now of chairing Secretariat Committee and having sat on Secretariat for the past four years representing the Community Committee of Assiniboia have had the opportunity to sort of embrace some of the things that the committee is responsible for and could

be responsible for. And although over time we come to understand that within the 16 of us, for the vast majority of the individuals in the gallery, the media, they don't quite understand what secretariat is or isn't. By itself, it is the functioning of this building, of how we run the Council, and that falls under the responsibility of the Speaker's Chair. I've always felt that it should've said something to the effect of speaker or secretariat of Council, much the same as our legislative cousins on Broadway. They have the management committee of the legislature. So, looking at different words that are popular today, we've come upon and are requesting that you approve today that we change the name of Secretariat to the Governance Committee of Council so that it's somewhat frames in fact what it is we do at the Committee chaired by the Speaker. So, that is my request today and I ask for your approval on that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nordman. On the Clause No. 1…we'll do it separately. All those in favour? Contrary? Councillor Smith recorded in opposition, okay. And on No. 2, Councillor Nordman.

Item 2 – Council Members' Immunity from the Process of Liability

Councillor Nordman: We'd like to advise that…we would like to lay over the Executive Policy Committee for up to 90 days.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. EPC's laid this over for 90 days. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried and now moving on to Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Nordman.

COUNCIL SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Nordman: I'd like to move that By-law No. 22/2011 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 22/2011.

Councillor Nordman: I'd like to move that By-law 22/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 22/2011.

Councillor Nordman: And I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and that By-law No. 22/2011 be read for a third time and that the same be passed and order be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Thank you Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: And that's the end of that. And Councillor Steen moves Adjournment. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: His Worship, Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor Nordman.

Council adjourned at 2:30 p.m.