

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Wednesday, May 30, 2012

The Council met at 9:34 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Swandel.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Unfortunately our Page is ill today so we will be calling on our Commissionaires to do that duty. At this time I would like to invite Mayor Katz to the podium and we have a small presentation that we would like to make.

On May 4, I was invited to Ottawa, to be at the announcement of the host cities of the World Cup of women's soccer and the six hosting cities, Winnipeg is among those from Edmonton, Vancouver, Ottawa, Montreal and Moncton, to be participating in some of the 54 odd games that are going to be played in June of 2015. And we are joined today and I would like to recognize them and ask them to stand in the gallery. Members of the Manitoba Soccer Association, Christine O'Connor, Barry McArton and I know Hector Vergara is over there taking photographs. And although this is a FIFA event, members of the Manitoba Soccer Association are very excited about the opportunity to showcase not only our Canadian women's game but also the brand new facility at the University of Manitoba which will be the host of the games here in Manitoba. So, at the event on May the 5th, the President, a gentleman by the name of Joseph Blatter was good enough to present to the City of Winnipeg the FIFA, City of Winnipeg, Province of Manitoba, FIFA Women's World Cup Canada 2015 official host city pennant and at this time I would like to pass it on to His Worship.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: And as I understand it, we're going to have a display case with World Soccer memorabilia and what not. And although I know it's risky to give you a soccer ball.

Mayor Katz: Only if I use my feet.

Mr. Speaker: And the ball is inscribed FIFA Women's World Cup Canada, 2015, official host city announcement, Parliament Hill, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada presented to Winnipeg fourth of May, 2012. So, sir, there you go and as I understand it, you are also starting your own women's soccer team. (Applause)

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Before we go into the serious business, Councillor Wyatt has a presentation he would like to make.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you for the opportunity. The...in front of you, all Members of Council have received the Transcona Story 100 Years of Progress, the Transcona Centennial Book, put together by the community and it documents the history of the last hundred years of our community. I want to thank Mr. Speaker, the volunteers who have made this possible, who actually worked diligently. Specifically I would like to thank the author, Diane Truderung for her hard work and efforts on writing this wonderful book and as well Bond Printing, Greg Romance there for working towards publishing and selling, advertising, help to pay for the book and specially the main corporate sponsor of the book, CN Canada's National Railway, which donated \$20,000 towards the production of this book. So I want to thank them for their generosity and support. This is on sale. The Transcona High Neighbour Festival, this weekend, you're all welcome to come out for the parade and have a wonderful time. The Mayor's going to be in the parade and it's going to be a great event going down Regent Avenue, the largest parade in the history of the community actually and we've got I think I understand the Premier is coming, other dignitaries. And this book is on sale, so you can purchase it for \$20.00 from the Transcona Historical Museum. It's available and they're selling fast. They've already

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 30, 2012

sold well over 800 books in confirmed sales, and only 1,100 have actually been printed. So buy your book right away if you're looking for more. But these are complimentary from the people of Transcona to Members of Council. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. You might want to have him autograph them and you might want to open to page 222 where his picture is, so.

On a more solemn note, I would like to take a moment to recognize a former member of this Chamber, who passed away recently, and was really quite an outstanding guy in the community of St. James, and just because I'm from that end of town I probably know more about George Minaker than most folks in the audience. In the 40 years we've had this format of what we call Unicity, I think he is the only member of this Chamber that not only went on to be a Member of the Provincial Legislature but also to the Parliament of Canada. He served at all 3 levels of government, representing in one form or another, St. James: the civic riding of the day which does not exist anymore. He was in the original council in '71, '72, and he represented Booth Ward, for those of you who are not familiar, that's sort of around the Courts of St. James, that area. He went on to represent the provincial riding of St. James, was a member of Sterling Lyon's Cabinet in the late '70's and in 1984 he was elected to Parliament along with a team led by Brian Mulroney. He later was defeated and gave us the opportunity to come to know John Harvard better, but it's quite an extraordinary feat, in my mind's eye, that one individual in this modern era was able to represent at all three levels of government. So, at this point I'd just like everyone to rise and we'll have a moment of silence and respect for George Minaker. Thank you.

I'd like to move a motion of condolence regarding that. Councillor Fielding seconds it.

MOTIONS

**Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Fielding,**

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor George Minaker, which occurred on April 30, 2012.

Mr Minaker served the citizens of Winnipeg as Councillor for the Booth Ward from 1971 to 1973.

This Council extends to the Minaker family its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

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

MINUTES

Councillor Sharma moves that the minutes held on April -- of the meeting held on April 25th. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: It's time for our delegations and we would like to invite Mr. Doug Dobrowolski, President of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities in support of the motion, moved by His Worship Mayor Sam Katz and seconded by Councillor Wyatt; regarding the request to the Province of Manitoba to transfer the revenue generated from the 2.5 cents per litre increase in the gasoline tax directly to the Municipalities to address infrastructure requirements over and above existing funding levels. Sir, you have 10 minutes.

Doug Dobrowolski: Mr. Speaker, Members of Council, my name is Doug Dobrowolski and I am the President of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities. I'm here today to speak in favour of the motion before you. This motion calls on the Province of Manitoba to transfer revenue generated from the 2.5 cents per litre increase in the gasoline tax directly to municipalities.

The AMM has been calling for additional revenues over and above existing sources for a number of years now. This is what is needed to take on the monumental challenge of our infrastructure has become. We all know our communities are staggering under the weight of a massive infrastructure deficit in this area. This deficit is so large it is expected to reach \$13.4 billion in Manitoba within ten years at current funding levels. The number may seem almost insurmountable but is not.

In fact, last year's Infrastructure Funding Council Report identified a number of solutions to the problem. These solutions involved all three orders of government, municipal, provincial and federal. All require a long term strategy.

Following the release of the IFC report the AMM and the City of Winnipeg called on the province to do two things.

1. Dedicate infrastructure funding to municipalities equal to one point of the existing seven points of PST over and above the 2011 provincial budget allocation and
2. Provide a rebate of the PST paid by municipalities to the provincial government similar to the rebate, the GST paid by municipalities to the federal government.

We also called on the federal government to implement an escalator clause in the federal gas tax fund and I have continually called on our members, the 197 incorporated municipalities, to do their part and they are.

AMM Members are looking beyond municipal property tax to user fees, frontage levies, public private partnerships and tax increment financing options to name a few.

Our members are doing everything they possibly can to raise additional funds to municipal infrastructure but we need the other parties to come to the table. We cannot do this alone. That is why last summer, AMM undertook a campaign leading up to the provincial election called "Putting communities first".

Our goal is to make sure that, that candidates were fully aware of their infrastructure issues facing our members. During this campaign I toured a number of communities across the province. I met with elected officials, community leaders, citizens and candidates in the October provincial election. Some of the stories I heard and some of the things I saw were really disturbing. One hundred year old water and sewer mains, boil water orders, lack of cell phone service, housing shortages, collapsing bridges, unsafe roads and crumbling sidewalks and the list goes on and on.

After seeing the condition of Manitoba first hand, I asked our members to submit resolutions to help us underscore this serious issue. 150 municipalities did just that. The resolution collectively called on our provincial government to dedicate some of the revenue it collects to repairing and upgrading municipal infrastructure. This campaign was a huge success in my opinion. It did not result in sweeping election promises to share one point of the provincial sales tax with municipalities nor did it result in a promise to rebate the PST to municipalities paid to the provincial government. But it took this discussion to a place where it's never been before, to the people. This campaign was seen and heard by all political parties and the general public throughout Manitoba. And I believe... believe me when I say, the public supports this. After all they are driving on our potholed roads, walking on our crumbling sidewalks and visiting our rundown recreational facilities each and every day. This is a problem that hits home wherever we live. I suspect that that is why the AMM polled, polled Manitobans last November; we found that 64% of the respondents were in support of a 1 cent municipal sales tax dedicated to infrastructure renewal projects. Not only is that a significant majority but it's also an increase of 10 percent from 2008 from a similar poll. This tells me that the citizens of Manitoba are ready to do something about this issue. They are willing to do what it takes to fix their crumbling infrastructure. All they need is an opportunity. This brings me back to the reason why I'm here today, to pledge AMM's full support for this motion.

The Province of Manitoba created an opportunity in its recent budget when it announced 2.5 cents per litre increase on gasoline and vehicle tax to fund infrastructure. It created an opportunity to finally show the municipalities, our citizens, that they are serious about giving us the tools we need to fix our infrastructure. This money would not only generate an amount of money per year, one percent of the PST, but it would generate an additional 30 million for the City of Winnipeg, province wide, our members would see an additional 55 million. In other words it would be an excellent start to addressing a problem that is growing daily, one that affects virtually every person in Manitoba in some way.

In closing I would like to thank Mayor Katz and AMM Director Councillor Russ Wyatt for bringing this motion forward. I join you today in calling on the Province Manitoba to transfer the revenue generated from the 2.5 cents per litre increase in the gasoline tax directly to Manitoba municipalities. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Doug. Questions? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. President Dobrowolski, thank you for your leadership on this matter and for coming in and speaking with, to us today. You've recently returned from travelling to various municipalities around the Province of Manitoba. What is it you are hearing and seeing? I know you spoke a bit about that in your speech. Can you elaborate on what you're hearing out there in terms of the state of infrastructure? Because we see it here first hand at the City and we know the challenges here but what's happening outside the City?

Doug Dobrowolski: Well Councillor Wyatt, what's happening outside of the City of Winnipeg, a lot of communities at the time when their infrastructure went in, it only made sense to do, for example, the whole town at one time, whether it's water or sewer, so now a lot of that, it's all falling apart at one time. Not only that, their streets are falling apart, their sidewalks are falling apart. Recreation centres, a lot of them are centennial projects and they need major upgrades. So there's a big demand out there for infrastructure dollars.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. The recent announcement by the province in terms of raising the gas tax but yet not earmarking any of that to infrastructure funding either to municipalities or even themselves in terms of their highways, what has been the reaction of the AMM municipalities to that?

Doug Dobrowolski: Well actually the municipalities would prefer a raise in the PST rather than the gas tax because communities outside of the City of Winnipeg feel because they're a lot of tourist destinations and if you hike the gas tax too much, people are not going to come to their communities, so most municipalities would prefer a one point of the PST.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Wyatt: In light of the increase of the gas tax, you're arguing that, you're supporting the motion here today arguing that the money should go, dedicated on and above to existing funding for infrastructure for municipalities?

Doug Dobrowolski: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, thank you Doug for coming today. It's a very important issue and we're pleased that the efforts that you're putting forward, such strong efforts on this file. One of the challenges that we have with this is, the civic government or the municipalities don't have a direct relationship with the federal government; that relationship only exists with the province. At one time I believe when one of the percentage points of GST was eliminated, the Prime Minister, or somebody federally said that, it now creates room for the provinces to do something, for the municipalities, which creates a bit of a political problem, problem for anybody involved at the provincial level. Have you had any conversations or has there been any policy work done on the concept of creating direct relationships between the municipalities and the federal government? It seems to me that if the federal government was willing to enable the provinces to create this room, perhaps they would just be willing to reinstate one percentage point of sales tax so that we could get the work done. Have you done any work in that regard?

Doug Dobrowolski: Yes. We constantly meet with Manitoba MPs when they are in Manitoba. We have asked that question several times and that we still believe there was a missed opportunity when Prime Minister Harper dropped the GST those two points. To me that was an opportunity to raise another point there for infrastructure and also through the work for the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, we do great work and I'm actually sitting on one of the working groups that's putting this new Building Canada II so-called together and that's the idea of this program is to get the money out to all municipalities. This last Building Canada stimulus there were great programs and a lot of good money and a lot of good projects but it was basically a lottery. It was application based and you were lucky if you got some money but this new program, we're hoping it's going to be more accessible to all sizes of communities.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Doug, I just want to shift gears; today there is also a motion on the vehicle registration fee and dedicating those funds towards rapid transit. I'm assuming that you are of the same mind with the vehicle registration fee as you would be with the gas tax?

Doug Dobrowolski: Yes and I think it's up to the individual municipality where that money would go.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Doug Dobrowolski: And just in closing, on the one percent piece Doug, it would require a referendum. I heard the Premier on the radio today saying, he has no interest whatsoever in doing that. Could you give us a little idea of what the cost of that? I know there is a great reward with it, but there is a cost and also is it only the Premier that can initiate that process or is there a way that the people can initiate that process?

Doug Dobrowolski: Well, I've talked to the Premier -- a year ago I talked about a referendum and he said no then; he is saying no now and unfortunately the Premier and the province are the only one that can initiate that referendum.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Mr. Dobrowolski? Seeing none, thank you, sir. We'll see you in Saskatoon. Our second delegation, Marty Gold in opposition to Item 1 of the Report of Governance Committee of Council dated April 12 regarding Senior Election Official's Report and Recommendation 2010 General Election. Ten minutes, sir.

Marty Gold: Good morning Council, thank you Mr. Speaker, a hearty mazel tov to you Mr. Mayor, and Councillor Smith it's nice to see you getting around a little easier now-a-days. I appear today in opposition to the motion with regards to the acceptance of the review from the administration, pertaining to the conduct of the 2010 election and proposals for revisions to how elections are conducted in the City of Winnipeg moving forward. I do not want you Councillors to in any way interpret my opposition to this as having specific suggestions that the report might have missed some of the administrative flaws or things that would have been done better in 2010 directly. I'm not analyzing this material in microcosm to that degree but rather there are some issues that are raised by the contents of the report and the recommendations that flowed from Governance Committee, and as well, there are some gaps, I believe in the proposals that have come forward. Now I addressed these previously at Executive Policy Committee when this was first raised a couple of months ago. I'm pleased to see that some of the aspects that I raised seem to have been addressed in a kind of bureaucratized or legalese kind of way. However, there are other aspects that I raised that have not been addressed that I feel benefit Council as a whole, those of you that weren't present when I made my presentation at EPC to benefit from -- from hearing some of these concerns that have been raised and as I circulated this, I was fortunate to be able to play the entirety of my presentation, the audio of my presentation at EPC on my podcast and it got a pretty surprising response from my listeners in that they actually sat through it, paid attention and gave me feedback on a number of the individual aspects that I raised to Council. And I've also taken to heart the encouragement I got from a couple of Councillors that were present that were not members of EPC; so I'm proceeding on the same basis. Firstly, I'll identify -- they are recommendations not clauses. The recommendations that is, I do think can proceed without any kind of revision or difficulty, that would be B, G, H, J, K, L and M. Those generally related to the modernization of the payment methods, modernization of how donations can be made to campaigns and the streamlining of audit requirements etc. Those are essentially housekeeping matters and I find...I think it would be very difficult for anybody to find flaw or fault with those. Now with regards to some of the specifics and a lot of these are related to the desire on the part of the administration to encourage voter awareness and participation.

Clause A: To allow student workers at the ages of 16 or 17 to act as election workers, I made the point at EPC; the proposal to move elections to weekends is designed to make it easier for adults to participate as volunteers. It doesn't make sense to me to start incorporating people under the voting age into the, as election workers, into that process, until it is proven that the shift to weekends does not fulfill that gap where you end up with I believe the report said there were about a hundred workers short last time. I don't quite see the sense in that, I think that would be premature.

Recommendation C: With regards to the changing of the Charter to allow for Council to set a date in October for the convening of future general elections on a Saturday or a Sunday. I made the point at EPC and I make it again, there is...I am disappointed that when this returned from the Governance Committee, there was no comment that I could see anywhere in the report with regards to the issues that are raised with members of the Jewish community that are observant who are prohibited from marking a ballot using a pen or a pencil on Saturdays. And towards the end of October the Jewish Sabbath would not end until around 6:00 p.m., those that might go to synagogue would then return, they would have perhaps have one hour to be able to attend a ballot box and there are individuals such as myself who prefer to vote really, as late as election day, see what comes up in the news, see what comes up in social media, see what comes up if council candidates come knocking at your door. And I don't think that it's a healthy idea to put Orthodox Jews in particular, into a position where they might feel compelled to have to attend in advance voting polls, etc. under this. Now I'm not saying that I recognize that Vancouver and other cities do it but Vancouver when it comes to a Jewish community, I can tell you, Vancouver isn't Winnipeg, which is tradition of being Jerusalem of the North and I would like to see some sensitivity on the part of Council with regards to that issue and I have asked around and I still can't find any particular religious observance that prohibits any group that I can find from voting on a Sunday; but this one, if it does go to a Saturday vote it does present some challenges in some wards and frankly it doesn't matter where a Jewish person lives, they still could be observant and would be prohibited from effectively from being able to exercise their franchise on Saturdays. The residency requirement is also something, in recommendation D, reducing it from six months to sixty days, it may sound good but I'm troubled by this because as far as my research has been able to determine, a person cannot move to Manitoba and get a health card or be eligible for public insurance until 90 days. I'm not sure it's a good idea for the City to give someone the right to vote before they have the rights that are established for those to become residents of the province. The aspect with regards to third party advertisements, very slippery slope for the proposal that advertisements, having to be required, considered part of a least one candidates campaign. There is a free speech aspect where people have a right to speak out, to suggest that they support Councillors who are in favour, maybe not by name but in favour of certain kinds of initiatives and as opposed to other kinds of initiatives. The most

divisive example I could give, would be the concept of so-called development at The Forks. And for some unknown third party, administration clerk whatever to decide well a group that advocates one kind of thing that's going to count against certain candidates expenses and it's going to count as an endorsement of other candidates, I'm not so...I'm not satisfied that that is a path that the City should be going down. Similarly, this proposal the province investigate the rules, you want to talk about a murky term, that's as murky as it gets. Investigate the rules on campaign advertising to not allow an individual to undertake an unusual amount of high profile advertising not related to their candidacy. If you have a candidate who is in the used car business or new car business, never mind used car business, there's going to be a lot of advertising with their name on it in September and October when the new cars come rolling off. Who's going to decide that, that's unusual, because it coincides with their run for Mayor, for Council? Similarly, there's the question of what does unusual mean? What does high profile mean? And Councillor Mayes, I see you are grinning. So you see, this is a field day for lawyers but not quite as simple for those who have the intention of running for public office. Recommendation I which recommends that the province be asked to approve \$250 deposit for candidates for Council and a \$1000 deposit; for candidates for Mayor. This is an amendment to the previous proposal that would have had Council set the amount. I believe it's an improvement. I think some, some of my listeners said this was kind of Council skirting, making the decision about deposit, by having the province enshrine it as opposed to a previous recommendation was for Council to set it. I think the amounts are suitable. I'm not quite sure about having the province make that decision as opposed to Council making it. But, I think that at least is an attempt to improve it.

Now, my concluding remarks. One of the purposes of my television show City Circus on Shaw TV is to help grow voter awareness and voter participation in this City. This is the purported purpose by many of the amendments that are before you members today. Again, I point out if you want people to start participating, the simplest way is to make some moves towards ensuring the replays of these proceedings and more video replays and audio replays of Council proceedings are made available to the public whether through a You-tube channel or through for instance the Shaw or MTV video on demand, etc. There is no way for anybody who's not watching us right now that I know of to be actually access this video. It is certainly not easy to find and it is something that you need to address. If you seriously want people to start voting, you have to engage them before the election process. That is one way to do it. Lastly, there are some gaps in the information or in the recommendations that have come forward, I spoke of these at EPC and I'm again going to point them out. There's no reference to referendums- referenda. Can you make it easier? Is there a way to promote the public getting involved by bringing forward referendums on money bills or something? This should be addressed. If you want to look at how to get people engaged, nothing gets them more engaged, than the sense that they have a say in something and since referendums are allowed under the present Act as I understand it, but not very easily understood or accessible by the general public; there should be a move in that direction. There's no mention of recall legislation. And the administration might be well intentioned but it's like they want the election changes to cut one way. It has to cut both ways. If there was a proposal on the next ballot should there be recall legislation, or whatever the proposal would be, say 60% registration, voters registration signing such a proposal as they have in B.C.? You get a lot of people coming out to vote in the next election. Item last, there's no public consultation on this matter. I would have hoped that that would have been addressed, it's the second time I've raised it. It's the biggest issue facing you all and many aspects and many bills, motions that come before this committee as a whole and there should be public consultation on any changes to Winnipeg election processes rather than relying on the public consultation to take place at the provincial level and I can tell you people going to Committees at the legislature is not very effective. I think it's more effective for you as individual Councillors, Community Committees whatever, to get some feedback from the public on what changes they would like to see in elections, what would make them and their families more likely to come out and vote and participate in the demographic process. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Gold. As Chairman of the Governess Committee, we appreciate your input. Any questions, comments? Seeing none we will excuse you from the dias today.

Marty Gold: Thank you very much. Thank you very much Councillors.

Mr. Speaker: That completes our delegations for today and we will move into our Committee Reports starting with Executive Policy Committee Report of May the 9th. Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 9, 2012**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda item 1.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Report of May 16th, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 16, 2012**

Mayor Katz: I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. The report of May 25th, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 25, 2012**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: 1.

Mr. Speaker: Same, Councillor Smith? We'll stand down number 1. All those in favour of 2 and 3? Opposed? Carried.

Item 1 - Sponsorship Agreements - Exclusive Rights for Commercial Transactions in Streets and other Public Places - Delegated Authority to Chief Administrative Officer

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'd love to hear from the Councillor and any other Councillors and of course I will try and address any issues or concerns or any questions.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The sponsorship policy first came to Council in November of 2007 and at the time I did not support it at that time. A few other Councillors as well did not. Some of the Councillors that are here today were not on Council at the time, so it's a policy that there's several new Councillors that haven't had a chance to weigh in on this policy. And I agree that some degree of sponsorship and having a policy is reasonable, but this particular policy is very far reaching and I would argue it's too far reaching. I believe we have a duty to protect the image of our city and avoid over commercialization of public spaces and one of the main concerns I had at the time about the policy being brought forward was the delegation of authority to the CAO. While naming rights still require council approval the policy goes far beyond naming rights. Council approval is not required for sponsorships that could apply to all city programs, including equipment, services, projects, facilities, parks, park facilities, events and activities. We're not only talking about building names but green spaces. Places of quiet contemplation which should not be subject to visual commercial pollution. And putting business activity in a public park may change the whole experience of enjoying the beauty of the nature there in that park. The policy at the time in 2007 delegated the authority to the CAO for...for everything, except naming rights but what is in front of us today is some by-law amendments for our parks and streets by-law that essentially confirm the policy of 2007 and allow the delegated authority to proceed that was intended I suppose. But I opposed the 2007 policy then, for the same reasons I do today and today we are formalizing it and taking it to the next level where it will be virtually impossible to turn back and I think there's Councillors that didn't get a chance to vote on it, who are here now. There's Councillors who may want to rethink this as they are looking at it today. Once businesses have contracts and the right to use public space, it is very hard to reverse that and the policy is very clear that Council will not have a say over these kinds of sponsorship choices related to programming, green space as I've mentioned. And I'm very concerned about the accountability with this kind of policy. If a sponsorship agreement turns out to be a mistake, all Councillors can do is throw their hands in the air and deflect the blame back to City staff and that's not really going to serve the public very well. And as elected officials we will certainly be blamed if these sponsorship choices turn out to be flawed. You know, as local Councillors, I think we're all connected to the parks in our area. The local facilities in our area, and we're going to wake -- I don't know what I'm going to wake up to in the morning if I'm going to read in the paper that you know, Crescent Drive Park has a Pepsi machine in it. I just don't want that to happen, and without any checks and balances with checking back with the area Councillors or with Council, it just seems like it's really going too far. I also believe that this policy needs to be clearer, the policy around it that was established at the time, needs to have more safe guards to inspire confidence in the process. One example is that the policy isn't clear about avoiding product sponsorships that promote unhealthy lifestyles, such as fast food, or sugar laden drinks or even alcohol. It talks about underaged alcohol but it still could be promoting alcohol. It's a relief to know that illegal activities won't be condoned but, I don't think that's enough of a safe guard. And what if we are seen to be

promoting unhealthy lifestyle choices? Council should keep in mind that the world is changing. For example, some school divisions no longer allow junk food or soft drink machines in their schools and the cafeterias. Do we want soft drinks promoted by our parks and playgrounds? And I mention this because in 2007, when this policy was brought forward, Calgary was touted as an example of how great it was that they had Pepsi Cola give them a \$2 million sponsorship in their city. You know, and I think that could be denigrating to our city to have some permanently emblazoned junk food or unhealthy lifestyle thing emblazoned on our public assets and green spaces. We may need the new revenue, I understand what's driving this but there needs to be more safe guards in place. And the by-law amendments today are being explained away as housekeeping and I understand the process that is changing the bylaws to enact what was approved in 2007. I understand that now, although it took a little while to figure it out because it happened on Friday and it's Wednesday and we didn't have a council discussion about this. We didn't have a chance for Councillors to weigh in whether they're comfortable with the reality of this, and now that it's being finalized. And I guess housekeeping is one way to look at it. Another way to look at it is that this is an opportunity for us to not delegate away this authority and to keep a little more oversight over these things and I hope that Council will seriously consider that. I mean, we could defeat this, or if somebody wants to refer it back or something, but I think Council as a whole is not going to be comfortable with delegating this level of authority and I hope we will reconsider it very seriously today. And I think that I would like to look at this as an opportunity today to do that now that this had to come back for those by-law amendments. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith. If you with like to stay in your chair you are fine.

Councillor Smith: No, it's okay. You know, I could be supportive of this if it was not quite so sweeping. You know, the ...I don't mind the CAO having...making decisions on the sidewalks and...but I'm concerned with the fact that it says "or any other public spaces". You know, it doesn't mention parks here, doesn't mention them at all. So, I think we should not support this. No one can tell me why we should change this for all other public spaces including parks. I think we... I mean, tell me one reason why? What we have been offered with parks that we want the CAO to be the deciding factor and I mean it just makes common sense it shouldn't be so sweeping. So I suggest that we should not support this clause.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Havixbeck: I'd just like to make a few comments as Chair of the Sponsorship Program for the City of Winnipeg. First off, this is been a very successful program for our city and this motion here today or this piece that's already been approved by EPC is the next step in towards providing what was adopted November 21st, 2007, Council Minutes. This was supported by Mayor Katz, Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Leipsic, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt and Lazarenko, and rejected by Councillor Smith, Gerbasi, Thomas and Vandal. I'd just like to reiterate because there seems to be a lot of misinformation about this. There are restrictions that were right in this policy that was adopted by Council in 2007. And I'll just read it to you. "The City reserves the right to restrict sponsorships to certain services and to exclude products and industries which are not...which are inconsistent with the principles outlined in this policy. In general, the following will not be considered for the City of Winnipeg Sponsorship Policy: companies that promote the use of tobacco and weapons or the sale of alcohol to under aged youth. Sponsorship or marketing concepts of stereotype or otherwise denigrate individuals or groups. Sponsorship or marketing concepts that unnecessarily promote the commercialization of public space and parties involved in a lawsuit or otherwise debarred from doing business". So I think Council has already said that there is a mechanism in place to restrict having a cigarette machine, for example, in a public space. So I think to use that argument just for the sake of having an argument is really inadequate. I just want to also bring your attention towards a couple of programs that wouldn't exist were it not for our Corporate Sponsorship. And it's important to also note that this project was started back by former...the late Councillor Brenda Leipsic who did a lot of work on this and we're now seeing some of the benefits of those initial contacts because it is such a long lead time. Southdale Community Centre for example, received \$300,000 over this past year. So, we've had numerous announcements there. It completely revamped the community centre rebuilt they have ice rinks and a pleasure ice rink. That wouldn't have existed. We also have programs such as North Centennial Centre where a program can be open after school and a facility available for kids; who might not have a parent to go home to. So I think it's provided a lot of good things for our city. This is not something outlandish. It's nothing that can't be changed. We make changes to the levels of authority that the CAO, the CFO, other leaders in the public administration have, so if we begin to see some sort of a problem, this is no different than what we have in the past and bring it back here to have a hard look at it. And whether it's this CAO or another CAO, she or he would have that authority to continue to move forward to negotiate all the many public spaces that we have and that are growing every day with rapid transit and other areas. So, I'll leave it at that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Definitely no to this particular report but also, I probably would have voted against it in 2007 one as well. For what really amounts to what I believe is a political decision. This kind of thing is political and I don't know why it doesn't have to come through a political process in order to do it. I understand the naming does go through a political process to a certain extent and you know, I agree, actually, it's important to allow you know, for contributions to go towards things like fixing community centres and you know, in my ward, Vince Lee Community Centre has received donations from many people in order to improve things in their community centre that never required this particular piece of...this by-law changes and reports to exist. So, for me, I don't understand why that it's so important as it relates to community centres. It's okay to have sponsorship and that sort of stuff, but anyway, I believe that this is really, what amounts to a political decision and because it can be controversial, yes, they probably have some sort of system where if you're doing some kind of commercial enterprise on the streets, that there is some way of ensuring that there's a competitive means to go about doing it. But you know, this was very far reaching. I'm reading in here that it says streets. Well, what streets? Does this mean that we can have exclusive rights for selling? I know I didn't answer this question but exclusive rights to sell ice cream on the streets? That kind of stuff; advertising and so on; and commercial operations. So, for me, I believe what this really is, a political kind of decisions that needs to be made and I wouldn't have been in support in 2007 in this endeavour and I'm not in support of it now so therefore, I'm not going to vote for by-law changes that allows the continuance of what was voted on by Council in 2007. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important to remember here, what, what we're actually looking at here. It's not the whole concept of sponsorship; it's not a review of what we've done to date, it's just the issue of, do we need to authorize some more delegated powers and I do have some concerns with that. I don't...I think a number of the Sponsorship Agreements we have are certainly suitable. I think the one that Metro has with us certainly would have breezed through here had it come to Council for a vote but there are certainly some issues that I think Council should take a look at. Recently at St. Vital Park, we had an open house on 3 potential conceptual designs for a new skate pavilion by the duck pond and it was interesting that a number of people said to me well, we need to get some sort of coffee shop in here and an equal number of people said whatever you do don't put in any sort of coffee shop in here and one great thing about this park is it's not commercialized at all. So I think that's a tension that's a debate within the community that we need to respect and need to look at and not simply say well we'll delegate those sorts of pretty important decisions to the CAO. We frankly are probably spending more time debating this than we would ever spend debating some of the actual sponsorship agreements that might come forward; we're we not, to delegate this power. And I also take Councillor Gerbasi's point which is...well, when I was a School Trustee I was one of the leaders in our division in looking at trying to band junk food and junk food sponsorships out of the schools. Of course, one man's junk food is another man's healthy snack, so there was considerable debate. I remember calling another School Trustee, a John Orlikow in Winnipeg, to get some advice on what he had done with the City of Winnipeg and the Winnipeg School Division. So these things are...these debates are happening in our schools and different School Divisions and I think that's the kind of issue that should come back to Council for its approval rather than simply being delegated. Certainly none of this has to do with whoever the current occupant is as CAO. It's not an individual decision; to me it's the issue of why should we delegate this? I don't think is there a huge time saving or convenience to delegating it. I think these are the sorts of decisions that should properly be considered by Council as a whole. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Clearly there's some great benefits to be had here at the City of Winnipeg with Sponsorship Winnipeg. I know that in the inner-city, the Sponsorship Winnipeg is doing a great job with providing some recreational opportunities for our youth in the north-end and the inner-city. However, Mr. Speaker, although there has been some good work with respect to this particular report, going through some of the specifics of it, I'm finding that is there's a bit of a lack of specificity with respect to what is the finest commercial transactions for me, anyways Mr. Speaker. I'm just going to look up the history here and the history says, certain by-laws restrict the issuance of a permit giving a person the exclusive rights to use all or part of a street for the purpose of engaging in commercial transactions, therefore, Council approval for the above mentioned delegation is being requested for future sponsorships and the report also details Mr. Speaker, that these commercial transactions could look, could be newspaper and vending devices, which is fine for me. However, if you look at the actual by-law, it says here Parks By-law, the Parks By-law Number 85 of 2009 as amended by renumbering section 30 as subsection 30 of one and adding the following after it, section 30.2, in addition to his or her authority under subsection 7.1 to authorize a person to use a park as a place of business or to carry on commercial activities within a park, the CAO is authorized to utilize his or her delegated authority to approve sponsorship agreements which allow for exclusive rights within parks for the purposes of engaging commercial transactions. Again, I'm unclear, Mr. Speaker, of what exactly the commercial transactions are, although it does reference vending machines and vending devices, I'm okay with that and like I say, there's some benefit to be made from that. But however, what does it mean? Is it something, more comprehensive than that? This report I think needs to reference back to a source document to a list, and that would be akin to what we do in our Zoning By-law

when we rezone a property; it says there specifically what the uses are limited to. I would like it see something like that with this specific document because for me it's a little bit unclear. And if it was clearer Mr. Speaker, for sure, I would be supporting this as I did approve -- or I did support the Sponsorship of the Winnipeg clause, when it didn't come before Council in the past. So, I just wanted to draw that to everyone's attention and perhaps the Mayor and others can clarify that but I think it does need a little bit more work to reference back some specifics for me to find some comfort in supporting this particular report, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I just wanted to echo Councillor Havixbeck, that yeah, this program has been successful. Maybe not as successful as some people would like it to be but things take a little time to get moving and there's been some good work done. So, the program has been a success. So, the question is: why are we changing it today? It's been successful. If the political oversight hasn't been so cumbersome that it has quashed programs, if the political oversight that provides the transparency that I think is very good, hasn't actually made it so this program is not successful, then I maybe see a reason why we need to go back and do this. However, as we stated the program is successful, so what is the problem with having City Council have a check at it before it goes through? I personally don't see a big problem and I don't think the administration see a big problem with that too, because we're there to help and make sure that some of those political issues they may be unaware of we're able to be address. It might be something as simple as we may all think of a coffee shop in a community centre. I personally would never have any idea that that's going to be a problem. Why not? Who doesn't want coffee on a cold night? However, I'm not a part of that community, I don't know. So, in my good will I move forward on that idea. However, with the political oversight or at least in transparency there, Councillors could go hey, wait a second, you didn't know this. Let me tell you what's going on. Again, that's the purpose is of going through Council. I think it's a good idea. What about that person who has a beautiful garden somewhere and now all of a sudden shows up in the morning and sees it's called, John Orlikow Garden -- it's a John Orlikow Garden, well you know what, their mother was instrumental 20, 50 years ago building this garden but I slapped down some cash and now I have got my garden. Well you know what, that may be something because it's a public space where Council should have vetted that or maybe at least given the public the opportunity to know that it's coming rather than showing up in the morning because it is a public process. So when these have to come through us, at least the public has an opportunity to see it. And nothing pisses people off more when they show up at something when they had no chance of knowing about it. What the CAO release something? Maybe, maybe not but again coming through Council allows the public on again, transparency. So again in our Sponsorship Policy, we even state under the principles of transparency, integrity, business case and effectiveness. That's in our policy. So again, why are we going to try to minimize that transparency? Even in the effectiveness bullet, sponsorship opportunities must be shown to be in accord with the public interest, very vague, that again, public interest is -- I know we don't like that word sometimes but it is a political thing. What is a public interest? That is shifting and moving. Depends on the community. Again, I believe Council is the only group that knows what the public interest is. That's our job to represent that public interest. To have measurable outcomes, while I'm assuming there have been some. I've never seen a report but I'm sure if I asked for one I would have seen it and to promote transparency and integrity of the process. Does removing this layer out of the system improve transparency and integrity of the process? I can't see how. So again I state there hasn't been a problem to date. I believe that existing policy that was done in 2007, maybe was a little too far further extending. I believe that we should go back and review that policy to actually make it so it is in accord with integrity and transparency by having a little bit of a check and again, it's just a check as it comes through for some of the larger projects like naming parks. What about putting logos on police cars? Says we can do it in the policy. Maybe we'll have Domino's putting Domino's logos on our police cars. Is that something that Council thinks is a good idea? I personally don't. In that case you're right...but again, maybe some other, that's actually pretty good. Is that 30 minutes, again, maybe a 30 minutes so and that ain't so good, you know, so again, the question is do we want to do that? Again, maybe Council is fine with having Domino's in two minutes or 30 minutes on it, but Council should be making those types of decisions. So again, it's a healthy administration is out, so they don't inadvertently do something that maybe that isn't in the public interest because I know what they are doing is in the best interests that they believe but again, we are the final arbitrators in the end especially around things like public domain. So, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? If not, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: It be my pleasure Mr. Speaker. Reminds me why I love these Council Meetings so much. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the facts. I was very much a part of this process when it all began because as you know, the City of Winnipeg was challenged. We had a lot of facilities that needed help whether it was programming in community centres all across the city or whether it was basically building, etc. This program to date, under the leadership of Brenda Leipsic, may she rest in peace, and Paula Havixbeck, has been extremely successful. That's number 1. Extremely successful. Number 2, it's been around for 4 ½ years Mr. Speaker, and in all the comments I heard, not one criticism of any one existing sponsor. Councillor Smith in his ward from Zellers, hundreds of thousands of dollars for programming for kids; so they have a place to come after school and on weekends, a positive thing. Mike Pagtakhan experienced something

with B.F.I.. Go through the whole city - Paula Havixbeck mentioned some other community centres. This has been phenomenally good. So let's try to address some of the issues that were brought up here, Mr. Speaker. Okay, over commercialization. In 4 ½ years did you hear one example of that? No. Okay. Number 2, what happens when you are committed how do you get out of it? Mr. Speaker, all these deals are over periods of time. Either a 2 year deal; 3 year deal and if, if, which has never happened to date, a mistake has been made, the period does come to an end. It doesn't go on forever, Mr. Speaker. I remember when we first talked about doing this, Councillor Smith said Burger King City Hall do you remember that, Councillor Smith? It didn't happen, did it, Mr. Speaker, but they talked about it, okay. Let me ask you a question, Mr. Speaker and here I think the problem is and I think I can address two legitimate concerns that were brought up, one by Councillor Pagtakhan. Because of the way sometimes things are written; they are not as clear as they should be. I can assure Councillor Pagtakhan there is nothing here that refers to commercialization in parks; doesn't happen. What could happen in a park or quite often, maybe we don't have enough recycle bins or garbage bins. Yeah, you might have Great West Life say I want to put in 50 of these; we want our name on it. I think we would all support that. That's a positive thing. We're not talking about commercialization in parks period. Period. End of story. Number 2, Councillor Orlikow brought up, which I happen to think it's a nice name, John Orlikow Gardens. You can't name anything, Mr. Speaker, can't do that in this. It has to come to Council when you're naming anything. That's just the way it is and if people really read through this, they would understand it. But you know, Mr. Speaker, we can look and the other comment that was made is why change it; it's okay; there's no problems. There is a problem Mr. Speaker. Sometimes there's a problem with timing, you know, sometimes you miss a Council Meeting; you've got to wait a period of time. Just recently, Mr. Speaker, we did two deals with two of our local papers, the Winnipeg Sun and Metro. There was a timing issue and the reason this came up is quite clearly it's because we had nothing that addressed our overhead walkways. It was in a category that no one ever understood and we now have a situation where Metro News has exclusivity in some of our walkways and they paid handsomely for that, period and that's why this whole thing was initiated; it was never covered before Mr. Speaker, and it's also called a public right-of-way, an overhead walkway. That's what started this whole thing. Mr. Speaker it's been working, it's been successful, it's having phenomenal positive results throughout the entire city. Millions of dollars have been raised for the libraries; for community centres. It's a positive thing and we're just getting going. So you know what? Let's keep it going but let's also be very clear and I concur with Councillor Pagtakhan. Commercialization of parks doesn't exist. It doesn't exist. It's not part of this in any way, shape or form. Naming rights has to come to the City of Winnipeg. If everyone knows that and understands that; there should be no problem with this whatsoever Mr. Speaker, and I can also assure you, do not think for a moment, the administration does reports. I mean, is there anybody here who doesn't have faith in our administration? We've all said we want their wisdom, we want their experience, they write reports. It goes to the CAO. The CAO can be contacted by any Councillor here, I can assure you common sense they would communicate with the local Councillor, they would communicate with the Chair which right now is Councillor Havixbeck, if it changes, whoever the case maybe. This is not something happening in some locked door without transparency. We have more transparency than anybody ever has had ever, provincial, federally, transparency and openness happens right here and it will continue. This is a very good thing, Mr. Speaker. Why don't you talk to some of the kids who are benefiting from these programs? Why don't you talk to some of the community centres, who could never have accomplished their goals without some of these corporate sponsorships, Mr. Speaker. It's a wonderful thing. I wish we had done it 30 years ago. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes Sir.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Because the Mayor in his closing referenced my comments here, I just wanted to ask the Mayor, I was persuaded by the Mayor and you know, if he is willing to...I agree with him with the idea that, if it's truly that parks is not part of this, in terms of the commercialization that we strike out the Parks By-law as part of the By-law that's written as part of this report.

Mayor Katz: Absolutely Mr. Speaker, I'd be more than happy to do that, because I meant exactly what I said Councillor Pagtakhan. Absolutely.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan, would you like to move an amendment to this document.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes. Mr. Speaker, then basically, that the, I'm okay with the Streets By-law, I would just say that, we strike out the Parks By-law and the By-law Schedule A, and....

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 30, 2012

Motion No. 5

Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz,

THAT Recommendation 3 of Item 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated May 25, 2012 below:

3. That an amending by-law (Schedule A) be enacted that will implement Recommendations 1 and 2.

be deleted and replaced with the following:

3. That an amending by-law (Schedule A) be enacted that will implement Recommendation 1.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order. Councillor Wyatt says we need a seconder. Your point of order is?

Councillor Gerbasi: I wonder if we could refer this back and do this properly? Rather than, you know, there may be other issues we want to look at here. I mean, just to sort of, pulling out one piece of the report like this, I've never seen this process done this way. I'm just wondering...

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. I'll look for a seconder. The Mayor seconds it.

Councillor Gerbasi: I can't move referral because I've already spoken to. I'm not sure what we're voting on here.

Mr. Speaker: We've already spoken it, can't be referred at this point, now...

Mayor Katz: If I may, number 1, quite often we make friendly amendments and other amendments. All this would do is basically be deleting the reference to parks. This isn't that complicated. It's quite simple. There is an issue where some Councillors had a concern. I appreciate that concern. Let's delete it, so everybody knows it doesn't exist, and then move on and have a vote and whatever Council decides, Council decides.

Councillor Wyatt: May I suggest a process, if the will of the Mayor is that first it should be a motion to suspend the rules. Suspend the rules to allow Councillor Pagtakhan or anybody else to move a motion to delete, seconded, in writing, to entertain that and then we vote on that amendment and then we vote on the clause. First motion, to suspend the rules.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate your direction. I will ask for a motion to suspend the rules. Councillor Swandel seconded by Councillor Orlikow. All those in favour of suspending the rules so that we can deal with the parks motion. All those in Favour? Opposed? Motion carried. We've suspended the rules. Now, Councillor Pagtakhan you are going to move deletion.

Councillor Pagtakhan: That we delete Parks By-law number 2 section, as part of the Schedule A Amendment; Schedule A By-law.

Mr. Speaker: Seconded by his Worship, the Mayor. Discussion. Discussion. Seeing no hands I'll call the motion. All those in favour of suspending the parks portion of this, amending, I'm sorry... All those in favour? Opposed? All in favour of the item as amended? Against? Okay. Councillor Eadie is against. Motion carried.

So at this point we have dealt with Item 1 of the May 25th EPC report. We are moving onto notices of motion. Councillor Swandel.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS
VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Moved by Councillor Swandel,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS Council has included a 2016 completion for the Southwest Transitway in the Transportation Master Plan;

AND WHEREAS the current estimated cost is \$300 million dollars;

AND WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba have initiated an additional \$35 Vehicle Registration charge from \$119 to \$154;

AND WHEREAS the Province is expecting an additional \$17 million dollars in prorated revenue for 2012/2013 budget year related to this increase;

AND WHEREAS a full year should create approximately \$20 million of new revenue just in the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the City had previously identified this as a possible funding source to deal with the municipal infrastructure deficit including Rapid Transit;

AND WHEREAS the Premier has publicly stated that he supports doing the next phase of Rapid Transit and that his government is a champion of Rapid Transit;

AND WHEREAS the Premier will not allow the City to realize the full value of a transit fare increase to help fund Rapid Transit expansion;

AND WHEREAS the Province has short term deficit issues to address;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City request of the Province that funds raised by the new Vehicle Registration charge be unconditionally dedicated to sustainable municipal infrastructure including Rapid Transit and allocated to municipalities;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg allocation be dedicated as a cash flow to fund debt required to build the 2nd phase of the Southwest Transitway;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT said funds not flow until January 1st, 2016 in order to assist the Province in dealing with its short term deficit.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, this is pretty straightforward. I know we've got the other motion or the other notice of motion today. This is basically just asking – the City request of the province that funds raised through the vehicle registration charge be unconditionally dedicated to sustainable municipal infrastructure and including rapid transit and allocated to municipalities. There's also a clause in here that suggests if not happen to 2016; which would enable the provincial government to utilized those funds for immediate challenges that they have around finances and running a deficit. I want to remind everybody that there's only one taxpayer here and I think in asking my question to the AMM representative this morning, I made reference to the elimination of the G.S.T. which took about \$250 to \$270 million dollars out of play for the City of Winnipeg or in the City of Winnipeg from that one taxpayer. And so we've got a number of things here this morning. You've got the gas tax issue; you've got this vehicle registration. We know we heard some conversation about the 1 percent and at the end of the day, I think it's important just to keep these things moving forward. I don't know that we'll get anywhere with the province. They've been pretty adamant about not wanting to get into these major increases and to let municipalities have some control over some of these types of funds, to better direct them at the priorities that we identify. So I'm probably speaking here about both notices of motion and both motions but I think it's important that we keep this conversation alive. And I encourage everybody to read the clause that the City requested the province that funds raised by the new registration charge be unconditionally dedicated. It's not an unreasonable request, when you look at it potentially raising \$20 million. \$20 million would serve a significant amount of the cost of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. You know, if your using 70,000 or a million, as an amount, I think 21 million would service about \$300 million, which is somewhere in the range of what we think that next leg would cost. So to have a dedicated piece for that would certainly help us to get this Rapid Transit stuff moving along further. The timing is great, you know, yesterday we just announced the commuter challenge that's coming forward next week and everyone is encouraged to get out there and look for an alternate means of transportation to get to work besides our cars and single occupancy vehicles in many cases. So, to be able to enhance our transit system, speakers yesterday at the launch, spoke about you know, the work we've done on active transportation, the work we're doing on Transit, not just on the Rapid Transit corridors but also other improvements and convenience and comfort, in our Transit System, that are bringing more people to the transit system and if we can start growing the capacity and building some more of these pieces of that system, if we've got a dedicated piece of funding to do the entire next leg of the southwest corridor coming from this new revenue source, that might enable us actually to move and start working on our next priority on the rapid transit. I not going to speak to the second motion because I think the rationale is basically -- it's all encompassing on what we're doing here and so with the closing piece is; we don't need to think of this as one-third, one-third, one-third. There is only one taxpayer. If this is dedicated revenue and it's really coming from that one taxpayer whether it's generated by a piece of legislation from the province or a piece of legislation from the city or a piece of legislation from

the federal government. It's our collective responsibility to look after the needs of the citizens and one of the highest priorities of our citizens right now is infrastructure. We need to find ways to get it done. We need to keep this conversation front and centre in the public. This is just one more way to do that and hopefully we'll find some success with some of these motions and some of the conversations that we're bringing to the province. We know they have some financial challenges. This recognizes that and gives them the opportunity to take some of this money for their immediate needs. They believe I think it was 2014 that they can resolve their deficit issue by. This is not asking for money until 2016 which is only aligning where we might need to spend money on the rapid transit corridor. So hopefully we get unanimous support on both of these motions. And anything to do with...these are our requests, we're trying to keep the conversation alive, we're trying to keep it front and centre, in the minds of our citizens. And hopefully the citizens will pick up the cry as well and let the other levels of government know that these are important issues to them. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie. Please proceed.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. I am a little confused. He was mentioning other motions but I understand we're debating a motion here about register...motor vehicle registration fees. So that's the motion I believe I'm speaking to. And, I have to say though, while I recognize that there is only one taxpayer, we all pay taxes and we pay at the different levels of government and we pay it related to different things. We pay a retail sales tax based on purchasing of consumer goods and related...and services, so to speak and I know that some services and products are excluded from provincial sales tax and so on. But, ultimately though, usually when a tax is charged it's usually for a specific reasoning behind it. You match...it's always good to match a tax related to directly to what those, what it's related to, for example, a car registration is related to putting a motor vehicle on a street or on a highway and that has been the concept actually, that the province utilized back when Gary Doer was the Premier and they expanded the amount of grants that they were giving to the city and to the province to improve highways. I think that was about 6 or 7 years ago. Part of that plan was they actually... that's when they started raising registration fees for motor vehicles, so that because there was this direct relationship with more motor vehicles on the road, more wear and tear and so on. And so, while I really appreciate the person moving this motion's sentiment in terms of trying to find new revenue, I really don't believe that I'm going to support this particular resolution. There was some time lines and I'm a little confused. He mentioned removing the 2016. I don't know what we're talking about there. But anyway for me, I need to know that I can record where the revenue's coming from? What are we producing? What is the problem that we're trying to solve with that tax because taxes are directly, should be directly related to the things we're trying it pay for and so I won't be supporting this and I'll speak to the motion moved by the Mayor which I think is a very good motion but that being said, I won't be supporting this motion about registration fees at this point. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: This is an interesting motion. I think there's some things about it, I really like. First of all, we know the need is there, we have the other motion coming forward and we talked about the need in these chambers for about ten years now and the need just gets growing and growing and that's really the monster we're facing is that unless we get a better deal from other levels of government, the need's going to just grow and grow and we're going to go deeper and deeper into the hole. I like the fact that it acknowledges that the province does have some financial challenges and I think that's probably a unique perspective because often when we go to...I almost said Ottawa but when we go to Broadway, we're asking and often times we're not cognizant of their financial challenges. And we know that they're significant and they're serious and we're one of many responsibilities. And I hate to say that because we should be our own autonomous government but the province has their own challenges including relationships with the City of Winnipeg. I'm a little confused. The first therefore be it resolved says it be unconditional. "Therefore, be it resolved the City requests the province that funds raised by the new vehicle registration charge be unconditional". The second one is that - The City of Winnipeg therefore be it resolved that the City of Winnipeg allocation be dedicated as a cash flow. The first one's unconditional; the second one is dedicated; perhaps it's only one or two years that it's dedicated to rapid transit and then it be unconditional for other infrastructure; we'll ask Councillor Swandel to clarify as we move forward. I think this is a; it's an interesting motion. I'm likely to support it but what I don't want to be interpreted by my support is that; I think we can start on rapid transit before 2016. I know that having spoken to some of the folks over on Broadway and in the paper today actually it mentioned that Premier Selinger would like to negotiate an infrastructure program with the federal government and I'm assuming the City of Winnipeg earlier than that. And I know that in previous conversations with the other governments, they've mentioned let's either do it the traditional way; through an infrastructure program or let's do it through tax increment financing. And I know in conversations with Broadway that they both said we can do this before 2016. So even though I like this motion, I'm going to support it, I don't want my support to be interpreted that you've made a decision already that we're not doing this until 2016 on rapid transit. I think that this is one of many motions that we've likely approved that will be...go into the bailiwick of intergovernmental negotiations and I'm not sure what's going to come out here. So I'm going to support this, but I think we can actually start on rapid transit before 2016, if the will is there. And in fact, I hope we do. It's in the Transportation Master Plan. I

think at this point it's going to be unlikely to be completed by 2016 unless we start next month which we are not going to, but I hope that we can actually get this done before 2016 and when I say that, I mean an agreement between all levels of government to move forward on it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A number of good comments made by various speakers. I would agree with aspects of what Councillor Eadie said, that I think it's good that Councillor Swandel is bringing this forward to talk about rapid transit, to talk about getting some infrastructure needs addressed. However, I do have, I do see this motion quite differently than the motion that will be coming to next, the Mayor's motion on the gas tax. And therefore, would not support this motion as previously mentioned. There are provisions here about not getting going until 2016; there are provisions here that talk about the transit fee increase that we rejected last year and their provisions. The subject matter, the vehicle registration fee doesn't seem to me to be directly linked to what we're dealing with in terms of rapid transit or infrastructure expansion. I think the gas tax is a much clearer, straighter line and is a place where we should start the dialogue with the province. So I appreciate what other speakers have said and I think it's good that we're starting to have this debate about financing and taxation with the province. I'll have more to say when we come to the gas tax motion and I hope we all support the gas tax motion. However, with respect, I don't believe I can support this motion for the reasons I've indicated. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Mayes. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate what the intent of the motion...I'm not even sure yet how I'm going to vote on it at this point. But I wanted to make a few comments about this whole subject we're dealing with. First of all it's great to see, it's great to see Councillor Swandel bringing forward the idea of using taxation-related to motor vehicles including the gas tax, the other motion and motor vehicle registration, because...and maybe I'm reacting a bit to Councillor Eadie's comments that, it actually does make sense to use automobile-related fees to fund rapid transit. And maybe this is a concept that's a little bit new for Winnipeg but this is something that is being done everywhere. In Vancouver their gas tax is, their transit tax, is dedicated from gas tax. Many provinces that are building significant rapid transit investments across the country are using...some of them are using 100 percent, some of them are using 50 percent of the gas tax they receive. So clearly, gas tax makes total sense to use for rapid transit and I think by extension, vehicle tax and other things related to cars in other cities do do that. Because the thing is, building a transit system and transit ridership benefits car drivers. It benefits all of us because it reduces the congestion on the road. Every bus full of 60 passengers takes 60 cars off the road. That is benefitting all citizens and that's the thinking we need to move towards. So I really do appreciate the intent of the motion. I don't like a bit of the tone of the motion, you know, it talks about the Premier not supporting the transit fare increase and stuff like that. I don't think that's necessary to take shots at the person we are asking something from. I think we would be better off taking a tone that's positive, that's working in partnership, that's making the case for why we need this rather than it is politically kind of taking a shot at a previous issue. And I guess that speaks to our whole approach here. What we're doing today, we have two different motions asking for additional funding for the province. We all know we need additional funding and I don't fault the idea of doing that. I guess there's nothing else, people feel we can do right now, but do that, but we're getting a consistently...not a very positive response. And I guess I'm saying maybe we need to look at a broader approach of intergovernmental relations than we've been having, than, you know, winging sometimes snarky worded motions, snarky press releases; kind of criticizing the government on everything they are doing. That doesn't seem to get us anywhere and I can understand why. If you're on the receiving end of continuous attacks on what they are giving us and lack of appreciation of the positive things they do give us, you have to admit that the...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, I'd ask you to get back to the essence of the motion.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm talking about asking the province for money so I think I'm right on topic. I'm right on topic, Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Swandel: Point of order Mr. Speaker. I think if you review of the Procedures By-law those type of characterizations are not appropriate for this chamber. That's why I tried to get your attention. I don't have a problem with the Councillor having a conversation about trying to get money but to make characterizations that are demeaning is certainly against our Procedures By-law.

Mr. Speaker: Point taken thank you. Back to the money.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, I'll right then. I'll try to, I'm not sure I understand what the criticism is, but I'll try to stick within whatever the rules are here. I guess I'm just trying to say that we should be taking a more positive and constructive tone in our intergovernmental relationships. That's really all I'm trying to say. I was trying to give some

meaning to that statement by giving some examples. But if that's not allowed, that's fine. I think people can read the motions for themselves. They can read the newspaper for themselves and see the comments but I think you know, we need to have a more focused effort. I mean, we have...it just doesn't come across well to...our efforts I think are dampened by the approach we've been taking and I think these motions are a good effort, there a good start but we should be taking this to a higher level than just winging motions every meeting, asking, and asking and asking. We need to go over to Broadway with a contingent of people and sit down and seriously talk and until you build an atmosphere of trust where you're not going to get attacked every day in the paper on what you're not doing and I also think that for example, during the budget, I didn't hear a thank you for any of the money we do get from the province, not one, it was just negative. We don't get ...excuse me, Mr. Speaker, can we have order here.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, order.

Councillor Gerbasi: The reason I mention that press release was the only thing it mentioned was that we didn't get this one thing we wanted on infrastructure, well we've gotten 50/50 funding on public transit; we got a lot of things that we didn't have in the past, and I'm not saying it's enough, I'm not saying we don't want more, but I think we have to have a more respectful tone and that was the point I was trying to make. In terms of the transit, I'm also...when I first saw this motion I was a little concerned about the date being so specific that the money doesn't flow until 2016. I agree with Councillor Vandal that there is a lot of political will to move faster on the second phase of the rapid transit corridor especially now that the first one's built and operational, you know people are like, that's great, you go flying along and then get back on the road and it's frustrating it's only 3.7 kilometres so, what I would like to see is...I was also going to mention I think the province has been clear that they see this as a priority too. They made that statement but we don't seem to be getting to the point of moving faster on that and I would not want is support of this motion again to be interpreted as we're not going to start until well after 2016 because I think that's too far. I think, you know, we've seen that when the political will is there; not just from other levels of government but from us, things can get done really, really fast. The Plessis underpass happened in a bolt of lightning, it happened so quickly. So, if we really want this to happen, it can happen before 2016. So I'm a little concerned about the wording of the motion that makes it sound...it's a little prescriptive saying it doesn't flow until that time but I appreciate the intent of the motion and I'm pleased it see Councillor Swandel wanting to see that project move up quicker because that's very positive. I'm also, the Transportation Master Plan that we approved before at our last meeting, we made some changes to it, increasing the number of projects we now have on the table to do faster and I think that's also a problem that we have to look at. What are our priorities? We have so many on the table now. And I think we need to be clearer what the highest priorities are and that's a little confused I think in the minds, and that's why I wanted to get back to this intergovernmental relationship which I think we can improve. I know there's been efforts, to talk to the Premier, I know the Mayor talks to him on a regular basis but I think we can do better and I think that's how we're going to get where we want to be; on things like this rapid transit file as well as our other files, by sitting down and maybe we need to have a more specific role on EPC. Somebody who goes over there and really works at this, and expand that role of intergovernmental relations because I think we can do better on it. But I do thank Councillor Swandel for bringing forward the initiative. I'm pleased it see him pushing on the rapid transit file but I do think after 2016 is longer than we need to wait. So, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't know how Councillor Gerbasi is voting on this yet. She didn't really say. But I'll wait with anticipation. You know, it's interesting watching the dance here, Mr. Speaker, by the N.D.P. apologists on Council, who are constantly now waving their hands.....

Mr. Speaker: I caution you Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: We cannot be too direct with the Premier. We cannot be too direct with the Premier, and the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is a big boy. He is a big boy. He knows what's going on. Have these folks been living in a bubble, Mr. Speaker? Have they been living in a bubble for the last year? Mr. Speaker, let me...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, I'd like you to speak to...

Councillor Wyatt: I hear what you're saying Mr. Speaker. I hear what you're saying. I hear what you're saying. But Mr. Speaker, you know, we just came out of a provincial budget last month where the Mayor had given the Premier half a dozen ideas, actually more, in terms of sources... of ways to fund the infrastructure challenge that's facing our City. He was up front, he was direct, he was diplomatic and instead, Mr. Speaker, the door is slammed on the City. Not only that, he took the ideas, thanks for your ideas and I'm going to use them and I'm going to increase these taxes and by the way, I'm keeping the money. And I'm not putting it into roads in your municipality, the City of Winnipeg, or any of the other 198 municipalities in this province. No we're not going to do that. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker we're not even going to put that money into the highways on the infrastructure of the Province of Manitoba that they are responsible for

that's crumbling. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means this was just one massive tax grab. A massive tax grab by Broadway, by Premier Selinger. A tax grab on the people of Manitoba, who are now going to be paying more to register their vehicle than ever before and not one penny of that extra increase, Mr. Speaker, not one penny, is going to go to the infrastructure that that vehicle registration originally set up for, Mr. Speaker, originally envisioned many, many years ago, was for. It was for infrastructure. It was for fixing our infrastructure, fixing our roads, fixing our highways. And instead they're taking that money and they're using it to balance their budget, the bottom line. And the same thing goes with the next motion as well. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago we sat in this chamber and then earlier this year, we sat in this chamber and we listened about how awful it was we were going to increase transit fares. We were going to increase transit fares by twenty cents, Mr. Speaker. Twenty cents. How terrible is this, this will drive people into poverty; this is going to destroy people and the solutions that came forward from folks, delegation after delegation and for the members of this council was charge the car user. Charge an increase on parking lots in the downtown. Tax them with extra fees. Tax them, Mr. Speaker, to be able to buy a vehicle, put a vehicle tax...a special vehicle tax. All these sorts of ideas and the vehicle registration, Mr. Speaker, was added to the list of ideas by many delegations and by members of this Council. Rather than having a transit fare increase that everybody abhorred or most. Not everybody. There's some members who still feel that some folks, in the transit system who use transit, should help pay for the improvements, not all of it, but one fifth is not much. So Mr. Speaker, here we are today, debating this, a solution, Mr. Speaker. Let's look at the motion. I want to thank Councillor Swandel for moving this motion and giving me the opportunity to second it. Mr. Speaker, this motion is well worded and is very clear. This motion would allow us to finish the southwest transit corridor. The existing transit corridor, the small little piece that's been built so far, has been a huge success from what I understand, talking to our public service. They haven't said this yet officially but informally, the response has been tremendous. So much so, that they are having a challenge dealing with the ridership just because of the volumes of folks that are using the system. It's exactly what was predicted. Actually, I think it's beyond their expectations. That's how positive it is, Mr. Speaker. Could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, if we could actually build the entire southwest transit corridor? The Rapid Transit Tax Force Report which Councillor Gerbasi was a member of the rapid transit tax force and Councillor Pagtakhan, we recommended in that report, Mr. Speaker, that the whole southwest transit corridor and it was actually, it was a push by Dr. Barry Prentice of the University of Manitoba, who argued on our committee, he was a member of the advisory committee, that you have to build an entire route. You have to be able to see how it operates. You have to be able to test it; you have to be able to model it. He's a professor. This is what he argued and he says you have to be able to demonstrate that it can work. And we know now from this little segment that we've built that it does work and could you imagine if we could build the entire southwest and then build to the east and into other parts of the city? This would allow us to do that. Every member of this Council should be putting aside their political differences and supporting this motion because this is the right thing to do, Mr. Speaker, to make it happen, dedicating this revenue. If we had a motion coming out of this Council saying unanimously, that we back this and it should be unanimous. It would send a loud message over to Broadway. You want to talk about lobbying Councillor Gerbasi? That's a formal lobby, direct lobby. We have to start standing up and saying these things because if we don't, where's the funding going to come from, Mr. Speaker? Where's it going to come from, that's the challenge we're facing. Never mind transit but also our roads and bridges and the Premier in the paper is talking today about infrastructure programs with the federal government. Let's be frank. He is talking about what we're now expecting is Building Canada is pretty well done. He is talking about the next phase of Building Canada or whatever it's called, which is in 2014 or 2015, whenever the federal government rolls it out. It's already expected Mr. Speaker. These are the infrastructure programs started by the Liberals, under Chrétien and they've been going ever since, every so many years, but the reality is Mr. Speaker, they're not the predictable funding that we know we need to be able to deal with the infrastructure challenges facing our city. We need this predictable funding. The gas tax is one, a vehicle registration definitely would be another. The solution, Mr. Speaker is to support this motion and to let's, and send it forward. I realize that for some of my colleagues here who have loyalties, friendships, that it's challenging, there's no doubt about it. It's challenging because of the fact that you have those loyalties and friendships over across at the other chamber. And I would ask you though, to put your...another loyalty first and foremost. A loyalty which I think is higher and more important and that is the loyalty to the city and a loyalty to your constituents, no matter what political stripe they may be. And the loyalty here, Mr. Speaker is that we have to start to fix the challenges we're facing. It's as simple as that. So, I want to thank Councillor Swandel for this excellent motion. This should be supported unanimously, across this country and across North America and Europe, vehicle registrations are used. You can go to Vancouver, Translink; they use vehicle registrations from the province to municipalities, thirteen municipalities there, benefiting in the lower mainland from vehicle registration to fund their transit system and other road improvements. This is not even talking about road improvements, this is transit. Let's vote on this unanimously. Let's make it unanimous. I'll even take back my opening comments if it helps you to vote. But let's send a message, Mr. Speaker. We heard people don't want to raise the transit fare to pay for the southwest transit; fine that was withdrawn, that was withdrawn. This now Mr. Speaker is a reasonable....

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: A reasonable solution. Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. A reasonable solution that, that Mr. Speaker, would make a huge difference, a huge difference, and it would set a precedent. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we are truly on our own. We are truly on our own and that's the scary thing; that's the message that I got out. I don't know what many of you got out of the provincial budget but now learning of the cuts that have been quietly are being made; which I won't announce here on the Council floor, that will be up to the Mayor, he handles inter-government affairs, but the quiet little cut-backs the province is making under the table, okay, to us, to balance their budget and they are cuts Councillors, that we have to send a message that enough is enough. That the challenges we're facing, we cannot rely on property taxes alone to face this challenge. We just cannot. But literally, Mr. Speaker, the message being sent from Broadway by that budget and they are the senior level of government, they are in charge in many ways Councillors, is that we are on our own. This city and every municipality is on its own when it comes to the challenges of infrastructure in every municipality and that really is a shame, Mr. Speaker especially considering they are the senior level of government. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't need that much time because I think Councillor Wyatt addressed a lot of the things that I was going to talk about. But, I think I want to start with the point that obviously here at City Hall, all Councillors are very supportive of rapid transit. As a matter of fact just recently, we moved up the date to complete the southwest corridor to 2016 which I think is a very positive step and quite often on this floor during this discussion, you heard the political will is there. Well, I ask the question, is it there, Mr. Speaker? And because I believe that is a question, that's exactly why I will definitely support this motion. Do I truly believe it will get us anywhere? No, I don't, unfortunately, because sometimes they don't listen but I'll tell you what it will do Mr. Speaker. Once and for all it will show everybody who is sincere and who is full of it Mr. Speaker, because that's what I've been seeing a lot of lately. A lot of talk but you know what, will is a wonderful thing. You need money to get things done, Mr. Speaker and we know where 95% of the money is, it's with the other levels of government, it's not with us. That's just a fact, Mr. Speaker. And you know it's rather interesting because I heard the comment about Plessis Road and a bolt of lightning came and it happened. It wasn't a bolt of lightning, it was the wrath of Wyatt and an election that got that done Mr. Speaker. Let's just call it the way it is and many Councillors here were jealous that that happened out there. They didn't like that. Because you know what, you want to talk about 50/50 transit sharing Mr. Speaker? I negotiated that with former Premier Doer, in case anybody forgot, because for decades it wasn't 50/50 and we got that back on the table. But there has to be a will, Mr. Speaker, and a commitment to spend monies. Without those two you've got nothing Mr. Speaker, and that's why this is going where it's going. Those are just the realities, Mr. Speaker. And you know what? I don't think anybody wants to criticize anyone. But the realities are, sometimes you have a difference of opinion from someone. How often in this chamber a Councillor may disagree with what I think and criticize me. I don't consider that to be bad, or I don't consider that to be ill will. Get up the next morning, I love everybody and respect them. There's nothing wrong for standing up for the people who elected you, the citizens of Winnipeg, the residents who live here. That's our job and the realities are right now, Mr. Speaker, the province has problems and they took every idea that we put on the table to address transit, rapid transit and infrastructure and took it to solve their problem. I understand it's challenging, but the one thing that I think is being misinterpreted here, in the specific motion, I truly believe that Councillor Swandel was being extremely generous by saying "Here is what the motion is. Here is what we need". We understand there is a deficit. The province has gone on record saying the deficit will be gone by 2016. We're not going to push you right now. We can wait until your deficit to be resolved with these revenues and then you can give us the revenues. You can't say no to that. You can't say no. It's a great motion. Everybody should support this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mayor Katz. Councillor Swandel to close.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Well, a very interesting round of debate. I'll just go through and respond to most of what been said. I think we started with Councillor Eadie talking about, he didn't see the connection why we would use vehicle registration fees and this is a fee, it's not a tax and it's important to realize that. So this vehicle registration fee, we constantly look at vehicles as being one of the challenges we have in getting to what we want which is sustainability. It's often said that transit, rapid transit, alternate forms of transportation, are one of our roads to sustainability. So, there is easily a relationship that can be made between the fee on a vehicle and its use for rapid transit. So, we can take that argument off the table right away. And especially when you look at single occupancy vehicles and what that means in the bigger picture. Councillor Vandal stood up and started to talk about unconditional verses conditional. The motion is very clear. To be unconditionally dedicated by the province to the city, and that the city take its portion of those funds and dedicate them towards rapid transit or in particular, the southwest corridor of rapid transit. So we can take that argument off the table. This is an unconditional flow of funds to the municipalities from the provincial government and that the city should look at earmarking these specifically for rapid transit. The only condition in there is that they be dedicated to sustainable infrastructure. And I think that's actually part of OurWinnipeg, is one of our things that we champion in OurWinnipeg. TIFs were mentioned. Well, we need to be very careful with TIFs. TIFs in two reasons. One is if you look at, you know, TIF was a great thing that was happening in the States in the last 20 years

or so or maybe even before that, it's actually driven some of those municipalities in the States into bankruptcy. They got in and they didn't know when to stop. And you take all your growth in taxes and you use it for dedicated fees, you're going to have to start creating new taxes. To substitute for the challenges that some of that growth brings. So you know ...and when you look at \$300 million, if you want to use TIF, well you better get rid of your 2016 date because by the time you have enough build-out to use TIF, to fund this or even a portion of this, let's say you use it to fund one-third, you're going to be many, many years out there. I would say somewhere between 10 and 20 years. If we were able to kept immigration going where it's at, you might be closer to 10. If the federal government keeps doing what it's doing to the province of Manitoba with some of its changing policies around immigration then you might be closer out to 20 years. The idea of this is saying; we don't start until 2016 as well. This motion says that it's a cash flow that starts in 2016. There's nothing that stops us from starting the work earlier. Many things we do...the project, you know let's say it's finished in 2016 that's when you would need to start servicing that debt and if you need it before that then that's where the city would find the small amount of money to bridge finance to get to that cash flow. Easily dealt with, not an argument that makes sense here. You know, this is a very clear motion and it appears that people have gone out of their way to find something wrong with it. I don't think there is anything wrong with it. I think it recognizes many of the... all of the pieces that have been raised and they were carefully and calculatingly included in the motion to ensure that the motion couldn't be argued. Councillor Gerbasi talked about transit fare increases and the fact there is a reference in here to the transit fare increase that was killed by the province. The reason that's in there, is if you look at other cities which many Councillors like to compare us to on a regular basis, you look at Ottawa for example where transit fares I think run at \$3.50; you look at Vancouver where there is not only a gas tax that's dedicated to sustainable infrastructure but there's also in the city, there is a specific transit tax imposed on gas in Vancouver. That's why that's mentioned because if you're not going to allow us to have the fare increases and dedicate them so that we can build the transit system like people champion like Ottawa, if we can't set the fares there, then at least give us the dedicated revenue stream; that's why that's in there. That's why you need it there. You need it so that it can be recognized that that is one of our challenges. We don't have the revenue streams like other cities have. So, where are we getting that revenue from? If you're not going to give it in transit fares, because the way you choose to handle that, then look at this as an option. This should be more palatable here. You're affecting the single occupancy vehicles and you're taking the money that's generated by vehicles to promote transit. It makes perfect sense. You can't argue it. I guess, you know, the last piece is this whole inter-governmental relationship piece, and you know, we can go on and on and on, our fault, their fault, whatever. The fact is, representing the single taxpayer, looking at our collective responsibility and I keep saying this over and over again, we're not getting anywhere. Here's an opportunity for the Premier to do something. You know, somebody could stand up at the provincial level and say let's have a municipal summit on infrastructure; with the province at the table, with the Premier at the table, with the Mayor at the table, with some other municipalities at the table. Let's start to have a better understanding of the challenges that each entity faces because we have certain assumptions we make about the province and we know they make assumptions about us that are wrong. They make assumptions about municipalities that just are purely wrong. So, I assume that we're making assumptions about the province that are wrong as well but there is nobody doing anything that says we need to be sitting down and getting rid of the misinformation and driving forward to build a better city; to build a better province; to have sustainable infrastructure. You know I guess, you know, if I were the Premier, I would look at this, it's out in 2016. If I was a political adviser, what a great opportunity to extend an olive branch; to start the process of how we change this relationship. Recognize this is not about politics; that this is about sustainable infrastructure. Say yes we can do this. The arguments are in the motion as to how you can and why you can. 2016 is the cash flow date start, not the project start. The cash flow date start. You know, that's hundreds of million...I don't know, maybe a hundred million dollars between now and 2016, bit less than that. You know, that's a lot of money for the province to use in the interim. If they're going to be funding anyway and they want to be playing in this rapid transit pieces; why wouldn't they? There is the opportunity, say you know what, we need to come to the table with the City of Winnipeg. We need to have a better relationship. We can't make this political. It has to be about the infrastructure; it has to be about the needs of the people. Let's do it. Just stand up and say yes. You know, just say no - to heck with that. Just say yes. It's very simple, all the arguments are here, and I've listened to the province and their budget. I've seen their challenges. They're going to make those go away by 2014, and we're giving them two more years after that, just say yes, let us get something done.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Swandel. Closing arguments completed; All those in favour? Opposed? All right record the vote. All those in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Mr. Speaker: And those opposed please rise.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Mayes, Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 3.

Mr. Speaker: Motion passed. Notice of motion; the second one we have Your Worship.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS
GAS TAX

Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS modern infrastructure is key to supporting the City of Winnipeg's economy and creating a vibrant community;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has been unable to make the required improvements to its infrastructure primarily due to the financial structure of municipal governments and their limited sources of revenue;

AND WHEREAS the cost to raise the average condition of the City's infrastructure to an appropriate asset management condition has been estimated at \$3.5 billion growing to \$7.4 billion over the next 10 years;

AND WHEREAS currently, only 6.3% of all taxes paid by Winnipeggers go to the City Government with 93.7% going to the other levels of government, an actual decrease over the years – it was 7.9% in 1997;

AND WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba percentage increase in the grants to the City of Winnipeg is dead last when compared to other large Canadian cities;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has been relentless in its attempts to negotiate and advocate for long-term, inflation-adjusted, dedicated funding from the other levels of government for infrastructure funding;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada has allocated gas tax funding to municipalities of which the City of Winnipeg receives \$41 million annually;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg City Council and the Association of Manitoba Municipalities have previously asked the Province of Manitoba to provide one point of the existing provincial sales tax (PST) over and above funds that are already received, which would be dedicated as a stable, reliable source of funding for municipal infrastructure;

AND WHEREAS on April 17, 2012 the Province of Manitoba announced a 2.5 cent per litre increase on gasoline and diesel tax to fund infrastructure;

AND WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba have budgeted \$296 million in gas tax revenue in their 2012 budget;

AND WHEREAS every 1 cent of tax on both gasoline and diesel generates about \$12 million for the City on a per capita basis therefore generating approximately \$30 million within the City of Winnipeg alone;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to transfer the revenue generated from the 2.5 cent per litre increase in the gasoline tax directly to the municipalities to address infrastructure requirements over and above existing funding levels.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The gist of the motion is to request that the Province of Manitoba to transfer the revenue generated from the 2.5 cents per litre increase in the gasoline tax directly to municipalities to address infrastructure requirements over and above existing funding levels. You know, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting. Yesterday there was a report from the FCM. I'm just going to read one sentence, "Local governments continue to operate without a stable and secure share of the total tax revenues generated by their communities and they remain vulnerable to offloading of costly responsibilities by other orders of government. Of every new dollar in taxes Canadians have paid during the past 50 years, federal and provincial treasuries have collected 95 cents, with just 5 cents paid to municipalities". Mr. Speaker, the realities are, we are facing a crisis. We've said it over and over again and talking about it doesn't really address the problem. You can either identify the problem and work towards a solution or you can just pretend you are an ostrich and bury your head in the sand which, unfortunately, is what many have chosen to do. I've talked about in the past, if you look at the revenues, and I think it's been said here many times today, there's only one taxpayer. All the money comes from the same people. And if you look at the numbers okay, the City of Winnipeg gets a total of \$212 million, total Mr. Speaker, from our provincial government. Okay that's what it is. Now, what you have to know first of all is that the provincial government gets transfers from the federal government of \$3.1 billion...actually, \$3.6 billion in federal transfers. That's what they get and we get \$212 million. In addition to that, they get \$3.1 billion in income taxes both individual and corporate. The city gets zero. They get \$2.9 billion in other taxes, such as sales tax, fuel tax, payroll tax, tobacco tax, land transfer tax, etc. We get nadda. They get half a billion dollars in fees such as

licensing fees and fines. We get zero. And they get about another \$0.6 billion liquor commission and lotteries. We get zero. Those are just all facts, Mr. Speaker. So how are we going to address this problem? There's been so much discussion about one point of the existing PST, okay well that's fallen on deaf ears. We were...I was very happy to see the AMM here, that represents all the municipalities in the city be supportive of this motion. And the realities are, Mr. Speaker, if there is any tax that should be applied towards our infrastructure, it's gotta be gas tax Mr. Speaker, it just has to be. Because it's that gas that goes into the buses, the cars, the trucks, etc., that's basically wreaking havoc on our streets, etc., and that's why they are in the state they are. So what could be more logical? This was actually one of the suggestions that we, this Council, made to the provincial government. This just makes so much sense, Mr. Speaker. And the realities are, you have to keep on trying, okay. Sometimes the first effort doesn't get you where you want to be. Sometimes the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, but you can't give up. If we give up and don't address this problem Mr. Speaker, we're going to dig ourselves in such a big hole that your great, great, great grandchildren won't get out of it, Mr. Speaker. It's this Council that has to start this now, and we, the City of Winnipeg, have to play our role as well, as well as the federal government; but so does the provincial government. So, that's why the ask is there and I'll be happy to hear comments from the rest of Council.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I actually have an amendment which Councillors will have before them, seconded by Councillor Smith, which is I think viewed with favour by the mover and the seconder and that is to simply to lead one of the whereas here, and that is the whereas that reads, "Whereas the Province of Manitoba percentage increase in the grants to the City of Winnipeg is dead last when compared to other large Canadian cities". So it would be, I guess, Mr. Speaker, we're technically debating simply the amendment that's been suggested to me that in the interests of time I will try to address all the issues here. I am in favour of the motion, if it is amended. I wanted to thank Councillor Wyatt for his discussions with me over the last couple of weeks on this. This was the Mayor's staff, Bonnie and Brad from the Mayor's office and the Mayor, trying to co-operate, trying to see what we can come up with here, it's something we can all vote for and I think it would be important that we all vote for this and I think it's also important to say -- well as Councillor Swandel said, he talked about extending an olive branch. So, I think if we were able to delete this one whereas; this, we don't get into a debate with the province about particular numbers and who is last and who isn't and well you're not including the capital, you're only including this, that and the other thing. Let's get on to debating the real matter at hand, which is the gas tax. I think, as the Mayor says, this is appropriate to address in the context of infrastructure. I think what we are doing here is some people have said it's just theatre, because the Province is going to say no, I think it's more than theatre. I think we're trying to come up with a position that we can all back, that we can go down the street to Broadway with and say "look, this is something that we need to have a serious debate about". We have a serious problem with infrastructure and we should be trying to work co-operatively to deal with that. Is this going to find favour? I'm not sure. Maybe not; but at least it starts a dialogue. There is talk of having some sort of summit; I think that would be in order to try and get different issues on the table. People from the province have said to me well, you've got budget documents that say...that start with...we all know property taxes are aggressive form of taxation and people in the province have said well, we don't agree with that. Why do you say that? So, maybe this is one of the misunderstandings that Councillor Swandel is talking about. But I do think this one is the gas tax one. The previous one was vehicle registration. I certainly see the two differently. I think it's important to lobby the province on the gas tax. I think it's important to lobby, I think there's a federal piece of this as well; maybe we can address that with FCM and maybe Councillor Wyatt can use his high stock at AMM to talk to them about seeing if we can go forward to the federal government to try and get more federal gas revenue as well, I think that's appropriate to try and address our infrastructure needs. I think we do need to move forward on this file without...you know people talked about cheap shots or rhetoric or snarky comments. Let's leave all that aside. I think, if we make the one amendment here on balance the motion is a very good one. It presents legitimate needs of the city and it presents a reasonable position of the province. Let's see what they come back with but let's at least get that dialogue going to see if we can't get something progressing on the infrastructure file. The dialogue that I think we need has to be both federal and provincial but, and this is targeted simply provincially, but I think that's in order, that's our short-term need. I don't want to get into debating the provincial budget, our own budget. Let's try to work together, move forward and say look this is a serious proposal, it's more than just theatre, all of the Council is behind it, so let's try to get some revenue to deal with the infrastructure and some of that may be mass transit. Councillor Wyatt said to me...I think the biggest infrastructure project they ever did in Transcona was underground. Nobody saw it. Nobody knew it was there, nobody thanks you for it, but we have infrastructure needs on the surface and below the surface. Sometimes hard to see those ones below the surface but I think we need to look at those as well. Try to get some provincial funding here and we may get told go tax people yourselves; we'll provide the matching funding but at least let's get that dialogue going and have that debate amongst ourselves, rather than simply complaining or simply bemoaning the lack of funding. Let's go forward with this. Let's go forward unanimously and get that dialogue going with the province. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Mayes, speaking both to the amendment and the clause, Councillor Eadie.

Motion No. 4

In amendment,

**Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,**

That the Notice of Motion moved by His Worship Mayor Katz and Councillor Wyatt regarding Gas Tax be amended by deleting the following clause:

AND WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba percentage increase in grants to the City of Winnipeg is dead last when compared to other large Canadian cities;

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. This is actually a great motion that's coming from the Mayor, our leader of the city, to try to negotiate with the province what we really need, which is a fair source of revenue that can come in so we can deal with the infrastructure problems that we hear from our constituents and our residents all the time. I am standing up for my residents and for my constituents, Councillor Wyatt. And I always do. I always will. And what I like about this particular motion as well, it doesn't dedicate necessarily where it's going, other than we want the revenue to take care of our infrastructure problems. And you know, expansion of rapid transit is more related to gas tax because sustainable transit is about trying to stop the fossil fuel production of this city and we have motor vehicles actually that are going to be coming out on the road, they're already out there. There is a Mazda fully electric car that's riding the streets of Winnipeg and they pay a registration fee. Why would we want them to contribute for paying for rapid transit? I haven't the foggiest idea? But they do use up the roads as well so that's the relationship and you know, the registration fee of course is a tax because it goes directly to the government of Manitoba. MPI collects it but it goes to the government of Manitoba, it's a tax. But, this gas tax, this motion is great. We can then proceed as a City Council on deciding where our infrastructure needs are and then we can decide how it gets spent and I think that's appropriate is probably the best way and it's too bad there actually wasn't, I would say, a 5-cent gas tax increase in which the province would have said two and a half is for the City of Winnipeg and we collect our two and a half. But that's not the case. So our leader of this city, Mayor Katz has said well then, at least let's have our revenue, the gas tax revenue, we'll decide where best to spend it because we need to do it and over and above what we already get in grants because I do understand that and I do support actually the motion coming to amend it to remove a whereas clause that you know, frankly we don't want to see a reduction in the grants that we do get from the province. We want to see this increased revenue, but you know, why should we get into a debate whether it's the lowest or not. Like, I mean, we need to be able to proceed with the province and say listen, the City of Winnipeg, the Councillors and the Mayor of this city understand what our citizens, what our residents, and what the people need for infrastructure in this city. So, let's vote for the motion to take out the whereas and let's hopefully unanimously vote for this particular motion which I think is rational and you know, I'm not sitting in any bubble contrary to some characterizations around the table here. You know, I believe that we have to represent the needs of the city and I do. And you know, I might mention Gary Doer and his efforts to increase the grants that he did in 2006-07 to the city for road improvements, which it did happen, there were increases, I know that, it did happen. So, but those are facts, facts that sit on the table. And so we are proceeding with facts that we have. We, the fact is, we need increased infrastructure revenue; the province said that they needed the increase in gas tax to pay for infrastructure road problems, issues that they're dealing with and we're willing to oblige them and do exactly that, increase the spending on infrastructure with the two and a half cents. So thank you very much, Mayor Katz and thanks to the rest of Council. I think this one should be unanimous and I think it's going to be that way. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Eadie, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm going to just put a few comments on the record and just support Mayor Katz and again, thank him for the opportunity to second his motion. I think it's a well-worded motion as well; same as the last one. And you know, it's...I think timely because of the provincial budget and the fact that they've done this increase of two and a half cents. The two and a half cents is significant, Mr. Speaker. You know, it sets the precedent for other increases in terms of fuel taxes that they could do in the future and the fact that they've earmarked none of this to fighting the infrastructure deficit whether it be municipal infrastructure deficit or the provincial infrastructure deficit is very disappointing. It's a step in the wrong direction. It is literally another tax grab in terms of what they've done. And you know, it just makes no sense that they should be increasing fuel taxes and that money is not going into increasing infrastructure funding. It's been said of the federal government, the federal government has earmarked and have an agreement now with the municipalities across the country that \$2 billion of infrastructure...of gas tax fuel, gas taxes, from the federal government that we pay now in gas taxes at the pumps that will flow back to municipalities across Canada, ours is the equivalent of that \$2 billion, Winnipeg receives 40 million. Sounds like a lot but when your entire infrastructure deficit, your under funding of existing infrastructure, Mr. Speaker in a given year is now more than \$400 million for existing infrastructure, it's not even 10%. So, we've got a huge challenge, Mr. Speaker. In terms of where we're standing right now. The motion, the last update we had in terms of infrastructure our infrastructure deficit was in 2009 and those numbers, those were 2009 numbers that are listed in the whereas clause and so those numbers are old

now. They are actually, you know, 3 almost 4 years old. The fact of the matter is our infrastructure deficit is actually quite a bit higher than that now because we have in those three or four years, we have not met the infrastructure funding challenge and therefore Mr. Speaker, that just adds on to the top of the deficit and it just continues to grow and grow and grow. It's really, I think, AMM does polling of Manitobans on our behalf on this issue and the one thing that has come very, very loud from the residents and citizens of Manitoba is that literally and the wording...everything is crumbling, that everything is literally falling apart. And they see it on the surface, they see it with the roads and the sidewalks, they see it in their community facilities, community clubs. They see it in their 40 or 50-year-old libraries; they see it right across the board. They literally, the entire public good, the entire work that has been done by generations of Winnipeggers" before us is literally crumbling before our eyes and we do have the ability to correct the problem Mr. Speaker, we do have the resources. The problem is Mr. Speaker, all those resources are at the higher levels of government and the tax system we created as a country 140 years ago, gave all the powers to Ottawa and to the province in terms of the ability to raise revenue and raise taxes and very little to the municipalities and we're faced with this dilemma today. There is no doubt that the federal government should do more in terms of the fuel taxes. They should be...their fuel tax is upwards of 5, \$6 billion, maybe higher now because of the fact that the cost of fuel is up. And not just gas tax but fuel taxes, crucial difference, Mr. Speaker, because you know gas tax is one where you add in all the fuel taxes, it's quite a bit more and so we're not receiving all of that either. That is going to balance the federal budget of the federal government. So 4 billion plus, what Canadians are paying, is not going into infrastructure as it should be and the same here in the province they're now increasing the fuel taxes. The province has argued and there are folks in the industry who disagree with it. Provinces argued that the existing fuel taxes are going infrastructure, there's folks in heavy construction association elsewhere who disagree that that's not the case. Whatever the truth is Mr. Speaker, we do know this, this two and a half percent increase that they've made is a hundred percent not going, and not going into infrastructure, and it's going to balance the budget of the provincial government. So this is not very good Mr. Speaker. We have to send a strong message. We have to be united on this. In the interests of Council's solidarity and working together, I'll be supporting the amendment by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Smith. I will say though that the clause that's being proposed to be deleted, is accurate. The fact is the percentage of increase we are of large Canadian cities we are at the bottom in terms of what they've been doing in the last short little while here Mr. Speaker. We actually as a province, to the credit actually of the, you could say to the first N.D.P. government under Schreyer, started the provincial/municipal tax sharing agreement, sharing income taxes, corporate and personal with municipalities. We were at one time as a province leading the nation when it came to funding the challenges municipalities face. We are steadily sliding, Mr. Speaker. Even with some of the funding mentioned, in terms of comparison to other provinces other jurisdictions in this country, we are declining in terms of revenues and the Province you know, they have a massive challenge, I understand that. They got health care, they have education, they have challenges that are important to our community as well but we're simply saying that as a community we need to have some targeted revenues that will help push our infrastructure spending back up to allow us to do it. We're starting to raise property taxes Mr. Speaker. The criticism from Broadway was, you're not raising property taxes, were not raising property taxes. We have gone and borrowed money Mr. Speaker. We have borrowed money. The federal government's gas tax funds allowed us to borrow against that. But that is pretty well at the limit now, Mr. Speaker. We've increased infrastructure spending because of that borrowing but we basically we're doing projects we had to do, we had to do bridges, we had to do certain roads. These are things that had to be dealt with or else we literally would have been shutting down bridges like the Disraeli Bridge. So, Mr. Speaker we are now, you know, there's no, on the horizon, no new gas tax from the federal government; deal coming forward. If the province doesn't step forward and show leadership that other provinces have been showing, you know Mr. Speaker, we will see continue decline in our infrastructure. Our citizens, ironically, look to us because the infrastructure falls under our bailiwick in terms of the municipality. But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, the tools that we have to do the job are limited. But we will have to start Councillors, increasing property taxes to fund infrastructure. We will have to start doing that. We will have no choice and that will be rather painful. Politically and it will be painful in terms of the impact on the...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: households that are going to be paying for these taxes. Our residential streets alone should be funded to a tune of \$150 million minimum Mr. Speaker, when we're doing right now approximately 20 million, 22 million. So Mr. Speaker, that alone would be a 30% increase on property taxes minimum, if we were to fund that on local streets. Just on the street in front of somebody's house but we may have to start talking and looking at that Councillors because we don't have any choice. We are on our own. The province is ignoring not just this municipality, not this city but every municipality across this province and we heard from the President and the AMM have been consistent on this issue and they've done a tremendous job on this issue. And in the past, I can tell you that during the provincial budget as it was presented, the AMM has always been there. And they've been very diplomatic in terms of how they've weighed budgets in the past especially in the effort of building good relations with the provincial government. This last budget, the words from the President, this was a disappointing budget. This was a failure, a failure and this is our municipal association who appreciates the relationship with the province and works hard at it. They themselves have

said this is an absolute failure of this provincial budget and a disappointing budget for all of the municipalities across Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, so I think that speaks volumes. Thank you, again, for the Mayor for his leadership on this, for taking this and once again bringing this forward. It's an idea that has been proposed before and the Premier took his idea and now took the money and we're sending the message, send the money where it belongs, into the infrastructure of our communities, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Seeing none, Mayor Katz to close. Oh I'm sorry, Councillor Mayes you can close on the amendment.

Councillor Mayes: Just say yes.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. (Laughter) Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, first of all I will definitely be supporting the amendment, that's number 1. I thought the comments made around the table were very profound. I think everybody realizes the crisis situation that we are in and I know that Councillor Wyatt made the comments about what would be happening with our property taxes but the reality is, Mr. Speaker, there is no way we could ever, ever address our infrastructure deficit with property taxes. We know we're in a situation where our revenues are limited. I told you the FCM report where 95 percent of all the money is going and obviously we need to work something out and if God willing the province is listening and hopefully they care about, this isn't just Winnipeg this is all the municipalities across the province. You know, maybe with a logical and a loud and a very profound voice, we'll find favour in accomplishing what I think every citizen in this province wants. Fix our infrastructure. It doesn't make a difference, roads, bridges, sidewalks, curbs, community centres, etc., etc. We have serious problems and this could be the beginning of addressing some of those issues so I certainly hope everybody will support this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mayor Katz. Recorded vote, okay, we're going to vote on the amendment first. All those in favour of the amendment, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion is unanimous. On the motion as amended, please rise for those in favour. I think we'll just say Visa that the motion is unanimous and we'll put it in the record as such. Thank you. Congratulations, Mayor Katz. We have a couple more motions. Motion 2 and it's for automatic referral.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS**

Motion No. 2

Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Nordman,

WHEREAS older persons are an important part of our community;

AND WHEREAS it is our community's interest that these citizens continue to live active lives and participate fully in the activities of the community;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg accepts the invitation from the Province of Manitoba to commit to participating in the Age-Friendly Manitoba Initiative;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Age-Friendly Initiative be endorsed by the City of Winnipeg to support participation and healthy active lifestyles for older adults and all citizens;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT City Council direct the public service to establish a supporting structure (Committee / Working Group) that represents all sectors of an Age-Friendly community;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT an elected Council Member be an active participant on the Committee / Working Group, and report regularly to Council on the activities of the Committee;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the plans of the Age-Friendly Initiative be publically posted to develop public support;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Age-Friendly Initiative work co-operatively with existing community organizations to ensure that their programs and services are more age-friendly.

Motion No. 3

Moved by Councillor Eadie,

Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

WHEREAS Winnipeg's City Council is seeking additional revenue streams to pay for infrastructure deficits;

AND WHEREAS transparency and accountability are essential to the spending of residents and businesses tax dollars so they know their money is being spent on budget items they are told the tax pays for;

AND WHEREAS matching revenue to expenditures is an important principle in public accountability for tax payer dollars;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg's current capital budget process does not identify all the specific revenue streams for each of the capital programs at the time Council votes on the capital budget;

AND WHEREAS tax revenue such as the tax bill defined "street renewal frontage levy" does not get clearly reported as to what specific capital budget programs the tax is paying for;

AND WHEREAS the Executive Policy Committee's selected budget committee members and the City of Winnipeg's management have a very, good handle on what revenue streams will be used to pay for the estimated cost being voted on at Council;

AND WHEREAS the five year capital forecast is adjusted to reflect current estimated costs in subsequent years;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the appropriate Committee have the City administration undertake the steps required to identify the specific allocated revenues used to pay for the capital programs and projects in the capital budget so City Council votes on all costs and revenues in the 2013 Annual Capital Budget - 2014 to 2018 Five-Year Capital Forecast.

Mayor Katz: Very quickly, I just want to make everybody aware of the fact that next week, June 4 to 8, is, it's a reminder to celebrate age friendly week. So hopefully, yes you participate in that, too.

Councillor Eadie: I'll move to suspend the rules to debate this resolution.

Mayor Katz: Yes you can if you so desire.

Councillor Eadie: I'll move to suspend the rules to debate this resolution. Why does it have to go back to the committee?

Mayor Katz: It's a referral. It's not a problem to go back to committee.

Mr. Speaker: Alright, so we'll refer it back to committee but we're moving in the direction of age friendly. Second -- I guess its number 3. Again automatic referral to EPC regarding the Capital Budget from Councillor Eadie and Councillor Orlikow. Okay. Consideration of by-laws, Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 75/2012, By-law No. 76/2012, number 77/2012 and number 80/2012 as amended.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 75/2012, By-law No. 76/2012, By-law No. 77/2012, By-law No. 80/2012 as amended.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws numbered 75/2012 to 77/2012 both inclusive and 80/2012 as amended be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 75/2012 to 77/2012 both inclusive and 80/2012 as amended.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 75/2012 to 77/2012 both inclusive and 80/2012 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. We have question period for the Mayor and EPC which will possibly proceed at some length I'm suspecting.

Mayor Katz: You're going to make me wait an entire lunch time to do question period?

Mr. Speaker: At least you'll come back with a

Mayor Katz: Point of Order Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker: So, we will suspend for the lunch period and we will see you back here at promptly at 1:30.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
May 30, 2012, at 1:30 p.m.**

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: On behalf of the Mayor. All right. That brought them in. All right, we'll start with Councillor Smith because he is in his chair. So Councillor Smith to Mayor, I'm sure is waiting with baited breath.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor, my questions are about giving Jet tickets to six City Councillors. Did you do this to strengthen support for your agenda at Council meetings? What criteria did you use making this decision to reward these Councillors? Next question.

Mr. Speaker: You only get one. You get three chances but one question at a time. First question Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Smith, I'm happy to address that question and the Councillor should be aware of the fact that on a regular basis, Mr. Speaker, I send out notification to all Councillors as well as the Clerk's office, etc., when there are tickets available, and some Councillors come forward and actually have taken them, whether they've been Jets tickets or concert tickets, and I will continue to do so. That's number one question. Number two Mr. Speaker; there are no favours of any kind Mr. Speaker. This is something that I do on my own. I offer it to everybody regardless of what party you might be affiliated. Number three, I find it insulting for Councillor Smith to imply that a ticket is going to have any impact on any Councillors. As a matter of fact, some of the Councillors who received tickets probably vote against a lot of things that I put forward. That's irrelevant Mr. Speaker. We try and do the right thing. End of story.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Smith: What was the total cost to Winnipeg taxpayers for these gifts of Winnipeg Jet tickets to the six City Councillors?

Mayor Katz: I'm not sure whose questions these are Mr. Speaker, because I would think that if someone is asking a question they would know what the questions are if they're reading them, but I'm happy to answer it anyways. There was zero cost Mr. Speaker. These are my personal tickets.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Last question.

Councillor Smith: Can you explain what you mean by your personal?

Mayor Katz: Absolutely Mr. Speaker I can do that.

Mr. Speaker: Last question, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Personal means, you put your name on a list, you get season tickets, you pay for it out of your pocket, they are your personal tickets.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, I think you said you had a question.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Through you to...

Mr. Speaker: You're finished Harvey. You get three questions.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Sorry Councillor Eadie...

Councillor Smith: What other gifts to Councillors have you made using funds from your office budget?

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, could you repeat that Councillor Smith?

Councillor Smith: What other gifts to Councillors have you made using funds from your office budget?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any gifts that we've made Mr. Speaker, to be very frank with you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. From the last City Council meeting, the Mayor agreed to go out on a walk with me in the North End to check out what's happening there, and we had a walkabout that was about two things; economic development in the North End as well as what people thought of qualities of a police chief might be. My first question to the Mayor is; what was his general impression about the economic development that's starting up there and any kind of future plans?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie, I thank him for the question. Actually we spent about two and a half hours together. A little short bus ride, met a lot of nice people on the bus; travelled through the parts of the North End of Winnipeg, Councillor Eadie's constituency; visited some commercial enterprises, spoke to some groups, and I can tell you Mr. Speaker, it was a very fruitful two and a half hours. I wish we had more time. We got some very positive feedback. We saw some of the very good things that are happening there. We also saw some things that, you know, we need work to be done there. But to be very frank with you, I was very impressed with some of the work programs I saw that were created and Councillor Eadie shared with me. We spoke to the people there and...former gang members are getting the opportunity to be trained which in my opinion was a program that we should be participating in if there's an opportunity in expanding. It's a phenomenal program. Spoke to women's groups in the area. Got some feedback about a new police chief, and I can tell you the one thing that seemed to resonate is they want to see more involvement with the community; a better relationship with people in every part of the City, and so there's a good relationship between Police and the entire neighbourhood, and people can feel comfortable sharing their thoughts and most importantly, not just feel safe but be safe, and certainly we do have work to do in that area, but I can

tell Councillor Eadie, when he brought up the idea and I offered to go with him, I thank him for taking me up on the idea and as I said, it was extremely fruitful and probably we should be doing much more of that.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Speaker Nordman, just specifically I was interested in what your impression was of the...I think they mentioned that they were going to open up, hopefully in September, of the Neechi Commons Building where we had some common knowledge about people who used to own it many years ago, and what was your impression of that particular facility?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I did have the opportunity to tour through it. It's still a construction site, but the work that I've seen, it's looking very different than from days gone by as I remember it and I'm sure as Councillor Eadie remembers it. They are still experiencing some challenges. I know we've spoken in the past with representatives from there as well as our Administration to see if there might be some opportunity for any potential with tax incremental financing. I know there are still discussions going on. It appears right now their big challenge is they're looking for some...they have the construction under control but they're looking for some capital as far as startup capital. I think there's about \$600,000 and of course any other monies they can raise they would pay down on their debt, so that would make it less difficult for them to service the debt down the road, but what I saw looked like something very good happening in my humble opinion Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Last question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, my last question is, in terms of that facility, which I think is really going to improve the neighbourhood, there's various ways of doing tax incremental financing. There are two different kinds. One where they receive a grant and another type where they can utilize whatever incremental tax they have to spend on whatever they think is appropriate. Do you think that either one of those models might work to sort of help them along?

Mayor Katz: I know Mr. Speaker there has been discussion with the Department on incremental taxes, and that whatever the increase is, there would be an opportunity to basically give them back money over a period of time depending on the improvements being made. It appears they're spending significant amounts of money. I can tell you I did have a dialogue with the Department a little ways back, and it appears that they didn't think there was going to be a large increase in the taxes. Based on what I saw, I will be having another discussion because now that I've actually seen it first hand, I need some further explanation to be very frank with you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker. 2012 marks the International Year of Cooperatives under the auspices of the U.N., and there are a number of cooperatives in the City of Winnipeg and throughout the Province. Probably the biggest example in Manitoba is the whole credit union system. Over \$20 billion in assets in the credit union system; one of the biggest credit union systems in the country actually, and they're approaching their 75th anniversary this fall as well. I'm wondering if the Mayor can advise if the City has any involvement in the International Year of Cooperatives. I know there is an event coming up at The Forks in September and I'm wondering what role, if any, the City is going to have in that celebration?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz?

Mayor Katz: Well on a personal basis Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Co-op gas as well as several credit unions, so I certainly know about the co-op movement here. I'm really not aware of any specific plans at this stage of the game but I would be more than happy to further investigate at this particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Mayes: One more question unrelated, and that is, I had a resident call up about a ban on plastic bags which, to my surprise, when we went back there was actually a motion in 2008, I believe, in front of Council, moved I think by Councillor Swandel and seconded by Councillor Steeves or vice versa, asking the C.A.O to do a study of a potential ban on plastic bags. I don't know how I'd feel about that. There seems to appear to be some division in my own office as some people want plastic bags for their pets and some people aren't as concerned about this, but I wonder if the Mayor could just at some point in the future or today if possible give us an update on where things stand on this idea of a potential ban on plastic bags.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I actually do remember that motion. I think it was Councillor Swandel that moved it and was seconded by Councillor Steeves, and I believe that Councillor Mayes is correct. It was referred back to the C.A.O. This was many years ago. He is no longer here Mr. Speaker. I'd have to take that under advisement and find out where it's at because I can be very honest with you Mr. Speaker. I haven't heard anything since then, so it's probably sitting somewhere. Might be buried right now, but if this is something that Councillor Mayes thinks we should be addressing; as you know, we can always bring something forward, there can always be discussions with the Provincial Government. They could do a ban right throughout the Province and simplify this whole thing about plastic bags. But I'd be happy to take it under advisement and get back to him on that specific motion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Further questions for the Mayor? Seeing none. That's got to be the shortest question period we've had in a long time. We will move to the Standing Committee of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED MAY 1, 2012**

Mayor Katz: Point of order! In all my time here there has never been a question period where my favourite Councillor, Councillor Gerbasi, has not asked me a question. I don't think we can start this now! Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: She is already on Saskatoon time. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker I would like to move items 1 and 2 of the Report dated May 1, 2012.

Mr. Speaker: Standing down one; alright we're standing down both items. Just a little hot there fellas.

Item 1 - Request for Priority 1 Designation - Streets and Sidewalks within the Exchange District

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll wait to hear what the concerns are and address them in closing.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't have a problem with supporting this, I just had a couple of questions that came and maybe they can be addressed now or maybe they can be addressed down the road. There are two issues and I'm not sure how the change in designation affects what become snow routes in the exchange district. From the perspective of the residential parking, we've got this...you know, trying to grow the residential in our downtown and there are challenges on streets right now as far as parking goes and even in marketing condos or rentals in the exchange district. Parking is already an issue. So, I want to make sure that both from that perspective, number 1, from that perspective that we're not having any impact on parking in the downtown. The other perspective is there is a lot of night life in the exchange district and as many people who might drive their cars downtown who leave they will on these streets, when they go home they my drive downtown and go home by taxi. I want to make sure that anything we're doing, we're ensuring that people, if they have had too much to drink in the downtown, certainly, anywhere in the downtown but in this case, in the exchange district that we're not doing anything or somebody might leave their car there at midnight but only come back in the morning to find it's not there. So, I don't know how this designation changes that. I like the fact that we're doing better snow clearing and in particular the sidewalks because there is a lot of pedestrian activity in these areas. So, maybe the Councillor can respond to those or we can get some further information. I don't have a problem with it going forward as is if we need to amend something in the future, we can do that.

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions? We'll do the questions then and you can maybe respond. Okay. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I just noticed that this is something that came out of myself and Councillor Orlikow's seconded the motion and I for one would like to see -- this is coming from the exchange district BIZ and you know, with respect to what Councillor Swandel was saying, there are a tremendous amount of parking spots within the downtown and not necessarily street parking. I don't think that would impact street parking if we designate all the routes from priority 2 to priority 1 and this is for; we're talking about pedestrian safety. There are an awful lot of people who work downtown Mr. Speaker and this is about addressing safety for both parking and for pedestrians. So yeah, pedestrians use sidewalks but also cross the roads and this is a critical issue that's been identified by the exchange districts. I would definitely like to see this being changed to a priority one so I'm a little bit disappointed that it's not happening at this point and perhaps Councillor Vandal can speak more on that.

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions? Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Relative to Councillor Swandel's concern, I don't believe there are any parking changes or amendments or negative consequences based on what we're doing. But I will check that out with the appropriate Administration and get back to him and all of Council for that matter for their information. Relative to Councillor Pagtakhan's issue, I'll reference page 3 of the report which essentially says most streets in the downtown square are regional streets because of their traffic volumes and functions. And there is no significant advantage to artificially creating additional priority 1 streets in the exchange district since the district streets are already normally ploughed immediately following the streets in the downtown square. On the second night of plowing operation. So, I think regardless of what the designation is they will get done on the second night because they are downtown, because it is the exchange district, and because it's important to plough those streets ASAP. So, if we were to move it to priority 1, I don't think they would get done any quicker or at least according to the Administration, there would be no advantage. And as far as the sidewalk clearing, that is going to get priority status based on the downtown square. The downtown square will be enlarged to include the exchange district so they will get priority sidewalk and windrow clearance based on the report. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, I'll the question on Item 1. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Item 2.

Item 2 - Granular Roadways Improvement Program

Mr. Speaker: Councillor...

Councillor Vandal: Roadways. Mr. Speaker, I will...this is something that we've done this year and was introduced by Councillors Fielding and Nordman, actually Speaker Nordman. So, I'll wait to see what the issues are and address those in closing.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes

Councillor Mayes: Councillor Vandal's stolen some of my comments; I was rising to commend yourself and Councillor Fielding for bringing this matter forward. The city stats show that actually, if you take St. Boniface Ward and St. Vital Ward together we have half of the gravel lanes in the city and probably at least half of the complaints, in fact I would say except for some matter having something to do with The Forks effort, more on back lanes than anything else since I got elected so, certainly pleased to see this brought forward. I'm a little worried about the 90 daytime frame to get a report back but I would certainly hope we would try and move this forward as quickly as possible and again, I don't really...I know Councillor Vandal and I have discussed this matter and I know it's important to his Ward and my Ward so, again my thanks to yourself and Councillor Fielding for pushing this forward. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yes. Just briefly a few comments on this. Yeah, this is something a lot of us face...the gravel back lanes. You know, there's been obviously a focus in terms of looking into the gravel back lanes as everyone knows you need a local improvement to do, to pave it which is probably the real answer for it but some of these old suburban areas, I think Councillor Mayes has some and I think Councillor Vandal's go a lot, Councillor Nordman and myself have quite a bit of it. The problem is that the majority of people on these streets have not ...they can't get everyone to sign on board to put on their tax bill because that's how it's financed. So, last year Councillor and myself passed a motion and we got some money put into the budget; to do some of the gravel back lanes. They did some last year, they didn't as many as they wanted to because when they put out the tender they didn't have the tenders that came back that were, that looked at the amounts. We did about 3 or 4 last year. This year the dollars are in place to do it. I did have a conversation with the Public Works Department in the essence of getting more work done quicker; I said, what is the process, so right now they're putting a tender. They didn't know what the pricing would come back at and I asked if there was capacity to essentially do a second tender, if the pricing comes in at a good amount they think the tender is big enough that you'll have the companies to bid on it. So, we worked with them, we said well, would there be a capacity of \$500,000 more work; paid for out of 2013, a first call on this budget item that's there. So right now that's exactly what this motion does it would allow us to get more work done in this particular year. And then we take from 2013's budget, we can make adjustments as we go forward in terms of that. So it's not a dollars and cents thing it just takes money from next year, we're going to see how those tenders come in and the 90 days, Councillor Mayes we asked, you know, when would the tenders happen or when would they come forward. They believe that there would be ample opportunities to do another tender for fall, late fall, to do some of this, so that's where the departments advised us of it. I'm somewhat comfortable with the 90 days but you're right, I'd like to see it as soon as possible, and that's the commitment I think the department made to us, so with that I'll stand down.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Speaker Nordman. I'm not opposed to this particular motion. I have just a number of interesting concerns I did have and I don't think I ever actually looked for it and I don't know if we carry short-term debt in order to finance things that will happen for today and go into next year. So I'm interested if we have some, if we do do short-term borrowing and how that works and so as we're not taking money from somewhere else this year to cover off the costs and then do something next year, and the...and the second point I would have is you know, really, again, it's strictly a money thing and an adjustment, so, one of my other concerns would be...I'm not sure under the financial management plan if there is a need for short-term borrowing, if this somehow moves us into a situation where we're not following that plan.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I just rise, Mr. Speaker, because we had a chance to speak about this now. The one thing we should be aware of here, is that gravel back lanes exist for one reason and one reason only, they're not paved. And they are not paved and they are not paved, I'm not finished, they are not paved because the folks who live on the gravel back lanes have elected not to pave them. Every paved lane in the city was paid for by the folks, by the property owners who live on that back lane. And the street in the front, same way and the sidewalk that goes, if there is a sidewalk, same way and if there is lighting in the back lane and lighting on the street, ornamental lighting, the same way. All paid for in two ways, either through local improvement or the charge is placed on a tax bill and they either pay it up front or amortize it over a period of time, to pay it back, pay the City back for the work or they pay for it in the price of their home when they actually build/buy a property in a development which has already been, this infrastructure has been installed. So, let's be aware of what we're doing here, I guess is what I'm saying. I understand and I supported the first initiative, the first program, you know, and I just think, we should be cautious because of the fact that to be fiscally responsible here, and ensure everyone is treated the same, these are local lanes. These aren't regional streets. These aren't streets that are really busy, that maybe, yeah maybe we should step up to the plate for instead of a LI. These are lanes belonging to people where, they've elected, not to upgrade their back lane, not to go and do a petition and get their names on board, when everyone else in the city has. And those lanes are crumbling now; and folks that do -- and so I guess -- and I have them too. I've got my fair share as well. And I have knocked on the door saying well, if we're doing this, when are these one's going to get done at my end of town. And you know, fair enough but, like I've said to the residents there, it's kind of tough love, they don't like it, every...go down every other paved lane in this community; it's there because those folks agreed to pay for it. It's obviously not that bad if you haven't...you don't want to pay for it. You're prepared to live with that, right. You might not like it but you're prepared to live with it because it's a gravel lane and yeah, it's -- no matter what you do and the other part of this, too Mr. Speaker. That's number 1. Number 2, the other thing, no matter what you do with a gravel lane, okay. The issue is drainage. And you go in and you can do the work and within a year or two and with the cycle, the wet cycle we've been having the last ten years, it's back to where it was before. You can't -- the water doesn't go anywhere. It doesn't drain. You have to get water out of a gravel...out to be able to stop that from happening and you can't because there is no pipe, there is no way to make the water run and if you bring too much gravel in and put it in the back lane and you literally create now a dam effect in people's back yards are lower than the lane and so now they complain "Well, my backyard, it's under water now". Right, because before it used to go into the lane. Then, if it's too low, then the lane's under water, then the rain is rutted and everything, well there's not enough gravel lane. The company's re-graded anything; put more gravel in, now the argument is well, there's never gravel there. Well, that's actually covered under a LI2, Mr. Speaker, if somebody wants to upgrade their lane to a better gravel back lane, they can pay for that, too through an LI. No different than those who complain about the dust on their gravel road, can pay through an LI for calcium treatment, for dust control. It's a service. So, let's be careful here Mr. Speaker, is all I'm saying in terms of this. Because, you know, we like to be popular and I know Hugh McFadyen announced he's going to pave everyone's back lane in the last provincial election and you know, look at how well that went over, right. And you know, so now maybe I know where he got the idea from. But you know, let's just be careful and you know, we have to be cognizant of the fact that everyone else, this is how they got their lanes and sidewalks and everything. They all paid for it and we just -- I think be aware of that, that's all I'm saying. I'm not going vote against this, I'm saying, let's be aware of that as we go forward here, thanks.

Councillor Swandel: I just want to say a couple of quick things. It's an amazing day today, first, no EPC questions from Councillor Gerbasi and you know, a unanimous vote on the gas tax and now Councillor Wyatt up here making some sense. (Laughter). No, I mean that with a great deal of jest. The Councillor is known for being a smart man and I just want to echo and just maybe put some punctuation on this. We need to be cognizant that more and more of the benefits of new development, when we do these cost benefit analysis on new development and we're see these positive numbers. That benefits being used to pay for some of the issues of the past. Whether it's gravel back lanes, the other one we see that...you know as much of the city now has twin sewer systems but those people are paying the same rates to deal with the issues that come with combined sewers. Sometimes people are tempted to make arguments around this stuff that it's actually cheaper to deal with these back lanes by doing this work and in fact, if you get into the

detail of it and you actually run the spreadsheets all the way out that's not the case. The best way to deal with that is exactly as Councillor Wyatt had suggested that you know, you improve the back lane and you have it paid for by the appropriate people and then you start running your had life cycle costing numbers after that. And there's a far greater benefit to doing that. That being said, we're in a place where we're doing this, I'm not going to vote against this motion, if we can get these things taken care of and we're comfortable doing it and some people get a bit of benefit out of it, well, maybe that's just the politics of the day and so be it. But, I think it's important to recognize and to punctuate what Councillor Wyatt was saying.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My understanding, the principle has always been, your streets or your infrastructure is maintained to the level of finish that it had originally. The notion that you have a gravel back lane, you're not going to get a free paved lane. If you've got a gravel back lane and over the years that gets absorbed into the mud and the prairie gumbo we have here, that gets replaced with the same type of surface. Sure, we need to redo a back lane with concrete, it costs more money but you don't have to do it nearly as frequently as you would have to add gravel or deal with land drainage or whatever suffices land drainage and a gravel lane. So, I'm supportive of this. We haven't added gravel to back lanes since the 1980s, there hasn't been a capital policy to deal really deal with gravel back lanes since that time. To me this only makes sense. I just...yeah, I think gravel back lanes in a lot of places, politicians prior to myself and a lot of people here, they approved front approaches on streets that were supposed to have back lanes. What that means now is people who should be using a back lane don't touch a back lanes and it's basically used for garbage and recycling collection now and as a result, a petition to approve on...you won't get the 60% you need to get a successful local improvement petition. So, I'm definitely supportive of this and it's long overdue.

Mr. Speaker: No other comments? Councillor Vandal to close on Item 2.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a good discussion. I want to thank Councillor Fielding and Councillor Nordman for bringing this forward. Councillor Eadie had a question about financing. This is money that was in, that is going to be in, the 13 capital budget. It was in the 12 budget, part of the overall streets budget, a little subgroup of that and it's in the 13 budget. So, it should be in the budget going forward. The thing I wanted to say is that, when this was rolled out, I don't think it ever anyone's intention that it's going to be there forever but I think it's an innovative program and I think we need to do this for a few years and then evaluate it, to see what sort of effect it has, because if after 2 to 3 years that the lanes just deteriorate to the existing...the conditions were pre-investment, then perhaps we need to go back and look at the whole LI process and maybe look at the LI process. Because I can tell you that that is a convoluted process that often results in nothing more than a stalemate or Mexican standoff where you pit resident against resident; nobody wants to pay an extra \$20-25,000 for a back lane they say, we don't need. Resident A says we need it; resident B says we don't need it and there is all sorts of thresholds that are appealable via the...a survey. So, that process is very convoluted. So, we have a problem, it's very real in St. Boniface and in St. Vital and obviously your wards and through parts of the city. So, this is looking at a solution, it's short-term and I say we do it for a few years and evaluate the effects. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Concluding the comments and close, All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. We have no motions brought forward from Infrastructure Renewal, no By-laws; we do have a Question Period. Are there any questions? Councillor Eadie for Councillor Vandal.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. To the Chairperson of the Public Works Committee; I wanted to actually start off by thanking the Public Works Committee for moving ahead the last year's issue about obtaining and getting planters maintained on Main Street on the medians, and those would be laid out today and it is very inspiring, and so, but just a question oriented towards that. I'm wondering about the...if you could find out what the distribution of those planters, how that was decided and how it came about, as I'm receiving questions myself from people, who, stakeholders along Main Street.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker, to Councillor Eadie through you. I will speak to Councillor Eadie and get further clarification on the question and for sure we'll follow up with the Director to see how that distribution was arrived at.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Public Works Infrastructure Renewal? Seeing none. Thank you. We'll move on to Finance Committee Report, there is no report; there are no motions, no consideration of By-laws. Do we have any questions for the Chair of Finance? Seeing none. We'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee for Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management. There's no report, there's no motions, there's no consideration of by-laws. Do we have any questions for Councillor Swandel, Chair of the Downtown Committee? Seeing none we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development and Councillor Browaty.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MAY 8, 2012

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce the report of May 8 and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 through 4, 5 as amended and 6 through 9.

Mr. Speaker: Nobody standing anything down? So we're voting on 1 through 4, 5 as amended. We'll consider 5 by itself. All those in favour...I'm sorry? Yeah we're pulling 5. One through four, All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. 6 through 9? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item number 5.

Item 5 - Review of Existing Secondary Suite Zoning Regulations

Motion No. 1

Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item No. 5 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated May 8, 2012, be amended by adding the word "attached" before the words "secondary suites", to read as follows:

"D. That Section 5. B. of the Development Procedures By-law No. 160/2011 be amended to include attached secondary suites as a use that the Director of Planning, Property and Development consider as a "B" Conditional Use."

Councillor Browaty: The amendment that's brought forward here was just a bit of clarification. Apparently the Clerk didn't get the intentions of the Committee in the provisions that were made at the Standing Policy Committee. Following Councillor seminar it was raised by one of the members of Council that perhaps going to an allowed status without conditional use for attached secondary suites was maybe too far in the first step. We're now doing something called the equivalent of a B variance; where the Director of Planning, Property and Development can approve a detached secondary suite with a period to allow people to appeal it. It will be posted on the property for 14 days and assuming there is no appeal, it can be brought through much quicker and this is a big step forward and the public service is very supportive of this particular amendment and this is again, just a little bit of clarification.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions regarding Item 5? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I have to admit, I thought this was my next traffic circle event for myself in the neighbourhood. As historical neighbourhood have a tendency to be very concerned about the concept of adding, let's say, a secondary suite or subdividing lots, in-fill in the middle of the blocks and what not. So I'm very happy to see that this amendment was put in. It allows me to be much more comfortable, it gives the public the opportunity in those circumstances where it just does work. Winnipeg is a very complex, diverse city with very different needs, so I think there are some circumstances where this may not be appropriate. However, why then would...as this gentleman yelled at me quite a bit about the other day, why would I approve something like this? I see this for my neighbourhood and other neighbourhoods that have large historical buildings. The fact of the matter is that baby boomers are leaving. You'll see it in assessment value of areas of the larger homes where that assessed value isn't going up as fast. What I see happening with everything that I've read is going to be happening, is large homes in the circle neighbourhoods, people are going to be moving out of those into condos and these homes aren't filling up as fast because of the maintenance they require, the cost they require to heat, and what not, so the value actually of those houses is decreasing. So, if I want to find a way, which we all do in our neighbourhoods, to have our mother to be with us but still living independently, I don't...not every mother wants to live in the same room as their other children but living maybe on a separate independent suite. It also allows your children, heaven forbid my children want to stay with me when they get to that age, but they do, it will allow them to have their own space and again, they can start learning how to live independently. But for me, what it does also, the secondary plan, or secondary suite allows, is that infill in a very, let's say, in a very gentle way. It's not a condo, four-plex condo going in the middle of a block. It's not huge skyscrapers going up in the

middle of the block. It's actually a way to increase some density which we need to do for many reasons, in a way that's subtle. The detached one off the back lane that may be a little separate but again, we have a different process for that so when it does work it will...it can work but the neighbourhood can still be involved and say my window is here, so face it there and so that not. Just so you know, I did reach out really hard because I was terrified about the back lash I'd get, so we sent out thousands of pieces of literature, we have on our web page, we have the appeal process, the technical information and how it will impact your neighbourhood directly. And we sent all this out and for other Councillors who maybe as a little nervous as I am, I've had a total of two negative calls, two. And again, what that worries me is that I don't believe it's engaged them well enough. I don't respond and say well everyone must be happy then. We did that with traffic circles and that's not the truth. The question is have they engaged? Again, I think that city Council has done everything we can, to engage them. We've had numerous public open houses which have not been that well attended. Local Councillors have done what they can but I believe that generally, I have to make a call which I think is the betterment for my community, not just today, not during my election period, but as those baby boomers are leaving, as these houses become more expensive to maintain, can we find a balance to allow some more of that in? I don't think... I don't see is as a huge onslaught of secondary suites happening throughout the neighbourhood. These old houses require a fair bit of permit work to be able to be affordable in that regards. I also know that presently that we have many illegal secondary suites happening throughout the neighbourhoods and you can see it, so hopefully this will help balance that off a bit and bring some into code. So, I will be supporting that especially with the opportunity for the public to appeal even the attached. I think that's really important, just to make sure it fits the context, so I appreciate the amendment. I appreciate actually the secondary suites. I think in the long run it will have a very positive impact. Some people today might not believe so but I believe in the long term, it will be a very positive impact for some of the older inner-city neighbourhoods, so I will be supporting it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just quickly, I was one that raised this issue as perhaps being...needed to put this additional layer of approval at least that the residents would have a chance to appeal, if the condition was approved by the Director. My fear was because of what was going on around the University of Manitoba. We have a great deal of older homes that were built as single family homes and either have a large number of students living in them and sharing them or they are actually being run like illegal rooming houses or illegal multi-family situations of some way, shape or form. I think...this won't totally get rid of that, there will be some people that will go through normal processes but I think there's huge challenge that comes with these types of renovations. When you get into the building code issues that exist with old buildings as Councillor Orlikow was talking about, these historic neighbourhoods, many people choose not to do this when they see the cost of the building code requirements for the whole building. You know, you're not just dealing with the new construction when you're doing that, there's a whole bunch of things that start to fall into place and this might not have as big an impact in historic neighbourhoods as people would think because the economics might drive people away from it. But I think, what we might see, we might see some of the newer developments being done; some new development being done with secondary suites contemplated at construction. People wanting to have their aging parents with them. I think where there are newer homes, people looking at it now, as an opportunity to help look after either parents or children that won't leave the nest. Some of us have that issue. Easy Jenny, you're not supposed to jump up and down. And so there are some opportunities created by this. And we know, you know, this is sort of coming out of places where there's far greater housing prices when we look at places like Toronto and Vancouver, and Calgary, where the housing prices are 8 or 10 times the annual family incomes, where here we are down in the range of 3 to 4 times annual family incomes for decent housing. People need to find ways to pay for those mortgages. So some of it is purely on the financial side; that's not the case here, I think here it's more on the side of being able to look after our loved ones in different situations. So I'm certainly supportive and I thank Councillor Browaty for the leadership on getting the amendment in place here; listening to the concerns and finding a way to get it done. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Again I would like to thank the Department for directing us in going through this process, the public open houses and there was certainly a lot of feedback and comment from the community on this particular one. In Winnipeg they can see the rates are very, very low while housing today is generally more affordable than other jurisdictions; it's trending towards becoming more expensive. The cost of building a new single family home now, I think is approaching \$400,000. Compared to other jurisdictions it's affordable but in the grand scheme of things it's still quite expensive. The size of the average family is down. The number of people in each household is down. The cost of providing the infrastructure to all these various communities of single family homes doesn't change but the number of people living there is changing; a very good reason to look at improving density in some cases, by doing these secondary suites. There's still a requirement throughout this that every property with a secondary suite has at least 2 stalls of off-street parking otherwise you need a whole separate conditional use and a full blown public hearing; if you want to do something where there isn't a minimum of two off-street parking stalls available.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 30, 2012

You can only do one suite per property. We're not talking about building massive rooming houses out by the University. This is one legal secondary suite, has to be significantly smaller than the primary dwelling on the unit, or on property; up to 1/3 in size. You can't have two doors unless they previously existed on the street facing the street, so that if you're in a neighbourhood that's traditionally single family it doesn't appear out of place because you're starting to put R2 or duplex style residential. This is again, a baby step. It's the appropriate thing to do and very happy to bring this forward today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Browaty. All those in favour of the amendment? Opposed? Carried. All those in favour of the amended Item, All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. We have no motions further to number 1 but we do have some by-laws for Councillor Browaty.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I would like to read the following by-laws a first time By-law number 72/2012, 73/2012, 74/2012, 78/2012, and 79/2012.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 72/2012, By-law No. 73/2012, By-law No. 74/2012, By-law No. 78/2012, By-law No. 79/2012.

Councillor Browaty: Mr. Speaker I move that the By-laws numbered 72/2012 to 74/2012 both inclusive; By-law No. 78/2012 and By-law No. 79/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 72/2012 to 74/2012 both inclusive, By-law No. 78/2012 and By-law No. 79/2012.

Councillor Browaty: Mr. Speaker I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 72/2012 to 74/2012 both inclusive and By-law No. 78/2012 and By-law No. 79/2012 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. We have question period for Property and Development. Councillor Smith.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Smith: I asked you at the last meeting when the report on electronic message centres, which your Standing Committee authorized on July 5th, 2011, almost a year ago, was going to come out. This morning there were cries of our Council not having the sources of revenue of the two other levels of government, yet we are allowing electronic message centres not to pay a cent to the City. The electronic message centre at Portage and Main was approved on June 17th, 2008, and thus we have lost revenue because your department has not been able to devise a revenue formula for such centres. How many years will your department need to deal with this matter?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to say to the Councillor that I spoke with the Director of Land Use Planning last week. I understand that the report is imminent. Part of the request from the Committee, in fact last year, was to go and take a look across the country to see what is being done in terms of revenue opportunities. I'm certainly hopeful that the recommendation from the Department will include some enhanced revenue opportunities (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Smith: Aside from that...I brought the matter up. That's why your Committee had it before you. But I'm wondering why since 2008 the Department has not been able to have a formula for these electronic message centres. I mean, it took all this time to have something happening, and you know, on your Committee, you have Councillor Wyatt who talks about lack of resources and here we have electronic message centres that have bring in a lot of revenue with

ads from various organizations and we've neglected it, and I'm wondering why it has taken all these years to deal with this matter?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Smith. 2008, the electronic message centre was not what it is today. Black screens with red letters and stuff. The technology is changing rapidly. The cost of these big colour full motion signs has dropped massively in the last four years. I mean, we need to clean up our streets; we need to clean up the esthetics of our streets. We need to move away fully and completely in my opinion from mobile signs and moving to E.M.C.s. They're great opportunities for businesses to promote themselves. We just need to make sure it is done in a proper, reasonable, balanced way, and I'm confident that when we see this report, there'll be a good opportunity for all of Council to participate in a discussion on it. There's going to be opinions on all sides of this issue, how far we want to go, where we need to land on this whole thing. The industry has an opinion, businesses have an opinion, and neighbourhood activists will have an opinion as well. We need to make sure that once this report is out, that we have a good discussion on it as well.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question is in regards to Parcel 4. You might recall a water park debate on that. But knowing that the Mayor is not really able to speak to that property issue, I guess I'm directing my question through you to the Chair of Property and Development. I think most of us agree here that the water park process, however well-intentioned, did not result in a very positive outcome. Nothing is moving forward and it's kind of a public relations disaster. So I guess what I'm asking is, what many people have suggested, a potential process moving forward that would be better, which would involve sitting down with the stakeholders at The Forks, the Human Rights Museum and other downtown stakeholders, and establishing a thoughtful, well thought out plan for that very significant piece of land, and I guess what I'm wondering and I would hope they would look at options that fit with what's there now and the bigger plans that are in place already for The Forks and other things. So as Chair of P and D, what steps do you see as the next steps to move forward with this important piece of land?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. The particular parcel of land we're talking about actually falls in the Downtown Zoning By-law area, so it actually falls to the Chair of the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management, but I will just make the comment that increased and improved public consultation is something that I think we can all embrace. I recently had the opportunity to attend the American Planning Association Conference down in Los Angeles, California. Actually I attended the conference last year in Boston. Councillor Havixbeck? Councillor Havixbeck? Can you hold out your book for a second?

Councillor Havixbeck: Oh yes, you shared it with me. Thank you.

Councillor Browaty: I have additional copies of this particular book. It's a book called "Successful Public Meetings" and it's published by the American Planning Association. I happened to pick up a copy of it last year in Boston. Had a big public consultation in late April of last year. Teaches you a lot of really, really great things on how to do proper public consultation understanding that, you know, sometimes when you go to the public you shouldn't say, "hey, everything's a blue sky" when in fact you've already determined certain items. These are items that are already pre-determined. Here's where we are looking for additional feedback and comment. Some of the stuff in there that are super basic but kind of blank is give a big room of people...when people are coming into the room, stand at the door as people are coming in to look them in the eye before they're that faceless, nameless person in the back of the room that gets a microphone and starts heckling you. So, I have additional copies of the book in my office. If anyone would like to borrow one, you're most welcome to have it.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well I guess it's just not my day to ask questions Mr. Speaker. I missed my chance to. I'm sure I'll get another chance to discuss it with Councillor Swandel.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman, just in terms of the division of downtown and where the Property, Planning and Development and the Committee has a role to play, I have a question in regard to...I was just invited to a River City Connections open house about a consultation that was done by this group that was talking about what to do with the riverbanks all the way through from as far north as my ward at the Louise Bridge area, all the way south and so on, and

so I'm wondering if the Chairperson can explain to me what this River Cities Connection consultation, how is that going to interface with the downtown, planning and property...

Mr. Speaker: Is this, Councillor Eadie, is this not a question...I don't really see it being Public, or Property and Development.

Councillor Eadie: No, as a matter of fact The Forks is part of...it's riverbank and this Parcel 4 is actually, depending on where you are along the river...

Councillor Swandel: This isn't a question period for Downtown Development; it's a question period for Property and Development...

Councillor Eadie: I'm not asking...excuse me...I would like to then explain myself one more time.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Eadie: The River Cities Connection is talking about going as far north along the riverbank...

Mr. Speaker: Right, we got that.

Councillor Eadie: ...to the Mynarski Ward which is not in the downtown area, and as well into south Point Douglas which I don't think is in the downtown area as well, so my question to Property and Planning is simply how are we going to interface this particular consultation with the Downtown Committee? I'm asking is there some efforts here between the two committees to figure out how that's working? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty, but just to be clear, the Downtown Committee is also a Riverbank Committee.

Councillor Browaty: Right. That's where I was going to start my comments. Anything to do with the development and promotion and preservation and economic opportunities of our riverbanks, I think would fall under the Riverbank Management Committee. As the Chair of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, I'm an automatic member on the Downtown Committee, but my understanding is if you have any questions on the River City Connection piece, the City of Winnipeg's representative on that particular group is actually our Chief Operating Officer, Mr. Deepak Joshi. If there's any way, any additional questions you have on that, you can certainly ask him. Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Second question, just as a follow up, this particular consultation though, you know, the aspects that we're talking about, go beyond right at the riverbank and I understood that the Riverbank Management, as Councillor Lazarenko helped to define it over the years, was more about riverbank erosion and making sure that the riverbanks are stable. I don't see how that has anything to do with the actual planning for what gets...that's a small detail about what plans are meant for development. Can you answer that question?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I do understand that, you know, certainly the primary function of the former Riverbank Management Committee was dealing with riverbank erosion and preservation, however in recent times, I do know Councillor Swandel, or Chairman Swandel, has frequently brought up economic development opportunities as they relate to our river ways, and that this River City stuff I think would follow most appropriately under the riverbank portion of Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, we will move on from Property and Development to Standing Policy Committee of Protection and Community Services.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED APRIL 30, 2012

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce Item number 1 which is the Community Incentive Grant for the Broadway Neighbourhood Centre. Did not meet criteria but I would like to move that item forward.

Mr. Speaker: No comments? Seeing none, All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. There are no motions for Protection and Community Services, no by-laws; do we have questions for Councillor Havixbeck, Chair of the Committee?

Seeing none we'll move on to Alternate Services Committee, Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICES DELIVERY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 22, 2012

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce report and move adoption items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Any comments? Nobody interested in sharing any thoughts? All those in favour of 1 and 2? Opposed? Carried. You know, if you would prefer that I bring Councillor Pagtakhan up here for these last two motions, I'll just invite him to come forward and I'll just make the motion on Governance....

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED APRIL 12, 2012

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, for the report of Governance Committee dated April 12th, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: I'd like to move Item 1 with regard to the report from the Chief Electoral Officer for the election of 2010.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Eadie and Councillor Mayes.

Item 1 – Senior Election Official's Report and Recommendations – 2010 General Civic Election

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Madam Clerk; and we'll let Mr. Speaker open up

Councillor Nordman: Councillor Eadie, please give me your question and we'll see what we can do to resolve your concern.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Speaker Pagtakhan. I had other meetings booked when we had some discussions about the report being sent back but, I just want people to know, I will be voting for this report today, but I have to say though, I am disappointed that a motion that I'd moved to amend to allow for City Councillors to start spending money and raising money at the same time as the Mayor did, especially given that for City Council and for the Mayor raise for that matter. We're not like the other levels of government where we get to raise funds all year around through year in and year out, we're not allowed to do that especially as to applies to the rebate; so there were some concerns here and I noticed in this current report it talks about extending the period of time for Councillors, basically to extend the election period which means you could do more fundraising. But, that doesn't alleviate the concerns because you know, I'm not...I believe in democracy. I ran in a number of elections and I've lost and I've won some and I need to point out here that it is difficult and our democratic process needs to be more open, let people get involved and get involved in this. And so the people who lose elections are not going to be able to raise any money, 60 more days after the election as... it doesn't matter. If you lose the election; raising money. So the proposal I put on the table for this particular report would have seen people having a better opportunity to do that ahead of time, to do it before and try to raise as much money as they can before the actual election day because again, nobody wants to give money to a loser, right? And as an individual you are no longer able to pay off the debt without violating the elections laws in this province as it relates to the municipalities, and so I still know see how this is going to protect it. So I'm going to vote for this particular report because I think there are a lot of good suggestions here, despite our delegation that came to say they had some problems with it. But I'm pretty well okay with it and in stating my reservation, I know these are just recommendations to

the province and I would like people to understand that, as this moves forward to the province and if they are considering any amendments, I will as a personal person who's involved in the democratic process as a politician, will present the idea that the City Councillors should be able to register at the same time the Mayoralty candidates in this case May the 1st. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker, question through the Speaker to the Speaker, as it were to Mr. Nordman or his staff, Mr. Gold appeared what seems several hours ago, to make a couple of points about provision E and F which are about third party advertising and about campaign advertising. Just to be clear, these are just recommendations to the province. So if people have issues with the detail of the wording, this is there and the province if they do want to do something here would have to go through a whole legislative process. The other issue that he raised, which pertained to Orthodox Jewish Community voting on a Saturday election, we may look to City Clerk's staff here for some advice as well. It's my understanding it's within our abilities to set advance polling locations however often and in whatever location we wish. His point was some people like to wait late but certainly we had advanced polls in the by-election no more than a week out from the actual election day. So during the by-election we had 14 advanced polls at individual buildings; 2 community advanced polls, during the election we had advanced polls at the universities; at shopping centres, so I just want people's concerns allayed I guess that, more than ever we're allowing opportunity to vote advance, if people do have an issue with the Saturday vote they'll have other opportunities. I know, Mr. Speaker you were...had some experiences in the by-election and of course in the general election you may have your own comments on that, but I didn't want people going away who might be watching this, thinking that we're somehow discriminating against that group because we do certainly have it within our power to set up advance voting locations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes, are there any other speakers? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I want to follow up because it was raised and I went to the Governance Committee and spoke to a number of the items. I want to thank the Speaker and the Committee for taking them into consideration and the Committee made a change whereby they held the original campaign date at the end of June and instead extended the amount of time at the back end in terms of paying off...raising funds to pay off an election debt and what I argued and I think Committee agreed, was that we...by moving up the date we're actually making it harder for non-incumbent members of Council to run because at the end of the day, if somebody here feels they are being challenged, they will do everything to clear their schedule other than meetings they have to attend and be able to campaign day in and day out and get paid while they campaigning day and night and be able to raise money and spend money verses somebody out there who has a 9:00 to 5:00 job, maybe can get a couple of weeks off, maybe a bit more to be able to run a campaign...to be able to go door to door full time, you know, I think that's a huge disadvantage so I felt this was an attack on the ability for non-incumbents to be able to run against incumbents. Are we Americans now? We want a 6 month campaign; we want a 9 month campaign, we want a one year campaign? Like they do down south. You know, we're Canadians and I'm proud to be Canadian and I believe we should make it easier for people to run and not harder. And this was going in the wrong direction, so I want to thank the Committee for the fact they saw that and made that change.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. No other speakers? To close, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The comments of the 3 or 4 Councillors that did address the report, the 60 days as Councillor Wyatt just suggested, came as a response to levelling the playing field. In many respects I agree with what Councillor Eadie said. I know trying to raise money after the fact is in no small measure an uphill battle. I won't say it's impossible but...well and I have too, in another life when I will share with you it was before we have the current legislation and when in your the heat of the battle and you go to your bank manager and say I need a line of credit and at the end of the day you're not victorious and you have \$6,500 worth of debt, you end up paying that off over 3 years, but it's a risk worth taking when you're in the heat of the battle. We don't have that flexibility anymore and at the end of the day you are not in a position likewise to have anything other than a balanced audit, hopefully. So we hope that the 60 day extension, along with extending the audit period; will allow for a fair presentation. To be honest, I was in the camp that felt moving the date forward to the same date as the Mayor, was the way to go but the committee prevailed; so I will leave it at that and we will send this to the province because ultimately they're the ones whose are going to decide. These are recommendations that we're sending. They are not by-laws, they are not anything more than that because as is quite obviously known that we are a creature of the province of Manitoba. As far as the advertising is concerned, yes Councillor Mayes, it is convoluted and as we get further towards this...what's appropriate for one group may not be appropriate for another and who is designated as being financially responsible for it has to be clarified. And I would suggest it probably is something that the province has got to look at in their own backyard when they go forward.

With regard to the Saturday Sabbath issue with our friends in the Jewish Community, point well taken. We have many advanced polls. The advance polls will allow you to vote at Polo Park if you live in St. Vital; you can vote at the University of Winnipeg if you live in Garden City. There are very flexible opportunities and those few hours, and Mr. Gold may like to go and vote at 7:45 on the evening of the election, but I think that we've made every accommodation, if in fact Saturday is the day we pick. We very well could pick Sunday, who knows. We will explore that as we go on but it does allow us all kinds of opportunities that this most recent election identified to us that we didn't, when we were not allowed into elementary and middle schools, even parking for instance, on a Wednesday as opposed to a Saturday when nobody's in the school parking lot, makes a big difference. So I think the fact that we're not doing anything that's not being done in a lot of other jurisdictions in Canada and in Europe, most recently you saw France having all their elections on the weekend. So we tried it with the by-election. I think it was a new scheme for the electorate, but at the end of the review we think we...we didn't do any worse on a Saturday than we had done in by-elections and I can just speak to Councillor Orlikow would you suggest a Tuesday or a Wednesday? It was midweek, the percentages were pretty much the same. So, I will leave it at that ladies and gentlemen and ask you for your support of Item 1.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Nordman, on the main clause, I'll call the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried and for the report of May 10th. Councillor Nordman.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED MAY 10, 2012

Councillor Nordman: Council, in the month of July we are asking basically to just move all of the dates back a week rather than Council on the 25th, we'll move it back to the 18th and the corresponding, moving back of the Standing Committee Meetings from the 10th to the third vis-a-vis the already posted dates and we would like your approval on that, the Governance Committee is comfortable with doing that. We think it facilitates our needs quite well thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor, on the main clause... sorry, point of order Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Not a point of order, just want to speak to the motion. I appreciate the motion I think it's great. But I just wanted to mention it cuts into my fringe festival time. Thanks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Alright, on the main clause, All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And Councillor Steen moves that Council do now adjourn. We're adjourned and roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 2:43 p.m.