COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, September 28, 2011

The Council met at 9:34 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

Mr. Speaker: Morning Councillors. Welcome to the resumption of business at the City of Winnipeg's September Council Meeting. We'll call this meeting to order and ask Councillor Browaty if he would be good enough to read the opening prayer. If all would rise.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Browaty.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We were expecting some guests from Red River, but the gallery is rather empty so I don't think they're here. We would also like to move a motion.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Steen,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,

That Councillor Orlikow be granted a Leave of Absence from today's Council meeting due to a personal family matter.

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

We are; we have no Pages today but Terry will function in that position I guess. That's something I should maybe suggest to you. There are high schools in almost all of your Wards. You may want to speak to the Administration there and ask if there is any interest in students participating as our Pages and refer them to the Clerk's Office that we encourage and enjoy having the youth here. So if you're in a position to do that over the next month or so, we will have some new Pages. There are no delegations but before we proceed with the business of the day, I would like Councillor Havixbeck to make a statement.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Tonight is the beginning of Rosh Hashanah, this is the Jewish New Year and many of my constituents in Charles wood-Tuxedo are of Jewish heritage but throughout the City I wish to take this opportunity to; for those who celebrate the Jewish Holiday to wish them a very happy and sweet New Year. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: And we agree with that, thanks Councillor Havixbeck.

MINUTES

Councillor Fielding moves the minutes of the meeting of July 20th be taken as read and confirmed. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. No delegations. Your Worship. Executive Policy Committee September the 7th.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 7, 2011**

Mayor Katz: I'll introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 5.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt; One and four. So 2, 3 and 5; All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 1 – Council Working Groups - Transportation Master Plan, Waste Management Plan, Shared Service Agreements and Infrastructure Funding

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I look forward to hearing the comments from Councillor Wyatt and then I will certainly try to respond. Thank You.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The whole concept behind this motion, the mover is not here today otherwise I think he would have spoke to it. But the whole concept to this motion is to encourage greater discussion with Members of Council to encourage greater collaboration amongst Members of Council, is to recognize that Councillors whether they are on EPC or not on EPC should play a crucial role in the development of public policy for our City. And the idea of having these working groups as a concept of bringing people together to find answers and solutions, we did have a Council Seminar that should be recognized on the Waste Management Plan recently, on Friday. You know, but the chance for input, of course is very limited because as soon as we have the Seminar, within an hour or two, whatever it might be, the press release is out and the report is on the Agenda and really, did you really have any kind of influence or role in the decision making? You know, it speaks to you know, are we a Council of 16 or are we a you know, a Council of 7 or 9 or whatever the case may be? So, Mr. Speaker, I really believe that the intent of the motion I think is an honorable intent, I think it's a good motion, it's something which these are big issues facing us as a City, Mr. Speaker. Transportation Master Plan, Waste Management Plan, Share Services Issues and the infrastructure funding. Council's work - are big issues. And they deserve I think attention and they deserve us being able to work together to implement public policy in a manner of; in a formal manner, Mr. Speaker, not an informal manner. We all do our informal work, we pick up the phone and talk to people, we talk to public servants, but in terms of actually having input, in terms of actually having a say in the development of this Public Policy, this is something which, Mr. Speaker, deserves an idea I think that deserves looking at. I know historically we've always relied on EPC to do virtually all of the Public Policy Development in the City, not just formulate the budget and present it which is what the Charter advocates EPC'S role and responsibility is. But, basically EPC has become the; for all intentions and purposes, the Policy Committee on all fronts. We know that most reports, especially most contentious reports will not show at a Standing Committee Agenda until it's before EPC and IEPC which technically doesn't exist. So, this is to say hey, let's create a bigger circle. We are a Council. And I think we heard and it was interesting at the garbage meeting on Friday, there were actually some very good ideas from different Councillors who are not on EPC; that maybe could have been adopted into the report, had that discussion been had earlier or had the time been given for that. So, I'm not going to support receiving it as information, Mr. Speaker, because that's the recommendation from EPC. I think this deserves better. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Chairperson Nordman. As a seconder of this resolution/motion, I just wanted to simply say that City Council could become much more; could be better and more functional, if we included those who; who don't get to participate in formal meetings, that helped to develop Policy and so I simply just wanted to put that out there. It's been my experience in other elected positions at the Seven Oaks School Board where the whole Board was brought together to discuss and look at major initiatives that will affect the whole system, and so the Items we do talk about here are plans that really affect the way the City will be operating for many years to come. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I thank Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Eadie for their words. I think they are coming from a good place. And when I read the Therefore Be It Resolved of this motion; Therefore Be It Resolved that Council creates a Transportation Master Plan, Waste Management, Shared Services Agreements, Infrastructure Funding Working Groups. And the Working Groups are made up of Council as a whole, with selected Administration. And the Working Groups will meet regularly, receive updates and provide feedback and ensure all of Council is part of the planning process. My comment to that is that that's the Role of Standing Policy Committees made up of diverse Councillors. Not everyone is on Executive Committee and we receive the information from various Administrations and we mull it over. Sometimes we refer it back as we did with the Route 90. Sometimes we ask for more information, and to give you a very concrete example, tomorrow we're having a Working Session of Infrastructure Committee where all Members of the Committee will be there along with the Administration to talk about the Recycling, the Garbage, the Waste Minimization Strategic Plan. We've pushed back the Committee date to; it was supposed to occur yesterday. We're now meeting on Monday afternoon and I really don't know what the Committee going to do with the Recommendations. We could ask for more information, we could amend it, we could send it back. That's up to the Will of the Committee. So, my concern is duplication of structures that are already in place. We have varied representation on Standing Committees and I'll extend an invite to absolutely everybody to come to the Working Session tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. If you have more questions of the Administration on the Recycling Plan, and I fully understand it. There is a lot of information there. Come to our Working Session. It's in one of the Committee Rooms and asks those questions. And, if your questions are not answered in a satisfactory manner, then we're meeting on Monday afternoon at 1:00 or 1:30 to formally receive the report and to discuss it, so appear in delegation. So, it's; although I think the intent is honorable and the intent is to work more -- in a more cohesive fashion and everybody supports that, I wouldn't want to see the work of the Standing Policy Committees replaced with informal working groups. So that's where I'm coming from, which is why I'm going to Support the Executive Committee Recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Vandal. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I wanted to say I appreciate Councillor Vandal's approach he's taking with the Standing Committee on that particular issue of the Waste Management. It's actually quite unusual that the Standing Committee Members are going to be as involved in that. Mind you, the report is already out. But I do think that that report; there was good consultation in that report in general. But, if you look at some of the other Items that are referred to in the motion, the Shared Services Agreement, Infrastructure Funding, the Transportation Master Plan, i don't know. I'm on the Infrastructure Committee and I haven't heard a word about any of those things in terms of any inclusion or chance for input really, so I think that's where this motion is coming from. I mean Councillor Vandal's taking an example of where he's trying to make an effort with his Standing Committee to do something very unusual by actually having it be a Policy Committee and do something. And I think this motion is coming from a place of frustration with the Standing Committee because basically they are underutilized. You have things coming forward that either bypasses the Standing Committee completely or just sort of already completely developed by the time they get to the Standing Committee. I think many Standing Committees are not generally on many of these issues, that are mentioned in the motion, really functioning as policy committees and that's where this is coming from there is a feeling that and especially any decision, a lot of decisions are dealt with at the EPC level and don't go to Standing Committees. Something like the Transportation Master Plan isn't being dealt with at the Standing Committee it's being dealt with at EPC and that is hugely important. There haven't been seminars; there hasn't been an inclusion of other Members of Council so that's where this motion is coming from. It may or may not be a perfectly worded motion and there might be a way to kind of pick it apart and not do exactly what it says but just to receive it as information is essentially filing it under "G" for garbage. So I won't be supporting filing the motion or whatever wording is used here. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: A quick comment. This is obviously a little bit of politics being played here. When I listen to Councillor Gerbasi speak, I hear things like you know the Transportation Master Plan being dealt with at EPC. The

Transportation Master Plan has not been at EPC. What we're doing is we're going out there and engaging with the public and talking to major stake holders and we have experts looking at best practices throughout the world, and drilling it down into a scenario that works best for the City of Winnipeg. This seems to be more a game of politics rather than the best interests of the general public. We at EPC and I hope I speak for all of us, are trying to create processes where we go out to the public and we use the experts and bring something forward. When we do bring something forward that it truly represents the best interests of this City not some political back and forth. You know, the Garbage Recycling Project Program was a great example of that. I sat through the Seminar that we had with all the Councillors, with the information, the same information that was presented to EPC a day or two before that, and you know, the understanding that came from that process that was one that engaged the public. I remind all Councillors that yes; Councillor Vandal talked about coming into meetings and making representations. The public consultation process is one where we can all participate in it as well. I don't know how many people went out to the Garbage Seminars that were held, the Waste Management Seminars that were held. I think Councillor Eadie might have been one of the only ones; and Councillor Sharma. But, you know, it was a great opportunity to get information out there. I know that my email and my telephone work very well in my office when I communicate with the Administration with people that are involved in these things. So the idea of getting information that I have that comes to me from constituents or from stake holder groups or whoever, it's not a problem. So, I'm not sure what we're doing here, spending our time with this. We have a system that seems to be working. We're getting good programs, good projects, good ideas coming forward, we're improving our City. This is a great City right now. We're one of the best cities to live in in North America. We might be on the cusp of becoming the best city to live in in North America. So I don't know why we want to change and create sort of political dynamics rather than looking after the interests of the people and best practices for great cities.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the comments of all the Councillors. Mr. Speaker, I believe right now that we have in place a process that is totally inclusive of everybody. And when I say inclusive of everybody, I don't just mean the Councillors here. You just heard on two occasions, what we do, for example with Waste Management. There was a process that we went to that included the public; that included all Councillors and keep something in mind; it was all created by the Administration. It wasn't created by the Speaker or the Mayor or the Chair; it was created by the Administration. We then had approximately a 2 hour Council Seminar where everybody got to have input, express concerns, likes, dislikes or whatever the case maybe. You also have outstanding Policy Committees where anybody, an individual or a Councillor, can appear as a delegation. So, to say there is not the opportunity to have input Mr. Speaker in addition to the fact that you can call the Mayor or the Chair of any Committee at any point in time and have a meeting, all those opportunities are there. And I've never heard a situation where someone said that they didn't have that opportunity. It's there. If people choose not to take them, I guess that's their responsibility. But the realities are, I think we are more inclusive today than we've probably been in the last two decades, Mr. Speaker. And we hope to continue that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further discussion. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Next. Item Number 4.

Item 4 - Proposed Policy - Public Commitment / Announcement to Fund Projects

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I believe this was Councillor Wyatt who asked for this to be stepped down. I would love to hear from Councillor Wyatt. I'm sure he'll have some wonderful words of wisdom for me to listen to.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Actually no, I just want to vote on it; that's why I stepped it down. I want to vote on it separately.

Mr. Speaker: To close Mayor Katz?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I concur with Councillor Wyatt, let's just vote.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? The nays have it. All right, let's have a recorded vote then. All those in favour, please rise.

A recorded vote was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

Mr. Speaker: Those Opposed?

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith; Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie, you didn't vote.

Councillor Eadie: I'm against; sorry.

Mr. Speaker: He's listening to Richard Cloutier.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 4.

Councillor Eadie: Can I approach the Chair? Thank you Chairperson Nordman. I wanted to indicate that I had a few little struggles this morning, and I would have; I just want everybody to know, I was going to vote whole heartedly for the Mayor's Recommendation to slow down the speed; slow down motor vehicles by schools. I think that's a great thing that the Mayor has moved forth such a motion and I was unable, because I was listening to my computer, I was unable to raise my hand to step that one down but thanks to the Mayor.

Mr. Speaker: thank you Councillor Eadie. All right. We've been joined by our guests from Red River it looks like. So welcome. We thought you would be here earlier, but you're never too late so thanks for joining us. September 14th EPC Meeting, Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2011

Mayor Katz: thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And Executive Policy Committee for September 21.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 21, 2011

Mayor Katz: Just wait 10 seconds. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 6. Go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: I'd like to step down number 6.

Mr. Speaker: Item 6. No further items to be set aside? We probably should vote on one through five. Items one through five, All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 6 - Winnipeg Police Service Regulation By-law Amendment
Police Officer Disciplinary Records

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker this is a; this was brought forward by the Chief of Police who I believe has already spoken on the topic, but the essence of this and I very much want to hear from Councillor Eadie, is their following of the same process that LERA has in place which gives total consistency so what I would I love to do; hear from Councillor Eadie and I will certainly try to respond to any comments he makes.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Chairperson Nordman. I'm actually in favour of this resolution. I just wanted to raise, well, kind of can the Mayor can give me information or the Clerk but I would point out that not every issue shows up at a Standing Committee that necessarily refers to say, Protection. I sit on that Standing Committee and like, I guess this is a human resource, that's why it didn't show up at Standing Committee on Protection and Community Services. I did have a couple of questions in regard to it. It sounds like its good sound practice to expunge, I guess, disciplinary records after five years, and it sounds like that's the practice across the country. So, it's not that I'm against it but I would have liked to have asked a number of questions and that particular day I was at EPC and I was not able to attend that one. But, there's other, I guess that's basically it, that I don't understand why the Standing Committee on Protection and Community Services didn't hear that.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Seeing none; Mayor Katz to close.

Mayor Katz: First of all Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the comments of Councillor Eadie, and if he has specific questions on this issue, I would be more than happy to meet with him and try to address them as well. I certainly would; we can both try to see if the Chief would be available; that's number 1. Number 2, I think the Councillor already answered the question. This was obviously something to do with Human Resources, it's following the process of most Provinces, including the Province the Manitoba with LERA, I think it's very explanatory exactly what it's doing and I certainly urge everyone to support this.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you. We have no motions from EPC, but we do have some by-laws. Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Yes we do. Do we not have Richard the report from this morning? That's on your Agenda, okay. By-laws, I move the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 110/2011, By-law No. 111/2011, By-law No. 116/2011.

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

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 110/2011, By-law No. 111/2011, By-law No. 116/2011.

Mayor Katz: And I move that by-laws numbered 110/2011, 111/2011, 116/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 110/2011, 111/2011, 116/2011.

Mayor Katz: I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 110/2011, 111/2011 and 116/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In December of last year, Mayor Katz stated that no level of government was more open, honest and transparent than the City of Winnipeg. He added that no contract with Veolia had been signed; it hadn't at that time, and that he had already said on the record that he would share whatever information he had when the contract was signed. To this day, the contexts of the Veolia Contract remain under lock and key away from public scrutiny. The City of Winnipeg yesterday, in the newspaper, in the media, had its wrists slapped for the way we handle secrecy around our City contracts. According to our C.A.O.'s comments in the newspaper, the policy is not to release anything for fear of revealing proprietary information. Many other cities carry out the practice of simply blacking out the proprietary information and releasing the rest of the information. My question to the Mayor is why don't we release that information? Black out the proprietary information rather than keeping entire contracts under wraps and appearing extremely secretive?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat my comment of last December. I do believe that there is no Government that's more open and transparent than City Hall right here at the City of Winnipeg, number one. Number two, if the Councillor does have a concern, because I know that there has been situations where information of that ilk has been released with information blacked out. That's something I'm happy to follow up on. Unfortunately the Councillor has not contacted me with that request. This is the first time I've heard it, and I would be more than happy to follow up on that.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well I think what's happened Mr. Speaker is that we've been slapped on the wrist by a National Organization, compared to the way we're doing things in general as opposed to other cities. We are being more secretive according to this National Agency that audited our City along with other cities and said that we are not releasing the amount of information other cities are releasing. Are you prepared to look into that and consider changing that policy?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I don't really know very much about this National Agency. They never contacted my office. Maybe they spoke directly to Councillor Gerbasi but I'm not going to comment on a National Agency that I've had no dialogue with. My concern is running the City and making sure that citizens and Councillors have the information that they require. That is something that I would work hard to make sure is a reality.

Mr. Speaker: Final question Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. On another topic, the Building Canada Fund is, of course, our major source of infrastructure money. We know it has been decided that this won't be spent on Rapid Transit, so what I'm wondering is where will the Building Canada Funds be going? Can you give us some kind of update? There's been announcements of water pipes to Rosser and Plessis underpasses and all sorts of things. Could you clarify where our money from Building Canada Funds is going to go or if or when we're going to know the answer to that? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to answer that. As the Councillor is aware of, this Council put forward a list of Infrastructure Projects which we have submitted to both the Provincial and the Federal Governments. It's one-third, one-third, one-third. To date, there has been one Project that they have agreed to move forward on and that is Plessis Road. It's obviously been publicized and they've made commitments, etc., through the media, etc., and

that's the one right now. We're still waiting for the other Projects to hear about them. We have Community Centre Infrastructure we're looking at. We have other Road Projects we're looking at. As the Councillor knows, this has to be agreement from all three levels of government and we're hoping we can bring some conclusion to some of those other projects and get agreement. At this particular point in time, there appears to be consensus from the other two levels of government on one of the Projects that we have put forward.

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

Councillor Fielding: Yes, Mr. Mayor, just today in the Winnipeg Sun there is a big story about Photo Radar Systems and what we should do in terms of the future. Does it make sense to re-enter into a Contract or maybe look at alternatives whether it be Policing or anything else. There were some comments made by the Premier that talked a little bit about the concerns; discussion that he may or may not have had with you in terms of the concerns with Photo Radar. Is it possible to elaborate any discussions that you've had with the Premier on your concerns you've had with Photo Radar in the past?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: My apologies Mr. Speaker. This could be a very short answer. I've never had any communication whatsoever with the Premier on Photo Radar. None. Nadda. Zilch. Never, ever discussed it in any way, shape or form. The last time we talked about Photo Radar would have been with the then Minister, which was Minister Chomiak and that was an issue on people getting tickets and whether they were all going to be set aside and in the end, the Provincial Government was totally supportive of that and did not issue any refunds. So from my point of view, I don't, you know, there's a lot that is said in newspapers. I don't really respond to those kinds of comments but I can tell you on the Record that there's never been any discussion whatsoever on Photo Radar with the Premier. The only discussion that I've ever had on Photo Radar would have been with Councillor Fielding.

Mr. Speaker: That's it? Thank you Councillor Fielding. Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Yesterday you made an announcement, and I was pleased to be there with you, in regards to questioning the current Provincial Election and the lack of announcements regarding Infrastructure Funding. The Provincial Government seems to have no issue weighting in on civic turf when it comes to many other issues like policing, but on civic infrastructure we've heard very little about this, this election. Since that Press Conference yesterday, have you heard any encouraging words?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: The most encouraging words, Mr. Speaker, I've heard is Councillor Gerbasi what's happening with Building Canada Funds. On a serious note Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to pretend. I'm extremely disappointed with all of the leaders in the upcoming Election who want to form the next government. There has been, according to media reports, over three billion dollars in promises, and unfortunately very little of that has to do with infrastructure, and I know you've heard me in the past Mr. Speaker talk about our 3.8 billion dollar infrastructure deficit, how it's impossible to slay that dragon when we only get eight cents of every tax dollar spent, how we need to work with the other levels of government. This Council, okay, approved moving forward asking the Provincial Government for one point of the existing seven points of P.S.T. above and beyond what we're already getting to address that, and this was the entire Province. This was the Mayors, the Reeves, all the Councillors across the Province who moved this forward. Yesterday's announcement, the President of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities was there and the horror stories that he enlightened us on when it comes to infrastructure and the rest of Manitoba, it was frightening and for some unknown reason it's been ignored, and I need to tell you Mr. Speaker, I cannot comprehend because since I've been Mayor, the top two issues have always been infrastructure, crime, and safety. That's always been the case and quite often it's been infrastructure that's number one. Why people don't get that all these other promises, although many are very worthy, if your City is falling apart, what are you accomplishing? If you can't drive on the roads, if you can't walk on the sidewalks, if you can't cross a bridge because of the state of repair, if your community centres are falling apart, what have you really got and why this is being ignored I have no idea, and just to be very, very clear on this Mr. Speaker, when we the Council, along with the A.M.M., ask the Provincial Government for one point of P.S.T. when the last budget came forward, okay, there was a little trick played implying

that we got something. Totally not true. We got nothing Mr. Speaker. We got what we were getting before with the same potential increase. The realities are we all across the Province asked and we were told no, and so my message to the Premier, you're not saying "no" to Mayor Katz. You're saying "no" to every Mayor in the Province, to every Councillor, to every Reeve, to every citizen, and I hope that whoever is elected realizes this is the problem and it has to be addressed, and I think what some people forget when they talk about funds and raising taxes, etc., we never asked. We, this Council and the A.M.M., never asked to have Provincial tax increased by a point. Others have asked for that. We never asked for that. We asked for one point of the existing, but what seems to be overlooked is the fact that the Provincial Government here is getting millions, billions of dollars in transfer payments from the Federal Government and we are getting less than peanuts to address one of the biggest challenges we face, and I hate to say it Mr. Speaker. We know what's happened with a few decades of neglect. Just imagine a few more. Someone's got to stand tall and say we need to do this and we have to work together.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Back again through the Mayor, I appreciate the answer and I was surprised to hear in some of the media reports that they were suggesting a new point of tax. I was positive we were talking about one point of the existing tax, so I thank him for that clarification.

There have also been many promises I think by all the leading parties this Election in regards to additional policing resources. We've always been stuck with the bill after year one. This time they finally worked their numbers out right. Are we talking about day one Police Officers, or ten year Police Officers or is there at least a growth pattern in the promises? Has your staff had any chance to look at the promises made and whether or not there's additional funding in additional years? Again Police Officers day one; get paid so much. The salaries escalate quite quickly.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Browaty for that question. It's something that we have discussed. In the meeting I brought it up and as you know, during election everybody's making promises and policing seems to be coming up quite a bit. And what I specifically stated to all the leaders is if you are making a promise and it has to do with policing, please ensure that you're covering all of the costs, and I'll use Police as an example. Number one, salaries. And what I mean by that Mr. Speaker is a Police Officer is hired and comes in their first year. They're making approximately $40,000 a year, okay? But in five years, that doubles as well as employee benefits, as well as pension, and what I'm saying if you are making a commitment then you deal with all of the issue from top to bottom with all the expenses, and that applies to everyone out there during this Election. And I want that very clear, because in the past, we have gotten killed. We accepted something, and then later on, boom it hit us and you know what, it cost us more to continue than the original commitment. It made no sense. Number two, the other comment I made as far as policing is concerned, is that I think we all know how the process works with policing. These are the resources that are there for the W.P.S. The Chief of Police, someone who is qualified, makes the decision where the resources go, and I don't think any elected official should be telling the Chief of Police and others with experience, a great many years of experience, how this works. In the past it's the same scenario. If the commitment was made for "x" amount of officers, the representatives of the Provincial Government would sit down with the W.P.S. The W.P.S. would tell them where they believe they need the resources, they would agree and move forward. For anyone to imply that they were upset that they put forward money and it didn't go where they wanted, it's just not true. There's always discussion with the W.P.S. and the Chief along with the Provincial Administration. And to be very frank with you, I think we need; you know sometimes you have to be careful of accepting a gift that you may not be able to afford Mr. Speaker. And so that message was to all political parties. Don't make promises that are going to cost us money and try and bankrupt the City. We need to make sure the commitment is made very clear from day one that you're covering these expenses for ever and ever, amen. I hope that addresses (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Browaty and Mayor Katz. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor. My question is about the Freedom of Information. According to the National Freedom of Information Audit, cities that scored highest in full disclosure were Regina, Saskatoon, Montreal,

Sherbrook, Quebec City and Charlottetown. Winnipeg has the worst record in providing information to its citizens under the Freedom of Information. Mr. Mayor, are you and your fellow E.P.C. members going to change that?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, first of all I thank Councillor Smith. Number two, this has nothing to do with E.P.C. Members and I think the good Councillor knows that. The realities are, is that this City has had a process in place. It's been there since the Councillor has been a Councillor, which has been many years. Nothing has changed, and if there is a belief that it should be changed then maybe we should all sit down and have a discussion on it, but you know what Mr. Speaker, in any scenario, I've seen some cities rank high, some low, some in the middle. The facts of life are; I know that when I've been involved and people ask for information I try and make sure they get that information. So, if the Councillor wants to make a point of having this open and honest discussion, I'm happy to do that, but please don't try and point a finger at E.P.C. Mr. Speaker. That's not right.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor, the whole question about electronic billboards, you made a statement that they were going to be taxed. Why are we taking applications for new digital billboards when we haven't figured out how to deal with this issue? How much to assess the sign companies?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, could I please ask the Councillor to repeat that please?

Mr. Speaker: Could you repeat your question please Councillor Smith? Thank you.

Councillor Smith: My question is, why are we not getting any revenue from electronic billboards? I know I raised this issue, the C.B.C. contacted you and you replied that we are going to be getting revenue from them. But when? They've been in existence for (inaudible)…

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Smith for that and this is obviously an issue that the Councillor and I agree on. I can tell you personally that I made my comments to the Administration that they should be paying; I don't know if you want to call it a tax, a fee, a license, whatever the case may be. It's a business. No question about it and they should be paying. My understanding is that right now they're trying to formulate something and hopefully something should come into effect. To be very frank with you, I think it should have been done a year ago. It's taken far too long in my humble opinion and I certainly will endeavour to find out if this is moving forward as quickly as possible because I agree with the Councillor 100% on that issue.

Mr. Speaker: Last question Councillor Smith? You're okay? Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor, it's fairly clear that, based on the Election, the amount of tension in terms of the Municipal Agenda has been very low by the major political parties. The commitments have been basic and not even getting close to what the Municipal asked has been in terms of what we've put forward as a Council, in terms of what other Councils have put forward, in terms of what the Association of Manitoba Municipalities has put forward. Considering that it's the Municipal Agenda has been a complete failure I would argue in terms of this Election, in terms of getting the point across, in terms of actually getting commitments that are significant from the two major parties. Mr. Mayor, what are you going to do in terms of leadership as we go forward to change this so that we, as a Province, can galvanize the Municipal issues? Clearly they are important to the average citizen. We know it's an issue with them. But for whatever reason they're being completely ignored by the Provincial level of government which clearly needs to address if we're going to get anywhere on these issues that we've talked about.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you I thank Councillor Wyatt for the question. As we all know, we live in a democratic society. Everybody gets to Vote during Election time whether it's Civic, Provincial or Federal. We also know the makeup of the "ledge". It's extremely difficult to form the Government unless you get support from within the City of Winnipeg, there's no question about that. And if citizens vote for whoever they vote for and municipal

issues are not at the top of the list, I'm not sure how you can tell people what to do other than to keep on reiterating where the problem is and that it has to be addressed and that time is of the essence. I think it's extremely unfortunate that a lot of the real meat and potato issues are being ignored. I think what you've heard a lot during this Election is on Health Care, Crime and Safety, Community Centres, all legitimate issues, but from my point of view, I guess the key thing they're looking at is; what will get them elected and what the hot buttons are. What I find difficult with that is, whenever we, as elected Civic Officials, talk to the public, they make it very clear to us what's important to them, and it is Infrastructure, and as I mentioned earlier it's not just the City of Winnipeg. It's every Municipality in the Province, and I can only tell you this, you know; whichever leader comes out and comes forward with the plan that will address our infrastructure deficit and really do something, is a leader that I would certainly consider supporting with my vote. That's all I can do as an individual, and to keep on talking to the media and try and get the message out there, as well as, to try and; you know quite often, a statement is made and the wrong impression is given, and a lot of times people get fooled. It certainly happened with the P.S.T. when the Provincial Government did some repackaging. Even the media got fooled on that one and I think we've got to keep on getting our message out there. So other than hammering away as often as we can, along with every Member of Council, I'm totally open to suggestions and if the Councillor has a suggestion, I would be more than happy to hear it. As I said earlier, I was looking forward for some profound comments. Maybe I'll get them now from Councillor Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Flattery will get you everywhere. No, well, my suggestion, would you be prepared to undertake the development of a strategy in terms of with our fellow municipalities, with the A.M.M., a new strategy to completely revise the approach in terms of how we're approaching the Province, how we're lobbying the Province, how we're getting our message out? In other words, looking at everything that's been done thus far, everything that has not succeeded and a new strategy to try to get that Agenda out, but somebody needs to drive that. Would you be prepared to drive that, Mr. Mayor, because that leadership needs to be had today in this Province?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I thank Councillor Wyatt. That is a profound suggestion and comment. Totally open to discussing that, 100 percent. I'd like to leave a comment with everybody. I think one of the biggest problems we face, Mr. Speaker, is we are a creature of the Provincial Government, and part of the problem is on most occasions, the Federal Government deals directly with the Provincial Government, and then the Provincial Government deals with us. I can tell Councillor Wyatt that I have spoken to many Mayors who think it's time for that to change. That whole system was created when the majority of the population lived basically not in the suburbs like they do today, but lived in a rural community, and that's changed. We're going back, you know, a hundred years ago, and the facts are that two-thirds of the population of the Province live right here in the City of Winnipeg. And to be very frank with you, this came very clear to me not that long ago but a few years ago, when we were lobbying for the gas tax, and after a battle, we got the gas tax here to go towards our infrastructure, but the gas tax was going to flow through the Provincial Government, and they were then going to cut us a cheque, but as a condition of it flowing through the Provincial Government they were going to charge us a processing fee or a service fee, which I vehemently opposed and I said if you're going to do that, then the Feds should flow it straight to us. The Province basically stepped back and didn't charge us a fee, but I believe in conjunction with what Councillor Wyatt has said, I think all the Mayors need to start lobbying the Federal Government in certain situations to be dealing directly with the Civic Government to be very frank with you. That is something that I believe in very strongly.

Mr. Speaker: Last question Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I appreciate that, Mr. Mayor. Mr. Mayor, would you be prepared to, before the Election Day since we have just under a week now, six days before the Election Day, to issue a letter to the party leaders reiterating and expressing our severe and deep concern of the state of the Election debate and asking them, pleading to them, on behalf of the citizens at least of Winnipeg, that we need to have this issue addressed, that a communiqué be sent immediately to them that the existing situation cannot continue as you have said so correctly.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, there's an old saying – "The difficult we do today, the impossible takes until tomorrow." I would be more than happy to have that done by the end of the day. I can assure Councillor Wyatt I am extremely disappointed that all of the comments that have come from yours truly and other Councillors, reinforced by the A.M.M. and other organizations, has for all intents and purposes fallen on deaf ears. So you know what? If I have to write a letter a day, I'm happy to do that because the bottom line is, we've got to do whatever it takes to make sure that this most important issue is not ignored and yes, I can assure Councillor Wyatt before the day is over that they will all receive a letter from yours truly and I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. To the Mayor, there seems to be a, well, there is a huge problem with Elm Disease with our trees in this City and from my understanding, actually Councillor Orlikow couldn't be here, but in terms of River Heights, there is a really advanced movement of the Dutch Elm Disease I believe it's called, and actually in my particular Ward there are a number of trees that are having to be removed and it's progressing at a, sometimes at an alarming pace and overall, trying to make sure that trees are then replaced and that information. I'm really wondering how it seems to me though as well that cash flow seems to be a problem in order to deal with this war on fighting to keep our trees, and can the Mayor explain to me what additional measures we can take to deal with this problem, given that it's just a huge, huge problem and we need to be able to deal with this and frankly, we can't really deal with it without man, people power.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Eadie for the question. Dutch Elm Disease has, unfortunately, been around for a while, and I can assure you that the Department is doing everything possible. There are other organizations. I know I've spent many hours with Dorothy Dobbie who is very close to this and they've raised money as well. I have never, ever heard of a scenario about dollars and cents being an issue whatsoever, but what I will commit to the Councillor is to follow up on that and find out what is the problem. Specifically, I do not believe it's money. If it is money, that's something we can certainly look at but I would certainly undertake to do that as soon as possible. I think it's extremely important for us to preserve our Elm trees. We know the value that they have and yeah, I have no problem following up on that but I've not heard that to be the case but I certainly will check into it a.s.a.p.

Mr. Speaker: Second question, Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you. It was in the news about there seems to be a huge pressure and the public is really concerned and I hear these problems. So yes, I really appreciate that. You look into it and it seems to me though the cash flow is a problem when it comes to many of the things that we do, and I'm just wondering how we're going to improve the cash flow to repair the roads that need to be renewed and replaced? It seems to me we're not really doing anything. We're asking for growth tax, for one percent for infrastructure. We definitely have a lot of growth infrastructure being built and on today's Agenda there's a whole bunch of; there's much more money in new growth infrastructure than there is in terms of renewing our roads and back lanes and sidewalks. So, really, given that $8 million of our current road renewal comes from the Province and two million is coming from the City, how are we going to solve that problem here?

Mayor Katz: I thank the Councillor for the question, Mr. Speaker. I think we all know what happens during budget time, whether it's Operating or Capital. This is called "Revenue and Expenses" and Revenue is quite simple, okay. The majority of our Revenue comes from property tax. We work hard to make sure that we have a positive environment in the City of Winnipeg to get people to come here, to start businesses, to continue to build. Right now we are flourishing. We've broadened our tax base that way. We also have other sources of revenue. I'm of the opinion, the Councillor is aware, that we do have other sources of Revenue. We continue to do that, and I would also like to make, you know, the Councillor aware when he talks about the amount of money that comes from the Province and what comes from the City, it's all coming from the same taxpayer Mr. Speaker. Same taxpayer is paying for it, and those are the people that are using our roads, our bridges, our sidewalks, etc., and I think Councillor Eadie just heard us talk about, and he certainly heard Councillor Wyatt and others talk about our

infrastructure deficit. We know it's out there. We're trying to continue. We already are increasing our Capital Budget every year. We have to do that, but by the same token, it's about Revenue and we want to continue to grow the Revenue.

Mr. Speaker: That concludes Question Period.
Councillor Eadie: No final third question?

Mr. Speaker: No final, sorry. We still have people on the list who don't have a chance. So Councillor there seems to be an extraordinary amount of moving around in the Chamber today. I'd just like to ask you to limit it wherever possible. Thank you, Mayor Katz for Question Period. I mistakenly recognized our guests up there from being from Red River. They are actually from "Taking Charge". They are; their leader is Carol Hoag. So we welcome you. I'm sure there is nothing wrong with the folks or you being at Red River but thanks for coming to City Council today. And Councillor Browaty. Property and Development.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I would like to Introduce the Report of September 13th, and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 4 and 6 to 13, please.

Councillor Eadie: Stand down number 9.

Councillor Browaty: One to 4 and 6 to 13; there's an amendment coming to Number 5 right now. I'll speak to the motion if I May? Move those.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of 1 to 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 and 13? Opposed? Motion carried.

Item 5 - Declaration of Surplus Land - Park Property - Corner of Silver Avenue and Collegiate Street

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is just a small amendment to the original motion. In fact, it was an oversight by the Clerk. The Standing Policy Committee already approved this particular change. It's earmarking $200,000 from the sale of this to deal with an issue at the Silver Heights Community Centre Rink Project that Councillor Fielding spoke to the committee about and was in fact approved by the committee, it just didn't make it into the recommendation out of the committee so, it's just a small housekeeping matter.

Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Fielding,

WHEREAS *on September 13, 2011 the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development amended the Winnipeg Public Service recommendation regarding the Declaration of Surplus Land – Park Property located at the corner of Silver Avenue and Collegiate Street to include the following amendment:*

And the following amendment

"2. That up to a maximum of $200,000.00 from the net proceeds of the land sale be credited towards the development of the Silver Heights Community Centre rink project, with the balance of the net proceeds being deposited to the Land Dedication Operating Reserve account.

AND WHEREAS *on September 21, the Executive Policy Committee concurred in the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development recommendation:*

AND WHEREAS *the amendment was inadvertently missed from the Council item.*

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED *that Item 5 of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development Report dated September 13, 2011 be amended by adding the following recommendation 2.*

"2. That up to a maximum of $200,000.00 from the net proceeds of the land sale be credited towards the development of the Silver Heights Community Centre rink project, with the balance of the net proceeds being deposited to the Land Dedication Operating Reserve account."

Councillor Swandel: This is just the old report? Okay.

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

Item 9 - Amendments to The Demolition Permits in Residential Areas By-law Number 4665/87

Councillor Browaty: I would be pleased to hear the comments.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. This particular motion, report allows me to speak out on problems that we are facing in the Mynarski Ward and elsewhere. There are a couple of questions I would like answered before I vote on it. But just to begin, the demolition of buildings and determining whether they are an emergency and this one isn't really dealing with that necessarily, but even dealing with the demolition of houses that need to be removed in an emergency fashion, for example, there are three homes on McKenzie in my Ward, that burned and they are still up there after, since they burned down in the summer, and more fires are being set there, and it's really troublesome that we have to take so much time to find the owners to take down what is really a distressing and actually causing huge aggravation to a young family that lives right next door to those particular homes. So, in the revamping of the demolition in our residential sector, I wanted to say that I am in Support of this change in procedures, but in closing debate, I would hope I could confirm this? What they're saying is instead of Community Committee dealing with okaying of demolishing a building that doesn't fall under emergency but falls under other types, that it's the City Councillor who just merely needs to say, give a nod or a go ahead. And number two, will this change be applicable to actually multi-family or apartment blocks which I have a number of those which are really not posing necessarily a great emergency danger but nonetheless, attract crime, attract all kinds of problems, and owners don't seem to want to deal with it. So I'm hoping this will have some effect on apartment blocks as well. And the only reason I speak out a lot to this, I would have showed up at this particular Committee but on September 13th there was another Committee Meeting happening at the same time, in which I had appeared. So I thought I would add that in the end but if in closing debate I could answer to those two questions that would be great.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Comments. These items are difficult to deal with much like our Vacant and Derelict By-laws. Try to take title without compensation. We know how difficult a process that is. I appreciate where Councillor Eadie is coming from. But in many cases these are private properties and we're restricted with what we can do on these properties. The people and their property are protecting under the Constitution of the Country so, the idea of a Councillor being able to delegate where property should get torn down, I don't think would pass the legal test. But, I appreciate where he is coming from and I think we just need to move forward with what we have for now and continue to do more work and perhaps I encourage the Councillor to talk with our legal folks and see where some of the roadblocks that we encounter are. Because this is not the first time these type of issues come up. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: To close, Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I thank you very much Mr. Speaker and I thank the Councillor from Mynarski for his questions. This particular Amendment here would actually give a lot more teeth to the City's ability to deal with Vacant and Derelict properties and it’s compatible with our strategy to do that. If there are further improvements

that can be made, whether I'm not sure if the extent of this particular Amendment covering Multi-family properties; I don't know that, but there is always room for improvement and I'm certainly willing to work with the Councillor towards further improvements going forward. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no more comments. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Browaty we have some By-laws.

Councillor Browaty: There's lots of them.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Motions?

Councillor Browaty: There's a Motion here actually.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry I've got so many here, I've got to plow through them. Number 1.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Havixbeck,

WHEREAS:
(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 71/2011, The City of Winnipeg authorized the expropriation of the lands described therein and made a Declaration of Expropriation dated the 20th day of July, 2011; and

(b) The City of Winnipeg served notice of the intended expropriation upon all owners of the lands intended to be expropriated and published notice of the intended expropriation in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the lands are situate, pursuant to section 1 of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;

(c) The statutory period for owners to object to the intended expropriation has expired, and the confirming authority has not been served with any notices of objection;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated the 20th day of July, 2011, made pursuant to By-law No. 71/2011 and expropriating the following lands:

The lands taken for Grassie Boulevard To Be Opened and shown as Grassie Boulevard on Plan Deposit 1608-2010 WLTO, prepared by Kelly Wayne Mantik, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

IS HEREBY CONFIRMED.

The lands described above are expropriated free of encumbrances.

The lands described above except:

- *mines, minerals and named substances which are excepted from or not included in the Certificate of Title of the registered owner of the surface under The Real Property Act or are not owned by the owner of the surface under The Registry Act; and*

reservations in favour of the Crown as excepted from the Title of the owner of the surface, or to which Title is subject by implication under the provisions of The Real Property Act.

Carried

Councillor Browaty: This is regarding expropriation of the Chief Peguis Trail Extension. By-law No. 71/2011 to Acquire Lands for the purpose of construction of the Chief Peguis Trail Extension Project in the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker: Any comments? Seeing none, All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Now we have some by-laws.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I move that By-law No. 102/2010, as amended, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 102/2011.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-law No. 102/2010, as amended, 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 Browaty: I move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 100/2011, 101/2011, 102/2011, 105/2011, 106/2011, 107/2011, 108/2011, 109/2011, 112/2011, 113/2011, 114/2011, 1115/2011, 118/2011, 119/2011 and 120/2011.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 100/2011, 101/2011, 102/2011, 105/2011, 106/2011, 107/2011, 108/2011, 109/2011, 112/2011, 113/2011, 114/2011, 115/2011, 118/2011, 119/2011, 120/2011.

Councillor Browaty: I move that by-laws numbered 101/2011 to 102/2011 both inclusive, 105/2011 to 109/2011 both inclusive, 112/2011 to 115/2011 both inclusive, and 118/2011 to 120/2011 both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 100/2011 to 102/2011 both inclusive, 105/2011 to 109/2011 both inclusive, 112/2011 to 115/2011 both inclusive, and 118/2011 to 120/2011 both inclusive.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 100/2011 to 102/2011 both inclusive, 105/2011 to 109/2011 both inclusive, 112/2011 to 115/2011 both inclusive and 118/2011 to 120/2011 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. Question Period for Property and Development. Councillor Havixbeck, Councillor Eadie. Go ahead.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Havixbeck: Back in June, Property and Development Committee referred a matter to the Administration to develop a policy on Electronic Message Boards. I was just wondering if the Chair could tell us will there be an opportunity for citizens and businesses to provide input into what is important to them?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. The Order, the instructions from the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, which the Councillor is a Member of, was actually just to go and review what is actually happening in other jurisdictions, what best practices are in terms of Use of the signs, in terms of the revenue generating opportunities from the signs as Mayor Katz was mentioning in his Question Period. That report was to come forward in 180 days and that would take us to either December or January. I thought for some reason it was the July meeting but perhaps it was June.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: I guess I'm wondering if; I've heard from a number of businesses, local businesses, on this issue, and I'm wondering if there is some consideration. We all know that reports come to council seminars and there's little, if any, opportunity to have them changed at that point. I'm just wondering if a policy could be made available or some input mechanism be made available to provide Councillors' feedback?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty?

Councillor Browaty. Again, what's coming back would only be a review of what the practices are in other jurisdictions. At that point that would sort of be a starting place, I would argue, for us to come up with a new Policy. I know the Mayor said to Councillor Smith earlier today that he would like to see it expedited and move as quickly as possible. Perhaps we could even move on some of; some feedback gathering process now even before that Report comes forward, so perhaps we could make a separate motion. Perhaps the Deputy Mayor, the Acting Deputy Mayor Havixbeck would like to that at the next Standing Policy Committee meeting. I would certainly be amendable to that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you Chairperson Nordman to the Chairperson of the Standing Committee of Property, Planning and Development, given that I have; I wouldn't want anybody to think that I don't; I haven't read and done homework about how buildings get demolished and what rules follow it and what people's rights are under Constitution and so on and so forth, and actually understanding in great depth having dealt with a number of issues in my Ward. I would note that some of these procedures are complex, but I would like to, if Councillor; the Chairperson could confirm that what they are talking about in this Resolution that we passed, that would you confirm that what they are talking about is dealing with properties and situations where, while it might not be an emergency where properties are actually not that more; the market value of the property and the house is not much more than the market value of the land and these are the kind of circumstances we're talking about, the City being able to move forth in. And as I understand the Report, it does say that a Councillor would be consulted on this particular thing. So, could you please confirm to me as the Chairperson of the Property, Planning and Development that that is truly the case and is in that Report?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I think we can all take a look at the Rreport and see exactly what's in it. If there is anything that needs further clarification I would certainly be willing to get that from the Department for the Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Chairperson Nordman, I would like to thank the Chairperson for that answer and I'm wondering if he could let me know, are there any other, given that the Standing Committee Chairpersons do have ongoing dialogues and I know I can call senior management myself, but is there any other considerations being given to how we deal with derelict and vacant housings to improve the way that we do things?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Council did give direction I believe back in 2010 to deal quite aggressively with vacant and derelict Buildings. This report before us today is part and parcel of that. In terms of other components, they're still coming forward. I'm not certain. We can certainly get back to the Councillor with that information.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, we'll move on to the next Standing Committee, Protection and Community Services; Councillor Havixbeck is the new Chair, congratulations.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just on; to make a note before we start, Item Number 4, I wish to refer this item back to the Assiniboia Community Committee as per Procedural By-law Section 22, Subsection 2. The item number 4 is Naming of the city facility in honor of James Ernst but before we debate it I would like to refer it back to the community committee.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Okay. Item 1. So we are down to 2 and 3. All those in favour of 2 and 3? Opposed? Carried. Number 4 we will refer. Thank you and.

Item 1 - Pilot Project - Taxi Use of Fire Hydrant Space

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck you open and we will…

Councillor Havixbeck: I would be interested to hear what the Councillor has to say.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: For a number of months now or number of years we've been having discussions with the Taxicab Industry and some of the problems they encounter in downtown; specifically when there's a pretty limited number of taxi stands, spaces where they can sit without being pushed on by either the Police or Parking Authority. They have been told and we've been waiting on this Transportation Master Plan that we're looking at how parking and traffic happens in the downtown. I see again we've got this concept that's coming forward and yes it does need to be vetted but the concept of a Taxicabs as long as the drivers in them waiting, being able to use fire hydrants as parking facilities. So you know the concept is a good one. It's shown in other jurisdictions, Calgary has this project going. They are seeing or their trying to prove out that that actually increases safety in the fire hydrants and there won't be a parked car sitting there with no people in it. There's allowed to be a car with people in it and if a fire truck needs to access the fire hydrant it's pretty easy to get access to it. We're putting this into a report system; given that we've got all the good things going on downtown and I'm thinking in particular of N.H.L. Hockey and the MTS Centre and a great need for; the MTS when you come out of there and try to get a taxicab because of the way the traffic has to go around; it can't come around down on Portage Avenue; the strip that's on Donald Street I guess it is, where the cabs can; there's only one cab stand there; so the cabs tend to piled up on the other side of the street then you got all the people running through the traffic trying to get to the cabs on the other side. With N.H.L. Hockey it's not just going to be Taxicabs; it's also going to be Shuttle Services from different restaurants throughout the City. I know when the Jets played there were shuttles from Ray and Jerry's and some of the other sort of prominent restaurants in the City. You know, this is a good project. I dropped it down just to ensure that the Chair and the Committee are aware of its importance. To keep this moving along rapidly, it's going to give us something

that is just going to enhance our downtown in particular. And I remind people when it comes to taxi cabs, for a lot of folks; Taxicabs are the first and last impression they have of our City. They'll come from the Airport in a taxi cab and they'll leave from a downtown hotel or a piece of downtown business or business somewhere in the City by taxicab to get back. So, anything that we can do to improve that service, it's a vital service in any City, is going to just help make us a better City. So my dropping it down is to highlight it and to make sure that the Committee is aware of the importance and the opportunity that's here in front of us. Thank you.

Councillor Havixbeck: My only comments would be that I agree with the level of importance and I appreciate the Deputy Mayor's comments on that. I understand from the Director of Public Works that this is a sort of cross kind of topic where it would involve different levels of government. The Taxicab Board, Fire and Manitoba Highways so we've sent it back to the administration to provide a report and to communicate with all of those groups and we will be following up on that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no by-laws. We have no motion within the Standing Committee. Any questions for the Chair? Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: I'm concerned about crime as I think all of us are. But, I would like to know how many shootings and how many stabbings have occurred this year. I'm not talking about just fatalities, I'm talking about people being injured, people being shot at or stabbed this year. And how many of these have been solved? How many individuals have been charged?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you for the question Councillor Smith, unfortunately at this point in time I don't have that exact information but I could get it.

Mr. Speaker: Fair enough. No further questions for Question Period for Protection and Community Services. Seeing none we'll move on to Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to Move Items 1, 2, 4, 5 as consent and there are amendments on 3 and 5; I'm sorry Item 1, 2, 4, and Item 6 as consent with amendments on 3 and 5 which I will Introduce later.

Mr. Speaker: And step down 2. Okay. They're dropping like flies here.

Councillor Swandel: I'll stand those down.

Councillor Vandal: Items 1 and 6. I'll move 1 and 6.

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

Item 2 - New Capital Project - Water Feedermain and Wastewater Interceptor Sewer Extension to enable Servicing of CentrePort affiliated lands in the R.M. of Rosser

Councillor Vandal: I don't know what I'm voting for. Item 2. Begins with the motion?

Mr. Speaker: Yeah.

Councilor Vandal: Item 2, Mr. Speaker, is a… and you'll have to bear with me, my computer is not opening up but I have a hard copy. It's a new Capital Project Flood Manual Upgrade; sorry, I've got the wrong one. I've got it here. Item 2 is the Funding of a Water Feedermain and Waste Water Interceptor Sewer Extension to enable the servicing

of CentrePort in the Rural Municipality of Rosser. Mr. Speaker, this was discussed quite thoroughly and passionately at Standing Committee. So, perhaps I'm going to sit down and let the Councillor and everyone else put their thoughts forward and I'll sum up at the end of the discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Are we going to read the motion? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll speak to the motion of referral as well, okay.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS there has been no briefing or Council Seminar provided regarding this major extension of City services to the Capital region;

AND WHEREAS there has been no service sharing agreement brought forward;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 2 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated September 13th, 2011 be referred back to the appropriate council committee until a service sharing agreement is ready for council's consideration.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker my Motion reads simply this; whereas there has been no briefing or Councillor Seminar provided regarding this major extension of services into the Capital Region and where there's been no service sharing agreement brought forward, that this report be referred back to the Infrastructure Committee until the service sharing agreement is ready for Council's consideration. And the decision here today is a complex one. This may be a very good deal for the City or it may not be but the point is that we as Members of Council should know what we're doing and the exact implications of it before we sign off on the major Capital Project that involves selling our water to another municipality. The problem is this is being brought forward for approval without the service sharing agreement being brought forward at the same time; and that's my major reason for asking that this be referred back. There is no valid explanation was given. I was at the Infrastructure Committee as to why we can't have the; hold this approval off until we have the service sharing agreement and look at it as a whole issue. It is our duty as Councillors to make informed decisions and be aware of what we're voting on and we're being asked to make a decision on blind trust in the service sharing agreement is going to protect our citizens' interest. I was going to say that there was a press; it was argued that there; we have to do this immediately because the Premier doesn't has to know that we're committed to this project. The fact is the Mayor already had a Press Conference saying he's committed to it and I think that's a pretty good commitment, although it was undemocratic because the rest of Council wasn't informed. But, my point here is today that the proper process should be that the service sharing agreement should come forward at the same time as the Capital Project. That way we can be sure that the public interests of everyone are protected. We don't know, there's a number of questions I have about the report, which a service sharing agreement would answer. It does mention; you know 8.5 million; we are paying in up front. Don't worry, trust us, you'll get that back. But what it doesn't explain and the devil would be in the details of the service sharing agreement is we don't know what other developments and businesses will leave the City to go to the newly serviced area reducing that tax base within the City; we don't know what the tax sharing agreement will look like. And we don't know about the potential impact of the transfer of our own taxpayers; tax paying industries or other development moving outside of the City. You know, that's why we have a complex set of criteria for service sharing agreements that are supposed to cover off our citizen's interest. So I don't know understand why we're approving the Capital Project already. I mean, if the service sharing comes in later we're going to say, well we've already approved the Capital Project. I know it says it's contingent on it but I've been around here long enough to know that once you approve a project it's really taking it to a level where it's pretty hard to reconsider it and I'm just saying that it would be much more prudent, democratic and appropriate to look at the whole thing holistically in terms of here's the Capital Project and here is the Servicing Agreement that's going to make this or not make this make sense and we have none of that information in front of us. And another issue is that there has been no response to the concerns that have been raised in response to the issues and the fact that First Nation's Communities are making

claims and making threats to our City. I'm just saying as a voting Member of the Council, I would like to be informed as to what is being done about that and I have not gotten a single answer. It was very publicly stated by First Nations and it was very publicly discussed in the media and the number of articles as well at our Standing Committee that there is a concern about this; threats that are being made to our citizens' water supply. Now, if it's not true and there is no risk and there's no issue here, then somebody could brief Council on that before we vote to approve a Capital Project that could inflame a diplomatic issue. I'm certainly concerned about that and I think that we have to be informed when we make these kind of decisions and understand them and there's been no effort to respond to my concerns. I couldn't have been more public about it. I think there should be; really what should happen is this could be referred back to the Standing Committee, Councillor Vandal talked so eloquently about how the Standing Committee is dealing with policy. This should be dealt with by, really by all of Council in terms of the Capital Region issues being very, very complex. This service sharing agreement could have a huge implication on a lot of things in terms of Capital Region expansion and movement of industrial industries outside our boundaries, within our boundaries, tax sharing and I really think we haven't talked about it. We didn't talk about it as a Council at all. It's just been announced in a Press Conference that we are doing this and that may end up being the right thing to do. I don't have those answers. But I'm being asked right now to approve it; the cart before the horse here, ahead of having the information about what is in that service sharing agreement and that's the key piece and it seems to me that this Council was not elected to just rubber stamp announcements without understanding them or having all the information about what it's going to cost our citizens; what the implications are on the growth of our City and all of these things. You know, I didn't get elected to be a rubber stamp and I hope none of you did either. So I'm sorry to continue to raise this but I think it's really important and my only concern on this issue is that this decision be in the best interests of our City and our development of our City and our bottom line. And I think it's very reasonable that all of Council is informed a) of the tax service sharing agreement, as well as some of the other issues which we could discuss privately in a Council Seminar in terms of First Nations concerns which have been completely silent. Silence is all I've heard on that. And I think these issues need to be proactively addressed by our Administration who are out there talking to people in the community but they haven't talked to the people who have been elected in spite of obvious publicly made concerns about these issues. So, that is why I'm asking. It's very simple. The project isn't going to happen until the service agreement is decided on anyway, so it's not actually delaying a real project. I'm sure the Premier would understand and trust our process of dealing with all the issues, and I'm sure if it's a good deal for the City as everybody is expecting me to believe in blind faith then when we see it we'll agree with it and I'll be the first to agree with it but it's got to be in front of me. I'm in the here to be a rubber stamp and I don't think any of us were elected for that. So I urge people to consider supporting this motion to simply refer it back. It's not delaying anything because it's not happening anyway and you can make an informed decision as Councillors. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi:. I think what we'll do is open the floor up to both the motion and the clause, so if you plan to speak on this, that we're dealing with both and the first speaker is Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Clause itself I'm fine with. It's self-explanatory. As Councillor Gerbasi mentioned it does have the protection of not proceeding until the service sharing agreement is in place. We've already set the prameters for the service sharing agreement. I don't have a problem with both of these things sort of being in stream at the same time and I think we can certainly assist CenterPort in getting this work done, the support and development done. We've got roads going in there so I believe there is some timing issues, right now there is some additional value that can be achieved by getting pipe in the ground while the roads are still being put in. And I want to remind Councillors that some time ago we had an employment land strategy that came out, that talked to us about the need for additional employment lands in the City and perhaps just on the outskirts of the City and I believe it identified CentrePort or those at that time it might have just been the Airport Vicinity Lands. So, this is not the first time this has come up. The need to get lands in that area of the City on stream as employment lands and knowing that some of the other parts of the City are becoming obscure employment lands. For example the Fort Rouge Yards in Councillor Gerbasi's Ward, where we're taking that old Brownsfield, those old employment lands and we're converting them into residential. And there's other places throughout the City where we see that; the movement of heavier industrial use lands away from those archaic uses and into residential or softer impact uses. I don't think Councillor Gerbasi has any risk of being known as rubber stamp Gerbasi. She does a good job of looking at every issue in detail and ensuring that we have vigorous debate on all issues. At the end of the day too, I don't think we're selling our water to another municipality, I think we're selling it to customers.

And it's still our water system that is or sewer system that is doing that. I mentioned construction timing already and I think there's some value there, if we can get this successfully done, we can help CentrePort move forward and bring some more economic activity into the Region, whether it's in the City or in the Capital Region in general. I think it's good for all of us. With regards to the First Nation's issue Councillor Gerbasi mentioned that the Band is working on a claim. I'm not sure that's correct language. The Band that raised this issue, I believe, is actually not the Band that we have a signed agreement with. There are two Bands at Shoal Lake; theirs Band 39 and Band 40 and I forget which one it is that signed. Thirty-nine is the one that brought the issue forward; I don't believe that's the Band that Councillor Gerbasi spec but it's not the Band that has signed to an agreement with the City of Winnipeg as far as the water. It would appear to me it's being used as leverage to gain some sort of economic opportunity for the area. I think their argument will be because of this there are restrictions and it restricts some of the economic opportunities that they have, and so they are just trying to create some leverage and further that conversation but as far as shutting anything down they are not the signatory to an agreement so I don't know that it has a great deal of clout. While it makes for good media it doesn't appear to have a good deal of clout. Those are my comments. I'm not going to support the motion. I think we need to be moving forward and the faster we get it done the better it is for Winnipeg and all Manitobans. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure, thank you Mr. Speaker. I first want to speak to both the Clause and the Amendment I guess referred back. Anyway, it's global. This is something that I know very well it's in my Ward. It's at the airport. You know, I think this is something that has been embraced very much so by the Federal Government and the Provincial Government and by the City. I think it has the dramatic potential to -- in my opinion, really revolutionize if done right, our City's economy. We know we're based on transportation; we know that we're you know at a hub, a point where we can take advantage of our transportation links whether it be flying; whether it be the truck route or rail that's there, there's a fantastic opportunity that's there. There's been a lot of dollars that have been committed on the Federal level, the Provincial level, and the business communities behind this. I think there is a momentum piece that's there; the City of course needs to do its due diligence with all the sewer and water that's a part of it. You know if you look at overall, I think in the City of Winnipeg there is estimated 125,000 jobs that are generated that's in the Mayor's Trade Council in relation to transportation trade. This is something that really needs to move forward with it. It's a very important piece for us. The 20,000-acres that we talked about is something that we can really capture on it and not just from a St. James perspective but I think it's one of these things, if we all embrace and move forward with it, it can really make a difference in our Community. Just to talk about some of the issues, pay back, you know obviously incorporated in this report is the amount of money, that we're putting up the 8.5 that's paid back through incremental taxes so there will be a payback process that's there; return on investments if you will. The piece that we're talking about with Rosser of course is the segment 1a). which is the starting piece that allows us; allows CentrePort going forward. This is really an important piece for CentrePort to when they're tracking businesses; their talking about what's going on in the City; showing this commitment from all 3 levels of government and having that servicing ability can really attract businesses so I can tell you it's very, very important. In terms of the aspect, in terms of the service sharing, service sharing is something that's very important. We obviously did mention in the report, you know, service sharing pilot project if you will again in 2005 and I think that got the majority of Councillors support at that point but I just want to repeat in terms of some of the aspects of it, Government to Government all consistent with Winnipeg's future capacity and services; there found on a strong business case to ensure delivery of services and more importantly the City of Winnipeg, if we do enter into some of these service sharing agreements, you know, Winnipeg would have a piece of the planning and I think there are some concerns whether some of these bedroom communities would create urban sprawl but we would be part of that planning process, I think that's really important as a City as we move forward because obviously there has been talk not just with the Rosser piece but other bedroom communities and how that's developed, so, if we're controlling some of the plan aspects for it I think we're covered off, I think it makes a lot of sense, we've done like I said a pilot project in 2005 which is well supported. I think the report also back stops us where it's going to come at the same time. So you will see the service sharing agreement that's a part of it and we are back stopped with any service agreement with the R. M. of Rosser. The First Nation's issues as well I think that was dealt with at the Committee and there's some discussion with the Minister, the Provincial Minister should be a part of those discussions. I think those discussions are under way and as we move forward I think the report gives us more, I think it's really important that we get an endorsement from Council in terms of this because it really is an important project. There is always

talking about what developments happen in the City of Winnipeg. I think there is a lot of momentum in this City that's going on in terms of the private sector dollars that are coming in, you've got the Jets, you've got IKEA you've got a lot of really positive things going on. Positive momentum; this is another piece of the equation. I think if we create something in terms of CentrePort is going to bring a lot of private sector investment, which means jobs to our economy it means a whole host of things, so this is just absolutely the right thing to do and we need to move on this quickly, we'll have the back stop with the service sharing agreements that are in place and a payback for the City of Winnipeg. So, I encourage all Councillors to really support this and show a strong sense of unity from this Council; that we need to move forward on CentrePort. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Fielding. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman, I will speak to both. In terms of the discussions around this particular move to do this, I would just first state that yes, I am whole heartedly in agreement that this will create employment opportunities for many Winnipeggers and it does have an influence. However, I stand in support of the motion to refer because the service agreement; I've heard today that the service agreement we can wait. Actually the resolution says we don't have to move ahead necessarily, we can wait it see the service agreement. I think I heard that but then I also heard this real need because the roads are being repaired and built now, there is a need to put this in and probably there would be some cost savings. I'm quite familiar with that. However, what I'm really worried about is the future here. I'll give you an example: let's be specific because I think it's important that we all understand or we at least we all think through what's happening here. We have an industrial area just outside of Transcona, outside of the City of Winnipeg outskirts and we have a Fire Department and yeah, we can go in there as long as the Municipality of Springfield I think it is, is willing to pay us to bring our firefighters in to cover that cost, that is probably be something that we would find under a service agreement. That's an interesting perspective because what we are building out there, is a whole bunch of buildings and the potential for housing is there, out in Rosser, I'm not talking about our existing space that sort of surrounds that area. There has been expansion of housing happening there in the Winnipeg side as well; but, in terms of fire. So, it's one thing to say that we might have an agreement where if we have to come in and fight a fire, the Municipality of Rosser or CentrePort would pay us to come in and take care of a fire. That's one thing. However, I would point out that the growth of Sage Creek has resulted in us actually having to build a fire station because the existing fire stations that were I guess some distance away, were unable to support fire problems there, so that's why we moved ahead with that. So I think that that is why you can't move ahead with this project until we really know what's happening here. Because, this could mean a real big problem for us in growth. I'll give you more examples of how we move quickly ahead with growth and development. Riverbend is a great idea. We moved ahead really fast with building a community and housing and developing all that housing, but there was never enough space set aside for a school. And then we had, well we didn't have a problem, but another level of government had a problem where they couldn't find a school. So these are future things that can happen which would cause us a problem and I have a real problem with saying let's go ahead with spending this money. I know that we're getting the money back but I have a real problem with this because once the water is being sold out to them and opportunities; some businesses will move out of the inside the City of Winnipeg and give up paying their property taxes in here and move to CentrePort and that's what business does. And I agree with that, if business wants to survive and make money that's what they do right. So, that's probably what's going to happen. So I really -- I'm urging -- we need to really get a sense of what the service agreement looks like, what the players in this are. CentrePort has a governing structure that runs it. Rosser has a governing structure that runs it and I'm really concerned about how all these pieces are going to interact. I read the Report and it sounds like there won't be any Federal income tax in this zone. It's like a tax free zone, in other words you're doing business in an international zone. How does that get governed? If you have -- like, who's governing that? How does that work and that means then who are we discussing about dealing with in service agreements? I think, frankly, I think it's easier for us just to follow the referred -- it's been sent for 120 days to the CAO's office. The boundary's moving out to the perimeter. Maybe we should go ahead with that before we start talking about supporting this because frankly I don't necessary have confidence that our service agreements with Rosser or CentrePort or whoever is actually going to cover off all these huge issues that might impact us in terms of us having to build a new fire station, somewhere where we don't actually have our own property taxpayers paying taxes. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise -- I'm going to be supporting the Amendment. I seconded the Amendment from Councillor Gerbasi and if it doesn't succeed then I'm not going to support the Clause. I think this is an important project as well for our City and for the future of our City. Mr. Speaker, this is also a very important part of the project to the Premier and to the Prime Minister of this country. Yet it seems, Mr. Speaker, that when they want something, we roll over. And immediately give them what they want. But yet when it comes time for us to address our issues as a City, oh I'm sorry you've got to talk to the Premier, is the message from the Federal Government or the Premier says I'm sorry I'm too busy with an Election, we can't talk about municipal issues. Mr. Speaker, this is directly tied to the future of our City and why Mr. Speaker? Because we have been advocating over and over about the infrastructure deficit of our City, and the crumbling Infrastructure. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have $8.5 half million dollars to send infrastructure outside the City. $17 million project, half is our responsible. Eight and a half million. Put that into perspective, Mr. Speaker. $17 million project. We spent 12 million only on residential streets this year. Residential streets budget is $12 million. Next year it's going to be ten for the next five years. The Regional Street budget this year Mr. Speaker, for the entire City of Winnipeg, $16 million: 16 million. This entire project, 17 million. Mr. Speaker, we are investing in Infrastructure outside the City at a time when our Infrastructure inside the City is crumbling. There is a huge irony there. And it's profound because of the fact that we are doing this at a time and at the same time we're asking these levels of government for support and they're saying sorry, we're having tough times, we don't have the money but we have billions for health care and Education but we don't have the ability to address the infrastructure needs of the largest Municipality in Manitoba. But we as a City, we're being nice guys and we're rolling over. We're rolling over, Mr. Speaker, being nice guys and giving them what they want right up front without the service agreement. Why isn't the agreement here? I've been hearing rumblings that they actually want to set up a separate authority, CentrePort, independent authority, of the municipalities, that they would have their own property, they'd collect taxes, they would issue permits, they would have fees. A competitor to the City of Winnipeg Mr. Speaker. I'm all in favour of competition and I've argued in the past, that if it makes sense to the City we should extend services if we know, if we see the principles tied in this report from 2005. But my earnest colleague over here across the way from Mynarski rightly put it, we've got these issues with municipalities in the Capital Region, inside the Capital Region, we -- and I want to thank EPC and the Mayor for referring that report to -- the motion to the administration in terms of boundary redistribution up to the perimeter, I think it's common sense, our boundaries should go up to the perimeter. But Mr. Speaker, this is a conversation that this should be part of; I realize it's really important to the Prime Minister, it's really important to the Premier but guess what? We have some very important things on our Agenda that we're hearing from our constituents too; that we need their help to address. So, why is this not part of that, Mr. Speaker? When all of this discussion happened in the last couple of years now, the last 3 years, it was said to us over and over again by the former CAO, by the Mayor, that we would be pushing it and making sure that this was part of the City of Winnipeg. This would become part of the city that the entire project would be inside the city. Then that flew off the table and this is before us today. Now, I understand that the Mayor has a tough job because he is involved with negotiations and you know, there is always the give and take. And we don't have the privilege of often seeing that, Mr. Speaker and I don't envy the Mayor with that work and I'm sure this could have been part of some sort of give and take in some sort of arrangement we're not aware of, all right. But Mr. Speaker, the optics are very bad in terms of this coming forward now and why are we waiting? Why isn't the report in terms of the actual service -- the service agreement is done, virtually done why is it not here? Is it because of the Provincial Election that it's not here? Because it could become very political? Mr. Speaker, I think CentrePort is a terrific project but this is -- remember, this is the City of Winnipeg. This is our project, it shouldn't be the R.M. of Rosser's project. All the services are coming from us. R. M. of Rosser doesn't have the ability to send water and sewer in this area. They don't have all the roads and transportation networks Mr. Speaker. It's us. The residents and people working here who will actually be working in this area, where are they coming from? From Winnipeg mind you, I heard they want to build a residential development here so maybe they'll come from their own residential development too. But by and large, it will be citizens of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker. So, I come back to the fact that we have yet, Mr. Speaker, to formalize one agreement with the capital region Municipalities, not one yet this is now on the Agenda for us to debate and to discuss at a time when our Infrastructure is crumbling and we don't have enough money to fix pour basic Infrastructure. Never mind our basic infrastructure Mr. Speaker but also new strategic Capital investment and new strategic infrastructure projects which we know we need to do as a City. But strategic infrastructure projects inside the City. Not outside, this is a new strategic infrastructure project outside of the City. Extending services where they've never been before. I think the Capital; the CentrePort, the concept is great. The Federal

Government has yet to commit in terms of what; what one Councillor referred to of the tax free, duty free status. There will be a lot of competition for that across the country Mr. Speaker. Why just Winnipeg, I mean, that's going to be interesting to see how they stick handle that one and if that will actually going to happen. But once again, instead of waiting for that, we're coming in, rushing in with this. And again, I want to preface it by saying I'm sympathetic to the Mayor and I don't know what goes on behind closed doors unfortunately and most of Council does, and I would say most of EPC does and so, I know there is the game of hard knocks, when you're dealing with these sorts of things and you're doing with what you have to do but, this is just my point of view in terms of the challenges we're facing and I think if we even caught some -- a little bit of indication from the other levels of government, you know we're sympathetic, we understand, you know what, we're going to work towards finding solutions with the infrastructure needs, but that's not even happening. The Feds -- you're not (inaudible) go to the Province. And the Province, sorry we're too busy talking health and education. Those are my words, Mr. Speaker thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Wyatt, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was anxiously watching the clock to see if Councillor Wyatt was going to run it down but I appreciate you giving me a few seconds to get in. Mr. Speaker, I've heard some very good and passionate comments so, I just want to put some facts on the record here. First of all, the issue with Band 39 and Band 40 as was stated to make sure there is no misunderstanding. We have an agreement with Band 40. I've been meeting with them every year since I've been Mayor. Sometimes we meet here, sometimes we meet at the leg and we've been coming up with economic development opportunities. Talk about an access route, talk about the winter road that's now been developed, etc., etc. So let's not mix up the facts our agreement is with Band number 40 and we communicated with them on a regular basis. I've never, ever, ever, communicated with Band 39. They are not part of our agreement. And I guess anybody on any given day can say something and can report it by the media that doesn't give it any credence whatsoever, so I just want to set the record straight on that: Mr. Speaker, since I've been Mayor, one of the key concerns I've heard from many Councillors here, is about what's going on in Capital Region. How people are moving into the Capital Region, their building houses, they're using all of our services on a daily basis because they basically work in the City and live just outside the City and their taxes are maybe a half or a third of what we pay. Just recently, I heard some comments by Councillor Browaty about a major development that's taking place just yards away from where the city ends, okay. Guess what? We've been absolutely helpless to do anything about that because the Province gave them that ability. What we're trying to do with service sharing, for the first time for the City of Winnipeg, to have a say and a control of what kind of development happens. That's number 1; more importantly Mr. Speaker, what's really going on here and people talk about the costs and I agree with many of Councillor Wyatt's comments but let's be very honest here, there are no costs here per se. It's being paid for by incremental taxes, so unique that 100% of all the taxes, any type of municipal taxes that are coming from Rosser, any type of school taxes, 100% of the money comes back to us to pay our share first. And once that's done, if we do get the service sharing agreement, okay, we now have a say in what type of development is going to go on there. That's what this is all about. Because unfortunately right now, there is zero control and zero input. I know for sure that Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Eadie, Councillor Wyatt would want to have a say. I know for sure that Councillor Wyatt and I believe it was Councillor Eadie moved a motion at our last Council that any land within the perimeter should be City of Winnipeg. Some merit to discuss that and I think that's what's happening. There is a lot going on right now. But Mr. Speaker, let's be honest, everybody I've heard, said that CenterPort is a good project. I will say it on the record, CentrePort could be a great project. A great project, provided it's basically a private sector driven, a single authority and one jurisdiction. I put that on the record from day 1, Mr. Speaker. There is an opportunity to do something really, really special for all citizens and provide quality jobs. And for us to maintain input and have some control. I would say when you look at what's going on right now and compare to what we can get, this is a win/win, Mr. Speaker. I will be Supporting the Clause. I will not be supporting the motion.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers, I'll ask Councillor Gerbasi to close on the motion.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker and thank you to everyone for their comments. I guess I still haven't really heard a good -- I think we've all agreed that the idea of having a really good service sharing agreement would be really important. We have to have parameters for this kind of development, we have to have tax sharing

revenues that come back to us, I think everyone agrees on all that, no one is disputing that what I'm disputing is that we don't have that agreement in front of us today and we're proceeding further, that is the reason I'm not Voting against the initiative, I'm Voting, I'm asking that we give this proper due diligence, so we have that information in front of us. Yes, Mr. Mayor we do want a say in it, and that's why we want to see; we want it decided in the context of an agreement so we will know the implications and there are greater implications to this than simply paying for this Capital Project. That money may come back and pay for the Capital Project but we don't know how many years but it will, and I trust that but there's a lot more implications to servicing the Capital Region which would, could fuel all sorts of other development which has not been explained to us how we will recoup the losses of our tax base as our businesses and residential and other things move out there. That could be an issue but it can't be understood or resolved or the solutions excepted until we have that service sharing agreement, so that's why I'm moving this. I think you know, there's been good discussion and I hope people will allow for the proper due diligence, I'm sure the Premier and the others understand that there is support for the concept but obviously we have to have an agreement in place to protect our citizens interests first, so, that's why I moved the motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi: We'll take a vote on the motion -- oh and that's right, Councillor Vandal gets to speak to the clause.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Councillor Wyatt is right on one thing. This is directly tied to the future of the City. (Laughter) This is directly tied to the future of the City. This is a classic example of the whole being greater than the sum of its parts because it's greater than just an Infrastructure Project. This is a strategic alliance with the Province, the Federal Government, on a major economic development initiative within the City of Winnipeg. We're talking about the transportation sector and we all know how important the Transportation Sector is to the City of Winnipeg. We all know there is a new airport that's going to be open in a matter of months, we hope. Days. Days. And we all know this dove tails on the momentum that this City is embarking upon with the Airport development, Councillor Fielding's mentioned it, the Jets are back, the downtown development, the downtown development, the Convention Centre expansion. I can go on and on. This is more than strictly an infrastructure project. I want to bring Council to focus on the actual recommendations. Recommendation 3, that funding for both projects are conditional on the City's contribution being a maximum of 8 and a half million dollars, which is 50% of the total project cost. Recommendation 4, that funding for projects are conditional upon satisfactory service sharing arrangement being executed between the City and Rosser, which will include amongst other things a capital cost recovery through incremental taxes and in effect Mr. Speaker what that means is that we are getting a first call on getting a repayment on the entire $8.5 million. And Mr. Speaker, I challenge anybody to find another infrastructure arrangement where we're going to get a hundred percent of the money we lay on the table back. Over and above that, there is a service sharing agreement that's going to come back to this Council that's going to pay us, I hope, not only sales revenue from water and sewer which is important in diversifying revenue for the City. We always talk about how we got to diversify from property tax and business tax only and I hope there is a premium on the revenue we get back that goes back into the Infrastructure of the City of Winnipeg. And we all know about our infrastructure challenges that we're facing. So, Mr. Speaker, if you actually read the words on the report, we know that we've set the parameters in writing on what needs to be agreed to before the money flows. We all know about the importance of CenterPort. We know the Province's; CentrePort has been around for what, four years now, the Feds have invested millions, the Province have invested millions, everyone is excited about the potential of enhancing the transportation sector within the City of Winnipeg and Councillor Wyatt is right, this is directly tied to the future of the City but it's more than simply Infrastructure. Mr. Speaker, First Nation issues, Councillor Gerbasi referenced, we do have an Agreement with Band 40 and we've had one since the mid 80's and they have been consulted on this and relative to the issues of Band 39 who we don't have an Agreement on who have been let's face it; they've been pretty unreasonable in some of the stuff that they've said in the paper, and through the media, press conferences. And I think based on those comments, it's not the way to strike a deal with the City of Winnipeg, as far as I'm concerned. There's all sorts of issues relative to this Agreement with the First Nations. I'm prepared to sit down with Councillor Gerbasi to go over that, but suffice it to say, this Agreement with the Clause that we have in front of us with Rosser, with the Province of Manitoba respects our current agreement with Band 40. Mr. Speaker, having said that, I'll call the question.

Mr. Speaker: All right. All those in favour of the Motion? The Amendment, right. The Motion Number 2. Ya. All those in favour? Yes sir?

Councillor Eadie: I have only paper in terms of this, Motion 2 or which is related….

Mr. Speaker: It's the motion to refer.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour, recorded vote, okay. All those in favour please rise.

A recorded vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Smith and Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please rise.

NAYS

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

City Clerk: The Vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 10.

Mr. Speaker: Motion defeated. Now on the clause, All those in favour? Opposed? Do you want it recorded? All right, thank you. Motion passed. That's Number 2. Now number 4.

Item 3 - New Capital Project - Flood Manual Update

Councillor Vandal: I suspend the Rules to move the recommends from Executive Policy Committee so this can be dealt with right now.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Require two-thirds. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: I don't know what he's talking about, I haven't read that either.

Mr. Speaker: All right. We understand Ross, um…..

Councillor Eadie: I don't know what kind of amendments....

Mr. Speaker: Let Councillor Vandal Introduce it and hopefully that…..

Councillor Vandal: There's essentially 3 recommendations. Number 1 is that the Flood Manual Upgrade Project under the Wastewater Capital Fund be approved as a new Capital Project outside of the normal capital budget process. Recommendation 2 is that funds in the amount of 8-and-a-half million from the non-specified account land drainage be utilized as follows: 250,000 to fund the Flood Manual Upgrade Project. 600,000 be transferred to the Flood Plain Management Account for individual flood proofing projects and 3 is the regular; the Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary. Mr. Speaker, based on further information from our Administration to Executive Committee, it's really a question of timing, this allows us to move on the key areas of the Flood Proof Manual, as well as, Flood proof other specific areas in the City of Winnipeg that are prone to flooding, and the flood manual question will further be discussed in the Capital Budget process, starting very soon, likely.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: This is more a question to the Chair. This, and this has come up before at our Council, but we don't have a response. We're still being considered. And that is the issue, Mr. Speaker, and it's tied to this. The issue of the operation of the flood way. We're spending money and this is more money for flood proofing, for shoring up river banks, protecting homes and yet the operation of the floodway criteria hasn't changed for years. The Floodway Authority in the Province are reviewing that right now and we as the City, are we making representation to the Province in terms of revising the use of the floodway criteria so that we as a City; we've expanded the floodway, we spent $750 million, the Province and the Federal Government $750 million expanding the floodway, Mr. Speaker, and we have this large; this amazing engineering device right by our City. We use it based on the criteria set forward already. However, Mr. Speaker, we saw what happened in terms of the flood this year. Of course we had the unique situation of the Assiniboine River but even in years where we haven't had that, Mr. Speaker, the floodway doesn't seem to be used. The river levels in the City are kept high; I'm not just talking about tourism and the walkways under water for virtually all summer but I'm talking more importantly in some ways Mr. Speaker the fact that as long as the river banks are high, that water is absorbed into the river banks and when the water comes down again, you have massive collapses occurring all over the place and erosion happening and this is a huge expense that's going to be; it's one of those expenses that's going to be incremental and it's going to keep costing us constantly. Why are we not using the floodway to its full potential to keep the water levels of the City down when we can at a level so we can keep the water off the banks and thereby reducing the flooding? Now I realize there are issues south of the floodway gates Mr. Speaker, in terms of what would have to be done there but I would argue Mr. Speaker that the compensation that would be necessary to be made to those folks south of the floodway gates would be impacted by a more active use of the floodway, would be a heck of a lot cheaper than what we're going to have spending year after year on flood mitigation, Mr. Speaker, and river bank damage to protect homes. So it's more of a I guess a question, I'm supporting the report but as a question that this needs to be taken and we should be making representation at this point when they are speaking and reviewing as they are actively reviewing their criteria right now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I just want to get clarification the amendments were Introduced as, does the Chairperson still need to Introduce the main Clause or am I entitled to raise my hand and say I'll speak to the amendment and the motion and the clause itself?

Mr. Speaker: This comes from EPC. So, this was just approved this morning, so you are welcome to speak.

Councillor Eadie: So we're only voting on the amendment coming up right?

Mr. Speaker: You can speak to everything.

Councillor Eadie: May I do that?

Mr. Speaker: Yes please.

Councillor Eadie: Is it my turn?

Mr. Speaker: Yes Sir.

Councillor Eadie: Okay sorry. Thank you Chairperson Nordman for that clarification. Actually, I asked, I wanted this stood down because there are a number of considerations that need to be given. I did speak to Public Works about this issue and I believe that was on September 13th I think it was, same time as Property, Planning and Development. But this; I have to say the manual as it stood this year or the year that just went by, it had; it worked well but had a number of problems because conditions have changed and actually, I believe the Province has a slightly different way of utilizing the floodway now in terms of its new capacity and whether or not it will go a 100% to block for Winnipeg, which would be, I think, given the capacity now, we're not just talking about affecting people

south, when the Red River spreads, we're talking about affecting people south, east and west, right. It goes all the way out and so, but so, as we're voting for this, this is very important too, to note; what this flood manual does is allows us to be able to predict and look at what's going to happen given certain forecasts not given by us but the forecast is actually determined by the Province. We heard a lot of problems about flooding this year and frankly, the forecasts were very difficult to make. But the City of Winnipeg itself does not forecast the potential for the water. It comes from someone else and then we plug that into this manual and we did have some problems this year with that manual. The problem is whereas we have spent -- the City has invested in protecting ourselves from floods; I believe actually the final berm is now being finished off along Scotia. Thank goodness. However, that only protects us to around 97 levels or a little bit lower. I can't remember the exact measurement but, what's really difficult is, we could not measure with the previous manual, the one that's going to be updated, we could not accurately predict what -- how many sandbags we needed; that became an issue recently, right. But what we should also know is this manual tells us, we don't do what Grand Forks or Fargo or anybody else does in terms of planning or taking care of emergencies. This City of Winnipeg will not plan and prepare for a 50% possibility like Grand Forks did in 97 and we all know what happened to Grand Forks in 97. I couldn't see what was happening on television but you know I was really alarmed at what happened there and so this City, we try to and we do, we manage our flooding possibilities on a much higher level. The higher level of possibilities of there being too much water and so we have to then move ahead with sandbags. Now we got lucky this year, right. Now, I don't know how they're going to incorporate this into the manual but I know that based on this year's experience; the manual and everything around flood proofing and emergencies will be taken care of, so, I just wanted to make sure that everybody's clear that while this is a manual change, and we're going to move the City to protect itself, again, the forecast comes from the Province, and we need to base our decisions on that, and that the floodway actually has a different operating procedure now because I know specifically, we had a discussion and at the upper distal possibilities this year we were king of concerned, because I think it's at a certain level at James, the floodway will only take half the water that would come into Winnipeg and we get the other half. So, 27.5 at James is a substantially; well I believe it's more than 97. It's a lot of water so we need to be careful and that's all I have to say and I'm in favour of the amendment and the motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, the issues are in front of us. The floodway issues. I agree incredibly important to the City. We can't let another summer of tourism go down the drain relative to the Forks but it's greater than that. For sure the City of Winnipeg should be discussing this with the Provincial Government and the Federal Government; certainly at an administrative level and when it's time, a political level if there is a floodway criteria that's being redrawn as we speak, then I'm sure our Administration are representing the City's interest but rather than just throw that out, let me ask the Administration for an update and I'll share it with everybody on where this issue is at. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Item number 4.

Item 4 - Review of the Snow Clearing and Ice Control Policy

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thanks Mr. Speaker, I'll Move the report and clearly sum up once I hear what the concerns are.

Mr. Speaker: Who stood down number 4? Russ, okay, go ahead.

Councillor Wyatt: I have no concerns Mr. Speaker, I'm standing it down just to speak to it because I'm very happy about this report. Very positive. For the new Members of Council, it's taken nine years, I've been on Council nine years, to actually get one of the Amendments into; which you're seeing, which is terrific, which is the part of removing the snow in back lanes where the lanes people do not have front streets. These are lanes, Mr. Speaker, which by and large have been built to a larger standard. They're quite large lanes and they have front sidewalks, they don't have a front street and the issue has always been our standard for clearing back lanes is they go down

once and they plow them off but that's it. And these lanes are so wide that people are left shoveling; it's like the front street basically but it's never been treated as such. And it's been moving motions at Community Committee over and over and finally now this is done and I want to thank I believe it was Councillor Swandel actually who moved the motion to ask for the review, so I want to thank Councillor Swandel. But I'm really excited; this is a very happy day. This is terrific because I know the folks on these streets and this has been an issue and I have been constantly emailing and it's actually I think, Mr. Speaker, for the new Members of Council, you know, stay at your issues, right. It doesn't happen overnight sometimes. I know Councillor Fielding has argued for term limits and this is an argument against the two term limit. It's argument -- you can still make a case for a 3 term limit and I've supported the 3 term limit in the past but anyway, you know, -- this is really great, Mr. Speaker and, of course, the active transportation items here in terms of snow clearing for that, we are a Winter City. I think we have probably some of the best -- probably the best snow clearing out of any major City in Canada and we often beat ourselves up about different issues but you know, we do a terrific job in light of the adverse conditions that we have to put up with in the winter. Sure, there is always room for improvement. And this is improving, you know, we're making improvements here Mr. Speaker, this is costing money but it's an improvement and service for the citizens of Winnipeg, so I want to thank the Mayor, and Council and thank the Chair for bringing this forward and shepherding this through to Council to be discussed today. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith and Councillor Gerbasi:

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you know with this. I support this whole heartedly but there is one concern I have than is the designated park pathways. It says the activities identified in this Clause will only be undertaken when adequate funds are available in the annual snow clearing and ice control budget. Now, I would like to know, for example, in the last number of years, have we had adequate funds? It seems to me a low priority here.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Wyatt ....(laughter) And the people of Wildwood Park thank you because as everybody knows, Wildwood Park is one of those areas that has back lanes and no front streets and it has been a long time issue and it's really great to see that being done and I guess the people in Wildwood Park don't complain all that much but I do hear about this and they are very, very pleased that we're going to have proper access to their homes. So that's great news. And also, very pleased that there is a stated policy on cleaning the Active Transportation Routes for both commuter and recreational activities. Because we are a Winter City, as was mentioned and yeah it is going to be a budget question on how much we have for that as always but it's a good policy to have it in place, so that's good news and Wildwood thanks you again.

Mr. Speaker: Wildwood is a long way from Transcona. Councillor Vandal to close.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. With the wonderful weather we've been experiencing, I hope it doesn't snow until January 2012. But there are improvements as articulated by Councillor Wyatt, and we will now be doing a better job on our Active Transportation Trails, on our Park Pathways, there is $350,000 more and in 2012 we have to just keep the momentum going once we give into the Budget. So, I'm happy to move this.

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

Item 5 - 2012 Capital Local Street Renewals, Alley Renewals and Granular Roadway Improvements - Delegated Authority to Director of Public Works

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I would just like to move a new Recommendation to a slightly amended Recommendation to read that any new project using surplus funds in 2012, regional and local street program be approved by the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. That is different from the existing Amendment to which you have in your binders or on the screen delegating authority to the Director of Public Works. This is just, bring it back to Committee. We're not saying we're going to hand pick whatever it is we want to do. The

Recommendations are going to come forward and they'll be approved and vetted by Committee that you sit on. Thank you.

Moved by Councillor Vandal,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

THAT Recommendation 2 of Item 5 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated September 13th, 2011 be deleted and replaced with:

"2. That any new projects using surplus funds in the 2012 Regional and Local Street Program be approved by the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works."

Mr. Speaker: Any comments? Seeing none – Oh, I'm sorry? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Chairperson Nordman. I did want to speak to this. I spoke to it at Public Works. I didn't have an opportunity to show up at EPC to speak to it as it got there, but in looking at this list of proposed 2012 renewal; well I won't say replacement or renewal, this table is kind of interesting in that the demand to repair and to take care of our crumbling infrastructure is really, it's bad. Since I gotten here I tried to bring this message across. In my discussions with the Department, it's very frustrating when there's not enough money to deal with what I call the worst of the worst roads. Now what happens is, we're because we're so limited in money, what we have to talk about is we talk about a problem between feeder streets and just local streets. It seems that feeder streets under this program get a higher priority because there is more traffic on them. However, the streets that are not feeder streets in my Ward, are really in really bad shape; I believe I have a road that needs replacement and what's happening is; it is being -- what's the word they use? Reconstructed or pardon me? Yes, rehabbed, I think it's beyond rehabbed, there's a sink hole on that particular stretch on Parr from Lansdowne to McAdam. But anyway, luckily it showed up at; what I'm trying to get at here is; we're not dealing with our existing infrastructure problems. We simply asked for 1% of growth provincial tax on top of what we already get for money. I agree with that but that 1% if we get it, should be; that's a growth tax. We should associate growth tax with growth projects and if the growth tax it not providing enough money, then why are we doing the growth construction? What we should be doing is; there's a Frontage Levy; a $14 million increase that we had last year. 14 million. Now, I know that this particular program we're talking here doesn't include a piece of what we were talking about under that 14 million but you know, the, we need to find a way to leverage this money. $8 million going into fixing up these roads that we're talking about here comes from the Province. Next year in 2012, 2 million comes from the City and I'm hearing that there might be some surplus and will look at other projects. And I think that's good. I mean, we need to use like whatever we have, let's get this back lane, let's get the streets, the sidewalks are just, they're awful. We really have to deal with this. People are getting hurt every day. Take a walk on the sidewalk at Burrows, east of Main on the southside. There is a person that lives with a wheelchair; they have to go down the road. The sidewalk is impossible and that one -- that particular sidewalk, isn't scheduled to be fixed because there are other ones that are just as bad if not worse. So really, what I'm trying to say here is, I'm really disappointed in our ability to make sure that we're dealing with the worst of the worst in our particular Wards and actually frankly, for the whole City because you know what, I don't drive but my wife drives a van and wherever we have to drive, that means our van is getting beat up on the roads; let's get this straightened out, so while I will have to support this motion because why would I say no to getting a back lane on Royal fixed that needed to be done 20 years ago? 20 years ago that back lane needed to be done, 20 years ago. And I've got another one that's almost as bad that's been needed to be done for a very long time. So let's, I'm going to vote for this, but I really; I'm really concerned and I want to make sure that everybody understands that. We're using Cash to Capital to do some of this infrastructure and that's not working either. That is not working. Cash to Capital is not working. We're using cash that we need for example, to deal with Forestry problems because really, the Dutch Elm Disease and there's choke cherry fungus killing trees in other parts of the City. We need to be able to deal with this stuff and you know, I'm trying not to lecture but really, we need to seriously deal with it this year. Thank you.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What can I say? Prior to; let me start with this. I don't think Councillor Eadie, Mr. Speaker is educating anyone who sits in these chambers on the infrastructure deficit. It's been around a long time and it's based on the revenues that are accruing to the City of Winnipeg it will continue to be around for a long time. We should be spending an extra $380 million per year on our infrastructure. Over 10 years, 3.8 billion and we need to do a better job and we need to involve the Provincial Government and the Federal Government. Having said that, as one of the old timers around the room, as I look around now, I remember an era from 95 to 98 where there was not one penny that went into local streets. Not a cent, not city money not Provincial money. Those were very lean years, they were tough times. That's a whole other discussion. In 2012 we have 10 million for local street renewals. 27 alley renewals. 3 million for granular roadway renewals. The Administration use this money to consult with every City Councillor. And I know they consulted with I, they've consulted with I'm sure Councillor Eadie, to go out in the neighborhood and have a chat over what should get fixed and what is the priority. So, given the limited funds that we have, I don't know if there's much more consultation we can do. And if Councillor Eadie chooses to do one street rather than another, then that's really the choice you make within the parameters we're working, so I would like to move this forward and keep negotiating with other governments for a better deal.

Mr. Speaker: First we'll vote on the motion. Motion forward to send it back to Standing Committee rather than to administration. All those in favour? All right. Okay.

Councillor Vandal: Should I be clarifying that?

Councillor Swandel: **v**ote on the motion to amend first. You're not sending it back?

Councillor Vandal: No, no, not at all.

Mr. Speaker: The motion amending the clause.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. And then we'll vote on the clause.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And now on the clause. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And we have some by-laws that we'll get through here at noon and then before we start into the next Standing Committee we'll break for lunch. So.

Councillor Swandel: You're not doing Question Period and by-laws first?

Councillor Vandal: We're doing by-laws but I have a problem and I can't open my computer and I need to read the by-laws.

Mr. Speaker: Actually we have waiver fees. Oh we already passed that. So by-laws.

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

Councillor Vandal: I move that By-law No. 103/2011 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 103/2011

Councillor Vandal: I will move that By-law No. 103/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 103/2011.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 103/2011 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. Now Question Period for Standing Committee of Infrastructure and Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I didn't get a chance to ask a question to the Mayor on Infrastructure on EPC questions. I want to take this opportunity to put it to the Chair of Public Works. We keep talking about this sort of relative to the Province because there is a Provincial Election going on. Some time ago, the Federal Government eliminated two percentage points of G.S.T., which just for the City of Winnipeg equates to somewhere between $250 million and $270 million. A substantial amount of money. When you look at us talking about one percentage point of P.S.T., it seems to me we could also be talking about the reinstitution of at least one of these G.S.T. points and the money flowing directly through the Provinces to Municipalities for Infrastructure. I believe when one of these points was eliminated, the Prime Minister, or maybe it was the Minister of Finance, made the statement that this now clears the room for the Provinces to do something for the Municipalities. But rather than leaving the money in place, it was taken away. So this is just one area and if you consider it flowing both G.S.T. points were to be back in place considering both governments are now running deficits, you could actually perhaps just flow one through to the Municipalities which would be an increase and if you flow both through to the Municipalities it would allow the Province to keep some of their money back to deal with their financial issues and we would still be ahead of the game as would the Province. The Federal Government has made overtures of the fact that they're going to balance the budget within a period of time without these two percentage points of G.S.T. so that would seem to be workable. So I guess my first question to the Chair is, is there any conversation going on pushing this infrastructure issue through the Province, back up to the Federal Government, who took this $200 to $270 million out of the equation when it comes to Infrastructure in the cities, in Municipalities in general?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, thank you. Infrastructure and crime are the two hot button issues facing any Government in Winnipeg and in Manitoba I believe. We all know about our deficit. We should be spending $380 million more in the City of Winnipeg than what we are currently spending. Over a ten year period that's 3.8 billion. I know that Mayor Katz has met with the Provincial Government on a continual basis to negotiate a better deal which will allow us to… more autonomy and at the end of the day, more funding to go into our infrastructure. Obviously we're at the tail end of a Provincial Election and frankly, I'm a little disappointed that this issue has not caught fire with the electorate to the extent that I think it should. So to answer Councillor Swandel's question directly, there have been negotiations in the past to negotiate an overall better deal framework for Winnipeg. I'm not sure on the detail of that better deal, but I know that a new conversation should be occurring on Wednesday morning with whoever wins the Provincial Election on Tuesday, to advocate a better deal for Winnipeggers over the long term with the Province and the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you Chairman Vandal. The second question I ask has to do with the fact that G.S.T. is rebated to cities but P.S.T. is not. If I use - $200 million as a number for infrastructure improvements on an annual basis, if we're paying 7% P.S.T. on that, that's about $14 million. That $14 million dollars would service debt and approximately $200 million more work to be done. Is there any conversation…I mean I've heard it talked about publicly. I don't know that it's ever been talked about directly with the Province. Any conversations with the Province about providing a P.S.T. rebate to the City for both Operating and Capital Expenditures?

Councillor Vandal: I believe Mr. Speaker, my memory is challenging me on this one, but I believe as part of the Infrastructure Council recommendations that were adopted by this Council, there was a certain percentage point of P.S.T. rebate that was going to flow back to the City of Winnipeg, and I think there have been some significant discussions that have taken part in the past between the Provincial Government and the City of Winnipeg led by Mayor Katz, and I think the important issue going forward is given we're at the tail end of the Election, that we need to continue the dialogue, the momentum to negotiate a better deal for the City of Winnipeg with the Province and with the Federal Government that is earmarked to Infrastructure improvements. We all know what the issues are. We all know what the challenges are. It's incumbent on us to, as Councillor Wyatt indicated in his questions, for the City to champion this, going forward with the Provincial and the Federal government starting Wednesday morning.

Mr. Speaker: Last question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My final question has to do with something the Premier said at the Chamber of Commerce debate the other day. The Premier said that the P.S.T. contribution, that equivalent of one percentage point of P.S.T. flowing grows naturally by five to seven percent every year, so therefore it's a growth tax. Given that we know construction inflation runs at eight to ten percent and has been higher than that, and we're projecting it to be at least that high for the next ten years, it would appear to me that we are going backwards. I wanted to put this question to the Mayor. I'll put it to the Chair and hopefully we'll get a response to the Mayor in the future. Given that the current policy of the Provincial Government is going backwards in the funding of Infrastructure, what can we do to at least get it to the point of keeping up with inflation?

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, Councillor Swandel has identified the very conundrum that we as the City of Winnipeg are in. All three Provincial parties…and I have to be honest, I haven't followed the promises made on the campaign trail with…very, very closely. But all three Provincial parties have not placed infrastructure renewal in the City of Winnipeg to the, on the forefront the way I think we all believe it should be. It's incumbent on us, I think, to wait and see who forms the next government and then regroup as a Council and have a Seminar on how we go about in the best way possible to strike a better deal with whoever is elected as the Provincial Government, and of course, it's no secret that that has to be led by the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and I think he has agreed to do that based on his answer to another question by Councillor Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie. Did you have…

Councillor Eadie: I'll stand up. Sorry.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, thank you. No further questions? All right we'll adjourn until 1:30 and we'll see you back here at 1:30. (Proceedings adjourned at 12:10 p.m. - Proceedings reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Good afternoon Councillors. We'll call the meeting to order. And we left off just before the Standing Policy Committee of Finance, so I'll invite Councillor Fielding to bring forward his motion.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE DATED SEPTEMBER 15, 2011

Councillor Fielding: Sure, I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: There's a motion attached to it so…

Councillor Fielding: I'll introduce it and I believe the motion is coming from Councillor Eadie.

Item No. 1 - Combining the Fiscal Stabilization Reserve and the Mill Rate Stabilization Reserve into the Financial Stabilization Reserve

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I'll listen to Councillor Eadie's motion on the floor and I'll hopefully respond at that point.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

WHEREAS *the City should adopt a policy to maintain a prudent level of financial resources to protect against the need to reduce service levels or raise taxes and fees due to temporary revenue shortfalls or unpredicted one-time expenditures;*

AND WHEREAS *the motion merely indicates that draws reducing the financial stabilization reserve below the minimum 8% target may be used, upon approval by a majority of Council, for major unforeseen expenditures and deficits in any given year;*

AND WHEREAS *presently any use of Fiscal Stabilization Reserve requires approval of two thirds of Council;*

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT *Item 1 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Finance dated September 15th, 2011 be amended by adding a new recommendation which states that:*

"All expenditures of the Fiscal Stabilization Reserve require the approval of two-thirds of Council and that any reserve replenishment plan also be approved by two-thirds of Council"

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Chairperson, Finance Chairperson, ah Chairperson Nordman -- or Speaker Nordman. This motion that I'm bringing is to amend the provisions for the new Financial Stabilization Reserve to require a two-thirds vote of Council to utilize any monies from the Reserve and also, to a two-thirds vote to; two-thirds vote to establish the replenishment plan, if the fund goes under the minimum 8% of -- 8% Reserve. Now, the reason I brought this Resolution, in the past one of the fiscal stabilization reserve had a requirement of two-thirds in order to spend money, it also had other conditions like you could only spend 20% of a certain amount and that kind of stuff; but it's the two-thirds vote that I noted that I thought was very prudent actually. This kind of thing when it comes to utilizing and dealing with what really are shortfalls and major problems, finance issues that we might have to deal with. A two-thirds vote really is a better way of getting the input as well of our majority of Councillors. It's a way to sort of leveling our ability to discuss and make sure the issues are there but really, a two-thirds vote is about prudency and accountability so in the past there must have been a reason that this was established in order to draw down money as well as to replenish. There was never a requirement, but to replenish a fund also requires some significant financial management manipulations. And it's very important that everybody understand and that we have prudence, because if we are not prudent about how we deal with these reserves, that's a problem. And actually, I'm -- you know, I always hear the Chairperson of Finance as well as many others around the table here, when we voted on the financial management plan which I did voted against last spring but really I'm not against prudence. I think you have to be very prudent and you need to look at how you deal with finances. And to have a two-thirds vote I don't see what the problem is. I don't know why it was taken away in the new reserve. As a matter of fact, what I'm looking at here is in the current financial -- finance -- or the financial stabilization reserve is that only if it goes below a minimum of 8% does the, does Council need to vote at all. But it would only be a majority vote under what's being proposed here. So this Amendment is just simply saying, let's bring it back to two-thirds. I think that it shouldn't be a problem. We as a City have to deal with this Stabilization. If there is a problem with Mill Rates, if there is a problem with deficits at the end of the year and we need to have a reserve to take care of that, I'm fine with that. But why not just have the two-thirds? Let's just make sure that you know, that also makes us accountable, right? Because then we have to debate it here around the Council Chamber and what's the matter with that? There's nothing the matter with that. So, I'm asking you all to support this motion to amend. I don't think it's going to harm the ability of this new reserve to do the activity that it needs to, and that's my position on that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm going to support Councillor Eadie's motion. It's been a bit of a interesting -- this Item, I had a chance to speak with the Clerks at lunch and I wasn't aware, for example, that the two-thirds -- to establish the two-thirds Rule, you don't need two-thirds and to remove a two-thirds Rule you don't need two-thirds, which really kind of makes you wonder why we have two-thirds Rules because they can be removed by a simple majority. So, it really; it's really interesting, Mr. Speaker, that you know, usually a lot of organizations in terms of their constitutions; you establish a two-thirds Rule, you need two-thirds to establish that Rule. And to remove it you need two-thirds and that makes sense. Because otherwise why would you have two-thirds but apparently in this case we don't need. Other examples were given where, simple majority to establish two-thirds Rule can be done and to remove it can be done, so I think that's a big loophole to be quite honest with you in terms of the whole intent behind two-thirds. And the reason is there's a safe guard, Mr. Speaker, the idea behind the Fiscal Stabilization Reserve, having the two-thirds requirement, our predecessors obviously had some rationale around that and it goes back to the huge problem the City had back in the mid 90's when Susan Thompson was Mayor and there was a big mess in terms of the assessment and how this actually the situation in terms of the City's fiscal security and stabilization was really in peril. And they learned from that experience. So I'm quite hesitant to change a rule where it says two-thirds and there is clearly a rationale behind that. I think clearly, if there is a need to go beyond the 8% and the case is made to Council of why we need to do this and it's still a two-thirds Rule where it exists, I think the Majority of Council would understand if that rationale was made to balance the budget and to meet our funding obligations, you know, I think that would be, I'm sure it will be able to be carried but it's a safe guard in place. So, I'm going to support Councillor Eadie's motion. I think it was there for a reason and the original fund, one of the two, and since we're merging them, I think it should take precedence over the other one which is a simple majority and we're dealing with even more money now because we merging the two funds. And we're reducing it from 10 to 8, in terms of the minimum requirement. So I think it makes sense. I don't think it's an unreasonable request and it does not, in the event that we need the funds, it does not tie the hands of the City.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I really don't know what to do here. I was reading the report, I thought the report was kind of silent on this but the more I look at it, it does mention that in one of the old funds it's there and in the other there's no two-thirds requirement and then so in the new Recommendation it doesn't specifically mention the two-thirds or not mention the two-thirds. There is some validity to an argument when we're dealing with things where it's important to reducing a reserve -- or the ability to deal with issues in a reserve, down below are required set level that we should have two-thirds support of Council to do that. I'm wondering if it wouldn't make sense to proceed as we have today, take the motion of the two-thirds and send it back for further discussion. At least because I'm having a little bit of difficulty understanding exactly the dynamics here; and exactly what the procedure. Because it's silent, the Procedures By-laws says, but I do know there is some urgency or some importance to make sure this moves forward, because it falls into our budget considerations in, for 2012, both Capital and Operating sides. So, my sense is that I'm kind of going along with where Ross is coming from here, but I don't know that we need to do it today though, that we couldn't get the report through and bring the Amendment forward for a future Council Meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Swandel. I heard -- sure.

Councillor Gerbasi: Would it be possible for the Clerk to clarify the position to Council about the two-thirds vote first of all, because there has been different information on that and secondly, I'm not sure what process Councillor Swandel is suggesting either in terms of....

Mr. Speaker: I heard refer it back.

Councillor Gerbasi: Like is that a motion of referral that would be required? And I guess my question would be -- I'm just speaking -- maybe I'll take this as my chance to speak and maybe someone could answer these questions.

Mr. Speaker: There is nobody else on the list.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh I'm sorry, is no one else?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh. I was just; I was just going to say, it would be good to get some clarification on this. I think that the concern that there was two-thirds in one of these reserves, I think there's many of us would like to see that two-thirds continue. Frankly I don't see, if that's the case because that's straightforward, then I think if you think that you should simply support the motion because I think it does, unless there is some reason why not, I'll wait to hear what other people say, I do think though the important point here is to maintain the two-thirds, and if someone has a suggestion other than the motion of how to do that, I would appreciate hearing that. Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, what is being suggested would be a friendly Amendment and maybe the Clerk can give us some direction here; a friendly Amendment that this be not a motion to amend but this would be a change to a motion that it be referred back. The clause would be carried but the motion going back. If the mover and the seconder agree to that change, the mover and seconder agree to that change. You would have to write a new motion?

Clerk: You're adopting this Clause based upon an amalgamation of two funds and it's specifically tied to operations articulated by the Administration. I'm hearing that there is some concern or questions. Is there a will to refer this entire Item back to the Committee?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Okay, I guess I'm closing debate on.

C**ouncillor Eadie:** I need to close on the Amendment.

Councillor Fielding: You can close on the Amendment. That's right Councillor ….

Councillor Eadie: You can speak to the Amendment.

Councillor Fielding: Sure. Okay, you know what, let me just go through the whole process where we're at and then we can talk about that but essentially, really, the reason why we decided to do this, is both funds were a little confusing, back and forth and where do you use the Mill Rate and Physical Stabilization? That's kind of where this started out with. We all remember the Financial Management Plan which we debated probably 3 or 4 months ago. A part of that Financial Management Plan, which of course we worked with our bond raters to developed, looked at reducing some of the reserves. Right now, we have about 10% in our Reserves which basically means the amount of money we spend, you chop that off and 10% of it stays in reserves, just in case there are problems with a whole bunch of things; whether it be on one side it's the deficit for a year, on the other side there's a whole bunch of issues there so it just gives them breathing room for any disaster that's there and I think there was a sense that it was confusing where the funds would be so we said okay let's just combine the funds together and pretty much all the rules are the same for both. A part of these funds; I want to do a little bit of bragging on behalf of the City's aspect. If you look at what the City has in the reserves, we have about 10% on average. You compare that vs. areas like Calgary; they keep about 5% in reserve that's there. So we have twice as much amount of room we have than in another city similar to like Calgary. I think Edmonton has around 8.2. So, most other cities and if you look at what; I'll give the Association name wrong but it's the Chief Financial Officers, they have a big Association and they say what levels of security should you have? And essentially at one point it was 5 to 15% you should have in terms of reserves. So, working with this, we talked with our bond raters and said, you know, we're at this level 10% would this impact us if we moved down to 8%. They very much supported that. That was part of the plan, part of their Bond Rating. The opinion of their bond ratings that came out over the last few months that's there, so this is a part of it. A part of this plan and I think everyone in this Chamber except for Councillor Eadie, I give him this, it was a 15-1 vote that we endorse the Financial Management Plan which saw that reserve breaking down to a little bit further than there. What the issue is that some people have brought up is the two-thirds support. So one of the funds had two-thirds, you need two-thirds Support and the other needed a stamp of approval and I think Councillor Wyatt was right in terms of now it started. It was during the Assessment crisis back in the day in the 90's where

they put this two-thirds parameters that are there. But it hasn't been used. It's been used quite well and another big part and this; this is accentually a money item; it's similar to in terms of the budget that's there. Any budget comes by whether it's Capital Budget or Operating Budget you don't need two-thirds of Council to support that. It will be problematic in any respect. With that you need a simple majority vote that's here. So in my opinion, it's very similar to that, and you also have what needs to be adopted by Council, a plan that's put in place of how you'll replenish the funds that are there. So I'm comfortable with just having the simple majority you know put there. One of the funds already has that, the other one had the two-thirds parameters are there but I essentially see this as a money bill, similar to when a Budget would be; anything else that's part of that and you don't need the two-thirds of Council to support that -- to support a Budget going through you just a simple majority so in my opinion, I think it makes a lot of sense. It does give flexibility. It goes with what Council proved in terms of 8% buffer zone where people would have and they can't access anything below that, so if we want to dip and say we're keep 7 % or 6% in our reserves; it would have to come back to Council; so, I think what this does it streamlines things, makes a lot of sense. There's no difference in terms of the dollar figures, it's accessing the money and once again because it's a money bill it would be a straight up vote in terms of majority should rule for it. So that's my opinion on it. I think Councillor Eadie will close on it and we'll hear what he has to say in his Amendment but I would support Council to just go with the report that's in front of us as is. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Fielding, Councillor Eadie to close on the Amendment.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman, so in closing, really, this actually -- what this reserve fund is for is actually if we have problems in our budgeting process in determining our revenues and in determining extra ordinary expenses which this also mentions. Those are things that demonstrate that somehow our money bills have simply failed. And so, that's when we have to use this reserve. That's when we are not doing well with money bills that we'd have to go to this reserve and that's why you need a two-thirds vote in order to deal with that because it says listen, what are we doing wrong? We need to vote on this and then we need to replenish it because it is important and we all agree and actually, I should clarify, on the Financial Management Plan, I voted against it because what was not in it -- I didn't vote on it against really anything that was there. I voted against what was not in it; that should have been in it; to have proper financial procedures and borrowing limits and so on in place. You need to have other principles that are not in there. So really, the principle of this particular reserve and there's a whole bunch of reserves of course. But this particular reserve is about, again, the failure really, of our money budget process. And, I would also note that I hope in the future, when we're moving resolutions to create something new, I know I made it really easy to have it tabled and it makes it easy to read but what it really did was, it made it very hard to amend. Because I would of just simply liked to have moved a motion to amend two little clauses but it was so difficult because of the way this thing was set up that, we should really examine how we do that. There seems to be red tape about our motions now. It's very difficult, so it should be very simple. So, anyway, so that's my closing. This particular reserve is about dealing with issues when our whole money process is failing. And that's why it requires a two-thirds vote. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding you need to close on the Item, the clause.

Councillor Fielding: I don't have much further to add for that. You know, I think it was a strong Management Plan that we put forward, Financial Plan. I mean this is something we worked with the bond raters for, so everyone can get up and say whether we agree or not agree but at the end of the day it's the bond raters who establish how we rate, how much it's going to cost us to borrow money with our credit rating. They are very comfortable on this, this is something that Council all supported in terms of a 15-1 vote for the reduction of it and you know, I think the big part is, this is essentially a money bill, right, you don't need two-thirds of Council for a money bill. I don't think this is anything sinister in here. It's pretty much the same rules that are in place and it gives reassurance; as long as we are above the 8% marker and if you go below, it gives reassurance that you can't go below that 8% marker in terms of the reserves it's there and everyone tends to agree with that. So, further to my point, I think it's a money bill and a straight up vote makes a lot of sense for the combination of the reserves.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We will now vote on the Amendment, Motion 6. All those in favour? Opposed? I guess we'll have to have a recorded vote. All those in favour please rise.

A recorded vote was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Smith, Wyatt.

Nays

Mr. Speaker: All those in Opposed, I'm sorry.

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Sharma, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, His Speaker Councillor Nordman.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 5, Nays 9.

Mr. Speaker: Motion defeated. And now we'll vote in favour of the clause. All those in favour? Opposed? Yeas have it. Now, there are no by-laws for Finance. Question Period for Finance. Seeing none, Councillor Fielding gets off free. And we move to Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management. Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 12, 2011

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no stand downs, All those in favour of 1 through 3? Opposed? Carried. No motions. We have Consideration of a By-law. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll Move that By-law No. 93 of/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 93/2011.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 93/2011 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 for Downtown. Oh we still have some more by-laws here, I'm sorry.

Councillor Swandel: Oh I see the first reading of the other by-laws. Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 117/2011 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 1117/2011.

Councillor Swandel: I'll move that By-law No. 117/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 117/2011.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 1117/2011 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. Now we have Question Period for Downtown. Go right ahead Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT – QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Go right ahead Councillor Wyatt**.**

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Through you to the Chair, Councillor Swandel, is there any discussion or consideration being given or are you open to the idea of looking at…we have a history in the City of a number of tripartite partnerships in terms of renewal of downtown and reinvestment in downtown. We had Core Area Initiative One, Core Area Initiative Two. We had Urban Development Agreement, we had the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement. We have now been without an agreement with the three levels of government for at least two years, maybe longer since the last one expired, and I know you've moved a motion in terms of riverbanks, for a tripartite agreement, but in your capacity now as Downtown Chair as well there is a real need to reinvest, for example, in our heritage buildings and the Exchange District. There is a need for us with the museum coming on line in the next couple of years to do a real face lift of a lot of the streets in the downtown which are really tired looking and that need work. Could we pursue actively a new tripartite…I know this is bit of the Mayor's because it's intergovernmental, but would you be open to doing that and seeing where that goes?

Councillor Swandel: Well I guess at any time when you're dealing with the other two levels of government, you're there discussing priorities. As the Chair of Downtown Development that would certainly be one of my priorities and I think a priority for a great deal of members of this Council. I can tell you this, that recently we have been able to do a lot with the other two levels of government whether it be the Human Rights Museum, there's talks around the Convention Centre expansion, the new T.I.F.F. program that's giving us some opportunities. I think you're going to see…hopefully we'll see something come out using T.I.F.F. to help deal with the sports, hospitality and entertainment district and the cultural district in doing some of the street works that you mentioned, giving them a whole different feel, making them more pedestrian oriented, bringing some lighting and those types of things. So we're continuing to invest in downtown and I think if you were to do the math, you're probably, when we're with all three levels of government when you combine it all, we're probably spending on an annual basis similar to what we have been spending through formal agreements in the past. But certainly I'm completely open to doing something formal with the other three levels of government and pushing that with the Mayor to make it an issue for intergovernmental agenda.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions at this point? Thank you. Okay. We'll move on to what was formerly known as Secretariat, the Governance Committee and we have two issues that we are going to Refer back to the Governance Committee. One is a report to Council regarding future review – I'm sorry; yeah, the immunity situation that former Councillor Steeves brought forward. And the second one we're going to refer back is the situation with regard to Ward Boundaries and what not, looking forward to a Census in 2011 and the results out in 2012 so, we'll just refer both of those back. Having said that I'm going to hand the microphone over to Deputy Speaker Pagtakhan and I will take over the Governance.

Deputy Speaker: Okay we're onto the Governance Committee of Council. We have the Report of September 19th. Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

**REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED SEPTEMBER 19, 2011**

Councillor Nordman: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's been awhile since I've had the opportunity to stand before you in the Chamber pit here and make a comment or two. As we move towards governance, away from the Secretariat Committee, we felt there were a number of initiatives that needed to be looked at and dealt with and as you're all well aware, the idea of a review of our Compensation Package for the 16 of us or the 16 potential of us that are in this Chamber had not been reviewed for 20 years and having; knowing that, we felt that we're not in a position to evaluate our own compensation, our own wage, and we retained, I feel quite wisely, an independent third party who was experienced with a similar type scenario with the Province of Manitoba, so we weren't in fact asking him to reinvent the wheel. We were asking him to look at how our City Elected Representatives were being remunerated and other benefits that are frankly are sort of commonplace in other levels of government. So, having said that, I will sit down and listen to the comments regarding Item 1, and I don't know if we want to speak to Item 2 at this point or not.

Deputy Speaker: We're dealing with Item 1.

Councillor Nordman: I know, okay. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker: We have a motion. We have a motion that's moved by His Worship Mayor Katz and seconded by Councillor Havixbeck.

Deputy Speaker: Are you moving…

Councillor Nordman: I was just moving 1. So speaking to 1.

Deputy Speaker: You want to do it separately or are you standing down?

Councillor Nordman: Just 1.

Deputy Speaker: So okay, we'll vote on Number 2 then? Okay. One and two are both stood down. Now we're dealing with the motion from Mayor Katz. Councillor Eadie has requested that the motion be read out and then the Clerk will read it out.

Item 1 - Review of Winnipeg's Elected Officials' Compensation - Michael Werier Report

**Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Fielding,**

WHEREAS the Governance Committee of Council on April 19, 2011, directed that outside expert opinion be engaged to report on the structure of compensation as part of a Review of Winnipeg's Elected Officials' Compensation ('the report");

AND WHEREAS the report was received and approved by Governance Committee on September 19, 2011;

AND WHEREAS the report gives detail on compensation structures in other jurisdictions and recommends a change to fully taxable pay for Winnipeg Elected Officials and a severance program for exiting Elected Officials;

AND WHEREAS the report does not give details on the overall costs of this compensation structure, and does not take into account the pension implications of these changes;

AND WHEREAS the Corporate Finance Department of the Winnipeg Public Service has not had the opportunity to have a detailed review of the financial implications of the report and the overall costs to both Elected Officials and to the City of Winnipeg;

WHEREAS a current review by Corporate Finance indicates the belief that the costs will possibly be higher than first contemplated and;

AND WHEREAS Council needs to be fully informed of all financial implications before it is able to make decisions on this issue;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council recommends that Item 1 of the Report of the Governance Committee dated September 19, 2011 be referred back and that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to Council within 60 days on the financial implications of the report.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much Madam Clerk and just for Members of Council this is a debatable motion, the Mayor will open on it and will close on it as well, we can all talk about it.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. First of all, I would like to go back. And most of you were there when we discussed at our Council Seminar this issue. And Mr. Deputy Speaker, this issue is not about increasing the amounts paid to Councillors or Elected Officials, because I very much believe that if I were in a debate, I could easily justify and win the debate that Members of Council are deserving of more money than Members of the Legislature in my humble opinion because of their responsibility and their workload. But that is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. The issue is that this process seems to be very different than any other process because it's lacking financial analysis. There was a report that came back from independent third party. Unfortunately it did not in any way, shape or form addresses the financial repercussions of what we are doing here today. It did not discuss the amounts of money we're going to spend annually. It was yours truly, after dialogue with the CFO, who pointed out that the numbers that were represented were not accurate they were much closer to 465,000 or 470,000 per annum verses the 350 number. The other key thing here is the liability issue of the pension. No one has looked into that, Mr. Speaker. If you increase a pension from where we are today, with the new salary, you have to take into consideration what your last five years are, which would be under a new salary. Which means there is a pension liability which would be unfunded. I know we've talked about it in the past but our concerns about potential unfunded liabilities and pension that never has been discussed in any way, shape or form and nor have those figures been presented to Council. So, Mr. Speaker, that could be anywhere from 1 to 1.4 million on preliminary information with the CFO. Why, I don't know that the CFO and our finance people did not have the opportunity to come up with the numbers so when you vote you know exactly what you're voting on. I think that would be prudent. We had two discussions here today. One was on CentrePort and Service Sharing and I heard Councillor Gerbasi very passionately say and I'm going to quote, "Members of Council should know what we are doing." How can you know what you're doing if you don't know what the numbers are? Number 2, Mr. Speaker, just on the previous matter with Councillor Eadie and we're talking about certain matters, we talked about being prudent with finances. I think in order to do that you need to know what the impact is, so all I'm suggesting here and there's very little doubt in my mind that the will of Council in the end is supreme and I'm quite confident I know what Council wants to do. But I think everybody should know what the numbers are, what the impact is, and then move forward on the issue, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Okay I have a speakers List. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I just want to encourage before anybody goes any further with this everybody to read the report. The report does have financial information. I whole heartedly concur with the Mayor that you can make all kinds of arguments about this. You can make political statements, you can be grandiose, that type of behavior, all it does is to further the idea that's out there in public that creates a negative image of politicians. This is how we deal with these things; we hire a third party to look at it from a fairness perspective, equity with other cities and municipalities. So let me give you the math. The Mayor's salary increase is $33,000, doesn't go to the Mayor; it goes to the Government of Canada. One taxpayer we argue on this floor, there's one taxpayer, so you can't count that value. Likewise with the 7 Councillors that are in the lowest salary range that equates to $91,000 a year not each that's all 7 combined that equates to $91,000 a year. The 7 EPC Members -- or 6 EPC Members and the Speaker equates it equates to $126,000 a year and then Mr. Deputy Speaker, the difference is $15,000 a year for a Grand Total of $265,000 a year that does not go to Councillors. It goes to the Federal Government. Now, I

think somewhere along the way we could find a way to get that $265,000 a year back from the Federal Government if that's really the issue. One taxpayer, my friends. One taxpayer. So let's not pretend that this is; that the information isn't here. So the real cost of this then becomes the pension contributions based on that $265,000. That cost is 10% of pensionable earnings that are paid for by the City of Winnipeg towards our salaries. $26,500 a year is the real cost. When you break that down on an individual basis, what we're actually arguing about here is 50 cents a day. Fifty cents a day. If you want to add that to the cost of severance, for example if 4 Councillors were to leave in any given year it would cost you $200,000 and you spread that out over the 4 years of term, that's another $50,000 per year would drill down to $1 a day per Councillor. Total cost per day, 1.50 between the two items which are here before us. So, the information is here if we choose to look at it, we choose to use it. I don't want to make this a political argument. I do not want to be standing up there advocating for one side or the other of this because I believe all we do is harm the image of politicians. Do you know how difficult it is to get people to run for office these days. There certainly isn't any security in the job. You know you look at people getting elected in the Federal Election, they have never set foot in their Riding? You know, what kind of security does that give to well intention people like I can argue logically different with Councillor Gerbasi all day long but I whole heartedly believe that that woman works as hard as any one of us here. I will fight to protect anybody who wants to put that kind of commitment to their community. It might not look like we're making that kind of commitment at our communities. There's always this negative perception. Just the debate we're going to have here today, it's only going to further that perception for 1.50 a day. 1.50 a day. Look yourselves in the mirror and ask yourself what you're doing? You hired a third party here to go out and do this so we don't have to go through this. This makes sense for us, for those that came before us. I looked at people, who put 20, 25, 30 years of service walking away with pensions of $1,500 a month. You know, and struggle… after giving that type of service to our City. This just makes sense to do this. Someone has to have the courage to stand up for politicians, not just us, but politicians around the country, they are constantly painted in a negative light. You know, we want strong people. We want to encourage more women to be in politics, we want to encourage younger people to be in politics, we want to encourage wise people, they bring all kinds of knowledge to the table with them, to be in politics to take time out from their careers to help make our City a better place. But for 1.50 a day we're going to try and to make an issue here? Those are my comments.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Swandel, next up we have Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Chairperson Pagtakhan. I heard a lot of talk about prudent -- being physically prudent and taking care of budgets, but I also heard people vote against prudency and accountability today. In terms of this bill, I don't see that there's a real need to have Corporate Finance spend even 60 days on this. This is not very difficult stuff to figure out as Councillor Swandel has eloquently pointed out. I think what he is also saying is why should somebody; either male or female, have to you know put their day; like we worked many hours a day. Councillors who work hard; they work hard, they believe in what we're here for. You do your job but why should your spouse pay for that in the end when it comes to retirement? I did a calculation, so, because, I'm okay with having an indemnity where one-third of my wages isn't subject to taxes but you know what, really, who has that nowadays? And so I had to it look up, but what I wanted to point out is; according to the pension calculations right now after 16 years, that would be 4 terms, I'm a new Councillor, after 16 years at the current rate and it's only going up; I should also point out this actual report is not giving anybody here a raise. There's not a raise in this report. We are still going to net the same income. What we do get though is, yes, the pension and so I'll point it out. Before we pass this motion, pass the main clause, the report from the independent consultant, before that I would receive after 16 years of service, $17,000, after 16 years, and I've been making 66,000 a year because that's right now what I'm making, 66,000 with the indemnity, right, so after 16 years what portion of that salary income am I getting? I'm not adding in the CPP, that's true, but I'm just talking about the City's pension liability for me when I retire? So, after this thing is voted in, I'm going to get guess what, a whopping $25,000 a year. That's a $8,000 difference, cost of living will come in as I understand it; I never voted on it but as I understand it Councillors' incomes are subject to an annual; some kind of a cost of living increase that allows it to increase. I think that's also fair; if that's the way things are going, but I wasn't here on that vote. So, really with this motion, I don't understand, really the motion to refer. We were all in the room; we talked about the calculations, yeah, it is more than a one third increase in terms of pension and liability but this is not something that is -- well, I talked about the failure of budgets and having a two-thirds vote. People didn't think that we needed to have a two-thirds vote in terms of us having real problems with all our money bills so I don't really understand that motion, so, I am, I'm actually supporting the main motion here; an independent, a person looked at this, he's not giving us a raise, there's a

severance package. You try to get your life together after being elected and then what do you do. I was elected as a Trustee; I stepped down to run in other level of Election in the City Council in 2006. I lost; my income was gone and I struggled really hard for a couple of years; like I mean really hard, and so it's very difficult, so, today again I'll be against this motion to refer and for the clause. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie, Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I stand before you and ask you my colleagues to give consideration, that it's not unreasonable to ask the Administration, we do this, time and time again. I have concerns with this report and I ask the administration myself for some commentary on it and the response I got from the CFO was that he was not part of the process and not part of the input and could not verify any of the calculations in the report. So, I start with the numbers quoted. We've heard 350,000, we've heard 405,000, 415,000, 465,000 in between the whole last EPC meeting and today's meeting and I'm sorry but those are a span of $100,000 in difference. So I can't support something for that particular reason. I believe that in the past we have with certain labor group negotiations asked for the Actuaries, to provide us some commentary on what the future value is. We've flown in Actuaries from Vancouver to have this information and yet we don't have any precise figure on what the long term pension liability is and that's a liability to the citizens of Winnipeg as taxpayers. So again that's another estimate not in this report. And our pension plan, I learned falls under the Council Pension Plan, we have our own pension plan so I don't know why we wouldn't have taken the time to just get a ballpark number on what that does to the long term liability. City Councillors currently contribute 22% to the Council Pension Plan and we can all pull numbers from this Report, from other information. But the -- it's likely that the actuary report will increase. And so I think we are shooting in the dark in voting for something that we don't know the exact number. In terms of the severance value there is no estimated value. There's numbers thrown around here today. I don't think that that's been adequately considered in this Report. There has been some estimate but there again there's lots of variables with that but again, that's another piece that I would have wanted from the CFO in this. Now given that there was no information that could be provided to me by the CFO; I went outside of the organization. I took these numbers and I asked someone who works in that industry to give me some sort of opinion on it. And given that all these amounts topping up our salaries put us, all of us collectively into different tax brackets, I have a calculation that shows that the Mayor's net salary will be the same, the Deputy Mayor's salary will go up and Councillors' salaries will go down $100.00 net take home pay. So with that logic, I would hope I could appeal to some of you in thinking that we may not have "costed" this out properly and that we may be doing something to pose more harm to us. I personally don't want to take home less pay. I took this job and I ran because I wanted to do something for my community. I knew what the salary was coming in, and I don't think that coming in now in our first year essentially, for some of us newcomers it's appropriate. I think taxpayers expect more of us. Other comments from this person that I consulted say that in some cases this doubles the pension contributions for the employer. I think if we were in a union negotiation, we'd be calling in some information on that. The people who have the most to gain of course are the longer serving Councillors and their pension contribution essentially doubles. I would also like to comment on a bit of the process. I understand in reading the report that only 2 Councillors provided input. I know I did. I provided my input by email and my email to Mr. Werier indicates that Councillors should be available for EI in case of job loss, maternity benefits and some prevision should be arranged to make the position more attractive to women in particular. Salaries should be on par with other major Cities, not with MLAs and to further this, I've discussed this with a number of MLAs who say, that some of their first order of business maybe to look at their salary compensation system. So to use that as the benchmark to me seems inappropriate. So I close with the comments that I heard today and I appeal to each of you my colleagues. Someone said, we weren't elected to just rubber stamp things, and I certainly can't do that. So, I would appeal to you to have presented some information to at least ask the administration to comment and provide a report. I don't think that's unreasonable.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Havixbeck, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well I guess I'm the most quoted Councillor of the day today, so I'm glad you're all listening. Rubber stamp. Rubber stamp. Well, and I think Councillor Swandel said earlier that nobody's ever going to accuse me of being a rubber stamping Councillor, so I think I'm on safe ground. I also will be supporting the original -- the report as it come forward and not be supporting the motion. I mean, I think -- you know, the numbers are there, like

as Councillor Eadie implied it's not rocket science, they're fairly straight forward numbers. There will be a few additional costs. But let's go back to the reason why we're doing this. It's been 20 years since this system of compensation which is what we're really looking at is the whole system, of how we're compensated and that hadn't been dealt with for 20 years. It's time that it was dealt with. I think everyone agreed on that. That's why everybody supported a motion to do so and to do so with a third party with a respected third party who is qualified and capable and did the work we asked them to do and it's really recommendations that were given to us from a third party. It didn't really come from us. I just wanted to make a few -- also, I would say that the recommendations that Mr. Werier had put forward are consistent with other jurisdictions and fair minded and I think if you look as those issues; the motion is not arguing about any of that, the motion isn't arguing that it's fair or that it's transparent or that -- or that any of those things aren't true. It's only saying we don't -- trying to make a point about the cost of it as something we don't know and that has been questioned very clearly that we actually do have a pretty good idea from the report. I would also like to comment -- it was said earlier that we didn't run an election on this. Well the reason we didn't run an election on the outcome of this report is that we didn't have the report; we didn't know what was going to be recommended. All we did is was ask them to study our compensation. So, no we didn't run on it, we waited until we got the recommendations because that's something we shouldn't really be deciding which is why we got a third party. I think some people might prefer to keep the one-third tax free status. This has come up over the years. It's kind of nice to be able to say, I only make this much to your constituents. But the truth is, it may be more comfortable for us to claim a lower salary number. The reality is that this is less transparent; it's inconsistent with how things are being done in other jurisdictions and it's basically gone the way of the dodo having one-third tax free, so, that's why that recommendation was there. It's not because it makes us more comfortable or it's easier to explain, you know that we get paid, but we do. We have a full time job and we have to get paid something. I'm strongly supportive of the severance package. It's really inhumane for people to lose an election or decide not to run again and just be; have absolutely no income from the immediate date that that Election happens. That's something that many other Councils have implemented and other levels of government they have in place. So it's really a matter of being humane. Many Councillors do not have other income sources, do not have other businesses, do not have other income, and they put that aside for the years they are working here and some of us did that when we had kids. We put ten years aside for that; now we put other years aside from our other career to do this and this is a great career and I'm not complaining about that but I just think it's quite fair to be compensated with a severance package similar to what you would get in business or in other political job. And I also would say I don't see this issue is left or right or EPC or non-EPC, so I hope everyone just votes with their conscience and goes the right thing but I think it may not be that politically easy for us; and even if the majority of people support this I think it isn't that easy for us to stand up and say you know, we should have a fair compensation package but it's the right thing to do so I'm doing that today. Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Our last speaker, Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Great, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm not going to spend too much time, a lot of this has been spoken before. I don't want to really downgrade this issue in any respect. I think everyone has their points for supporting it or not supporting it. There are some elements of this report that I do like. I do like the transparency side of the equation where you move towards more of a, what the salaries, I like that component of it. I do like the fact that it's an independent report that came out where it came out I think he did some work for the Province in there so, I do like those things. But the bottom line for me I guess at the end of the day, if, and I do appreciate there's one taxpayer at the Federal or Provincial level but at the end of the day this is going to cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of 400 or more thousand dollars to our Provincial, or to our City Treasury, in terms of projects that we could spend, we can do a whole bunch of other projects with that money. So yeah, there's one tax payer but it does impact our bottom line here, the amount of money which we can spend in terms of it, so really that's the reasons why I'm not supportive of the Clause. I am going to support the Mayor's amendment portion of it. You know, it's pretty much the same reason I won't be supporting the next report we're talking about in terms of the Councilor's Representative Allowance too because there's a financial cost of 165,000 and I'm pretty comfortable with the budget in itself, so once again, I do like some elements of the report but I won't be supporting it coming forward because at the end of the day it impacts our treasury and I think money can be spent in a better facet here at the City of Winnipeg. We know that we don't get as much as we should from the Federal or Provincial levels in terms of Infrastructure and all the stuff we talk about on our daily basis and this just means we can spend less or we got to make this a priority. One of the things that should be a priority at the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Fielding, our last speaker is Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know, I was listening to this debate and it's unbelievable this Amendment is only calling for more information. People are taking the position for or against the Werier Report. This does not take that position. It calls for more information and I don't know what it's like to lay or hurt us. Why not go with this Amendment? Why don't we act on the complete information. I asked Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Wyatt and these people who always call for more info but when it comes to something they disagree with, that's another story.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. No other speakers. Mr. Mayor to close on the motion to refer.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's much appreciated and I appreciate all the comments. And I think as we all know this issue has nothing to do with increased monies because there are no increased monies for the elected officials. All we're talking about is what the true costs or implications are. I heard the comment, the numbers are straightforward. Let me tell you how straightforward the numbers are, okay. One number, $265,000 comes from a Councillor and another number 350,000 comes from the Clerk. Another number, 465 to 470,000 comes from the CFO. That's approximately an 80% discrepancy but the numbers are straightforward, obviously they're not. Nobody even wants to look into the scenario about what the unfunded liability in the pension will be. Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether this was done in 30 days or not, it's not the amount of time, it's a matter of everybody supporting something, knowing all the information, and I have no problem with this going through. I think everybody should have all the information. That's it. Obviously it's not here today.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much for your summation Mr. Mayor. To close on the main Clause, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker, for me Ladies and Gentlemen it's, this is not an administrative decision. It's maybe a bit of a financial decision but it's a political decision that we all have to come to grips with. The rationale that you've all shared is all fairly uncomfortable with all of it. I understand where all of you are coming from. But the reality is, this is a report whose time has come. I'm comfortable enough with the information as it stands, as we invested in Mr. Werier's report, so I will be obviously supporting the main Clause and will pass my thoughts on the Amendments. So, I encourage you all to vote the way you feel and I appreciate the dialogue we've had through this last 6 months because it really did start back in April. And I think as the report said, it sort of quantified to some extent that we are a full time operation here. It's quantified us in a way that we're no longer an indemnity but a salary. The idea that we will have a three week for every year severance package, and for those in the audience who don't know, we do not pay employment insurance so we're not eligible to collect it, and I think like our civic employees who do have that opportunity, we would like to have at least some way of the immediate time after politics so I would encourage your consideration in that regard. And the last thing is the fact that within the document is the recommendation that this not go another 20 years that this be done every two terms or 8 years and it won't be such a shock at the end of the exercise and for both the people within the chamber and for the public. So I encourage you to support this and thanks for the debate.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman, you should be commended for your work on this. We'll now vote on the motion to refer. A recorded vote was called for. All those in favour of the motion to refer?

A recorded vote was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Fielding, Havixbeck, Smith.

Deputy Speaker: And those Opposed to the motion to refer.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Gerbasi, Sharma, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt, Nordman, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Councillor Pagtakhan.

City Clerk: The Vvte Mr. Deputy Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 10.

Deputy Speaker: Motion has been defeated. On the main clause, All those in favour? All those opposed? Motion's been carried. Mayor Katz is in opposition, Councillor Fielding and Councillor Havixbeck. Okay on Item Number 2 – Councillors' Representations Allowance , Madam Clerk.

Item 2 - Councillors Representation Allowance (CRA) Fund Policy

Deputy Speaker: Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: I would be interested to hear comments of Councillor Eadie. We have also reviewed our CRA and look forward to hearing what his thoughts are. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, ah, thank you. I should say Acting Speaker Pagtakhan thank you. I wanted to speak to this Resolution because the Councillors' Representation Allowance improvements here in terms of accountability and making sure that everybody knows what we're doing, is in here. We're actually going to be following generally accepted accounting principles here where you have to account for the money and the year in which it was dedicated for and I think that's a very important concept. It supports what the Auditor has asked for and it talks about a matching principle which is part of the generally accepted accounting principles. I also wanted to mention that this is going up on the computer system so people will be able to see what a Councillor is spending -- the Councillors' Representation Allowance on and frankly, I think that what I spend my office's money on, it's been almost a year and what I've been spending the money on are the things I need in order to accomplish the work we do in the Mynarski Ward. And actually, sometimes I think there should be a bit more to do, different things but frankly again, this actual Resolution, while it does add some money, it doesn't actually increase my CRA, and also I wanted to point out that the biggest extra cost to the CRA is related to a travel allowance of $550 a month. A parking spot that has a taxable benefit; the parking spot, a taxable benefit if you own a car, and also a parking sticker which has a value as well for your car. That's what people -- Councillors will be able to utilize. I just want to put it on the record now; I am in support of this motion but I will not be accepting any of the 550, nor will I accept the parking spot, nor will I ask for a sticker for my shoes, so I can park. That doesn't mean though that I don't have a travel allowance. As a matter of fact, I can still as I under it, under the CRA here, do what I have been doing. Well, let me step back. Frankly, people remember a year ago, almost a year ago, I asked for $45,000 in my CRA to increase, partly to get my information up to date so that I can continue to be informed while I do my job. But the other part was I was going to have somebody drive me. Now, that wasn't necessarily to drive me to get me from point A to point B. It was actually once you're in the building, how do you get there and if I was going to have a staff taking care of Access to Information; I might as well have a full time staff and that's all it was, so I would just point out though, that it is working out. I will be able to charge my taxi cabs. I take the bus often where I need to go and I think it will do and so the projection that somebody said, we know what the exact increase cost is for the CRA here, I would say you don't because I'm not claiming the 550 nor am I taking the parking spot nor am I getting a sticker. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie, is there any more speakers? Seeing none -- oops, Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: The end, I'm standing down this motion today. I agree with the transparency, however again, same logic as Report No.1, that I feel that the cost saving is somewhat light. I do disagree with adding auto

allowance over and above our current representation allowance. I see that as an added cost again to the taxpayer and I'm not for that. So, for those reasons I stand down on that.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Havixbeck. No other speakers. Summation, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will thank those who shared their thoughts with us. The -- a couple of items that were spoken of, the auto allowance and the parking and the parking spot, they are all taxable benefits. Those who choose to use it will, and for the vast majority of folks we are at such a point or many of us that an automobile is a requirement of our position to get back and forth to meetings in a timely fashion, so we're certainly happy to have that option. I know that we're now in compliance with what the City Auditor has been asking us to do for almost two years. Much of the template that he used and requested of us is similar to a larger City in Canada, Toronto has done a similar effort and we're happy to comply with that and have more fairness and more disclosure on how our Councillor Representational Allowance operates. So, thank you today and I will be supporting the Clause.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Nordman, okay on the main clause, All those in favour? All those Opposed? Okay. Motion is carried. Councillor Wyatt moves adjournment. We're adjourned. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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