CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF THE

COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, PARKS AND CULTURE

The Executive Policy Committee has had before it the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991, has concurred in the recommendations contained therein, except as noted below, and submits same to Council for approval and adoption.

On motion of Councillor Douglas, the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991, was considered clause by clause.

Moved by Councillor Thomas,
That the rule be suspended to allow consideration of the following motion at this time.

Carried.

Moved by Councillor Lorenc,
Seconded by Councillor Mendelson,

1306 - That Council approve a Community Incentive grant to the North End Women's Centre, Inc., in the amount of $20,000.00; And that this grant be a first charge against the Lord Selkirk - West Kildonan Community Committee's 1992 Community Incentive Grant Account.

Carried.

(Note: See Minute No. 1309.)

North Committee Room,
Council Building, Winnipeg.
September 9th, 1991

His Worship the Mayor and Councillors:

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture submits the following Report and recommends:

Community Incentive Grant Application -
Victory School Parent Advisory Council
Lord Selkirk- West Kildonan Community
File PR-2.6(24)

1307 - 1. On July 31st, 1991, Council referred back to your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, a recommendation for funding in the amount of $8,000.00 to the Victory School Parent Advisory Council under the 1991 Community Incentive Grant Program.

On September 9th, 1991, your Committee reconsidered the application from the Victory School Parent Advisory Council, for a 1991 Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $20,000.00 for a Wheelchair Accessible Playground at 395 Jefferson Avenue, in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community.

The Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee has recommended approval of this project in the amount of $10,000.00. The total cost of the project is estimated at $88,000.00.

Under the definition of Eligible Applicants within the 1991 Community Incentive Grant program criteria, this organization would not normally be considered a "sport or recreation" organization although it has been noted that a component of its service to the community is of a recreational nature and that this project would benefit the community.

After reconsidering all grant applications in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee area, your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture resubmits for favourable consideration the following recommendations:

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

1. That the criteria for the Community Incentive Grant program be waived in this instance.

2. That the amount of $8,000.00 be approved for payment to the Victory School Parent Advisory Council, subject to:-

   (a) Confirmation of all funding sources;

   (b) Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the General Manager of Parks and Recreation;

   (c) The applicant entering into a formal agreement with The City of Winnipeg.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Your Executive Policy Committee recommends:-

1. That recommendation 2. be amended by deleting the figure $8,000.00 in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the figure $10,000.00.

2. That recommendation 3. be renumbered to recommendation 4. and that a new recommendation 3. be added to read as follows:-

"3. That the Victory School Parent Advisory Council be canvassed to determine what amount, if any, they would be prepared to allocate from their Community Incentive grant, to the North End Women's Centre Inc."

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

In amendment,

Moved by Mayor Norrie,
That the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee be adopted.

Carried.

The motion for the adoption of the clause, as amended, was put and declared carried.

Community Incentive Grant Application -
Northwood Community Centre Inc.
Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community
File PR-2.6(24)

1308 - 2. On July 31st, 1991, Council referred back to your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, a recommendation for funding in the amount of $32,000.00 to the Northwood Community Centre Inc., under the 1991 Community Incentive Grant Program.

On September 9th, 1991, your Committee reconsidered the application from the Northwood Community Centre, for a 1991 Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $100,000.00 for restructuring the Northwood Community Club at 1415 Burrows Avenue in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community.

The Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee has recommended approval of this project in the amount of $40,000.00. The total cost of the project is estimated at $1,000,000.00.

Under the definition of Eligible Applicants within the 1991 Community Incentive Grant program criteria, this organization would not normally be considered as other civic funding is to be utilized. Core Area Initiative funding in the amount of $500,000.00 has been allocated for the Burrows Shaughnessy Revitalization Program.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

After reconsidering all grant applications in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee area, your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture resubmits for favourable consideration the following recommendations:

1. That the criteria for the Community Incentive Grant program be waived in this instance.

2. That the amount of $32,000.00 be approved for payment to the Northwood Community Centre Inc., subject to:-

   (a) Confirmation of all funding sources;

   (b) Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the General Manager of Parks and Recreation;

   (c) The applicant entering into a formal agreement with The City of Winnipeg.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Your Executive Policy Committee recommends:-

1. That recommendation 2. be amended by deleting the figure $32,000.00 in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the figure $40,000.00.

2. That recommendation 3. be renumbered to recommendation 4. and that a new recommendation 3. be added to read as follows:-

"3. That the Northwood Community Centre Inc. be canvassed to determine what amount, if any, they would be prepared to allocate from their Community Incentive grant, to the North End Women's Centre Inc."

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

In amendment,

Moved by Mayor Norrie,
That the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee be adopted.

Carried.

The motion for the adoption of the clause, as amended, was put and declared carried.

Community Incentive Grant Application -
North End Women's Centre Inc.
Lord Selkirk - West Kildonan Community
File PR-2.6(24)

1309 - 3. On July 31st, 1991, Council referred back to your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture a recommendation for funding in the amount of $20,000.00 to the North End Women's Centre Inc. under the 1991 Community Incentive Grant Program.

On September 9th, 1991, your Committee reconsidered the application from the North End Women's Centre Inc., for a 1991 Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $40,000.00 towards a new building program.

The Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee considered this application but did not recommend funding inasmuch as the program was not considered to be a traditional City of Winnipeg recreational/sport responsibility. The total cost of the project is estimated at $400,000.00.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

An Administrative assessment in relation to program eligibility and selection criteria under the Community Incentive Grant Program has determined that this project does not meet all the established criteria inasmuch as the organization cannot be considered a sport/recreational organization and Core Area Initiative funding in the amount of $100,000.00 has been allocated.

After reconsidering all grant applications in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee area, your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture resubmits for favourable consideration the following recommendations:

1. That the criteria for the Community Incentive Grant program be waived in this instance.

2. That the amount of $20,000.00 be approved for payment to the North End Women's Centre Inc., subject to:-

   (a) Confirmation of all funding sources;

   (b) Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the General Manager of Parks and Recreation;

   (c) The applicant entering into a formal agreement with The City of Winnipeg.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Your Executive Policy Committee recommends that the above recommendations be not concurred in in view of the fact that the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee did not recommend funding inasmuch as the program was not considered to be a traditional City of Winnipeg recreational/sport responsibility.

Further to the above, your Executive Policy Committee recommends that the Parks and Recreation Department be requested to canvass the Community Incentive Grant funds in all Communities to determine what amount, if any, is unexpended and in co-operation with said Community Committees, determine whether any of the Community Committees would be prepared to make available the said unexpended Community Incentive Grant funds to the North End Women's Centre Inc. and that other unexpended funds in the Community Incentive Grant Program from previous years be canvassed to see if they can be made available to the North End Women's Centre Inc.

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
That the clause and proposed amendment be filed.

Carried.

(Note: See Minute No. 1306.)

Community Incentive Grant Application -
Aberdeen/Argyle School (now known as the
Aboriginal High School) Community Council
Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community
File PR-2.6(24)

1310 - 4. On July 31st, 1991 Council referred back to your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, a recommendation for funding in the amount of $15,107.20 to the Aberdeen/Argyle School Community Council under the 1991 Community Incentive Grant Program.

On September 9th, 1991 your Committee reconsidered the application from the Aberdeen/Argyle School Community Council, for a 1991 Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $60,000.00 for School Ground Re-development at 450 Flora Avenue in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community.

The Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee has recommended approval of this project in the amount of $18,884.00. The total cost of the project is estimated at $240,000.00.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

Under the definition of Eligible Applicants within the 1991 Community Incentive Grant program criteria, this organization would not normally be considered a "sport or recreation" organization although it has been noted that a component of its service to the community is of a recreational nature and that this project would benefit the community. The project will provide for renovations to an existing facility which serves two school populations and the Boys and Girls Club.

After reconsidering all grant applications in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee area, your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture resubmits for favourable consideration the following recommendations:

1. That the criteria for the Community Incentive Grant program be waived in this instance.

2. That the amount of $15,107.20 be approved for payment to the Aberdeen/Argyle School Community Council, subject to:-

   (a) Confirmation of all funding sources;

   (b) Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the General Manager of Parks and Recreation;

   (c) The applicant entering into a formal agreement with The City of Winnipeg.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Your Executive Policy Committee recommends:-

1. That recommendation 2. be amended by deleting the figure $15,107.20 in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the figure $18,884.00.

2. That recommendation 3. be renumbered to recommendation 4. and that a new recommendation 3. be added to read as follows:-

"3. That the Aberdeen/Argyle School Community Council be canvassed to determine what amount, if any, they would be prepared to allocate from their Community Incentive grant, to the North End Women's Centre Inc."

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

In amendment,
Moved by Mayor Norrie,
That the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee be adopted.

Carried.

The motion for the adoption of the clause, as amended, was put and declared carried.

Community Incentive Grant Application -
Canford Sports Group St. Boniface –
St. Vital Community
File PR-2.6

1311 - 5. On July 10th, 1991, Council approved a Community Incentive Grant to the Canford Sports Group in the amount of $25,000.00 from the St. Boniface - St. Vital Community Incentive Grant fund. The total cost of the relocation project is estimated at $1,070,000.00.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

On July 30th, 1991, the St. Boniface - St. Vital Community Committee recommended an additional Community Incentive Grant to the Canford Sports Group in the amount of $3,745.00 from its uncommitted funds resulting in a total grant of $28,745.00.

An administrative assessment in relation to program eligibility and selection criteria under the Community Incentive Grant Program has determined that this project does not meet all the established criteria since this project is dependent upon additional funding in the amount of $300,000.00 from the City of Winnipeg and funds in the amount of $23,109.50 have been approved from the City-wide Community Incentive Grant fund.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture concurs in the recommendation of the St. Boniface - St. Vital Community Committee and recommends as follows:

1. That the criteria for the Community Incentive Grant Program be waived in this instance.

2. That the previous approval of the Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $25,000.00 be rescinded; and that a total amount of $28,745.00 be approved for payment to the Canford Sports Group subject to:-

   a) Confirmation of all funding sources;

   b) Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the General Manager of Parks and Recreation;

   c) The applicant entering into a formal agreement with The City of Winnipeg.

3. That the proper officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

Moved by Councillor Lazarenko,
That the clause be referred back.

Lost.

The motion for the adoption of the clause was put and declared carried.

Community Incentive Grant Application
Windsor Community Centre
St. Boniface-St. Vital Community
File PR-2.6

1312 - 6. On July 31st, 1991, Council approved a Community Incentive Grant to the Windsor Community Centre in the amount of $121,192.00 for upgrading the Community Centre grounds at 99 Springside Drive in the St. Boniface-St. Vital Community Committee.

Under the definition of Eligible Applicants within the 1991 Community Incentive Grant program criteria, this project does not meet the criteria as the grant request exceeds the $100,000.00 funding limit. Community Incentive Grants were awarded in 1989 and 1990 for $22,400.00 and $93,792.00 respectively. None of these funds have been utilized to date, nor has the project started. The Community Centre has not developed a comprehensive revitalization project for their facility and is prepared to begin the implementation phase.

On July 9th, 1991, the St. Boniface-St. Vital Community Committee rescinded motions for funding from the 1989, 1990 and 1991 Community Incentive Grant funds and recommended that a single 1991 grant in the amount of $124,937.00 be approved.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture concurs in the recommendation of the St. Boniface-St. Vital Community Committee and recommends as follows:-

1. That the criteria for the Community Incentive Grant program be waived in this instance.

2. That the previous approval of the Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $121,192.00 be rescinded; and that the amount of $124,937.00 be approved for payment to the Windsor Community Centre subject to:-

   a) Confirmation of all funding sources;

   b) Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the General Manager of Parks and Recreation;

   c) The applicant entering into a formal agreement with The City of Winnipeg.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Community Incentive Grant Application
H.S. Paul School St. Boniface - St. Vital
Community File PR-2.6(25)

1313 - 7. On September 9th, 1991, your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, considered a recommendation from the St. Boniface-St. Vital Community Committee that an amount of $5,000.00 be approved to the H.S. Paul School, for Play Space Development, from its 1991 Community Incentive Grant Program.

The St. Boniface-St. Vital Community Committee has recommended approval of this project in the amount of $5,000.00.

Under the definition of Eligible Applicants within the 1991 Community Incentive Grant program criteria, this organization would not normally be considered a "sport or recreation" organization although it has been noted that the provision of recreational opportunities does play a role in the organization's activities.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture concurs in the recommendation of the St. Boniface-St. Vital Community Committee and recommends:

1. That the criteria for the Community Incentive Grant program be waived in this instance.

2. That the amount of $5,000.00 be approved for payment to the H.S. Paul School, subject to:-

   (a) Confirmation of all funding sources.

   (b) Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the General Manager of Parks and Recreation.

   (c) The applicant entering into a formal agreement with the City of Winnipeg.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

Community Incentive Grant Application
Lord Wolseley Community School Association
East Kildonan - Transcona Community
File PR-2.6(23)

1314 - 8. Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has considered an application from the Lord Wolseley Community School Association, for a 1991 Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $3,607.30 for expansion of playground equipment.

The East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee has recommended approval of this project in the amount of $1,785.75. The total cost of the project is estimated at $14,429.19.

An Administrative assessment in relation to program eligibility and selection criteria under the Community Incentive Grant Program has determined that this project does not meet the criteria established for the Community Incentive Grant Program as it is not a sport/recreation organization.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture concurs in the recommendation of the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee and recommends:

1. That the criteria for the Community Incentive Grant program be waived in this instance.

2. That the amount of $1,785.75 be approved for payment to the Lord Wolseley Community School Association, subject to:-

   (a) Confirmation of all funding sources.

   (b) Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the General Manager of Parks and Recreation.

   (c) The applicant entering into a formal agreement with the City of Winnipeg.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Revitalization and Enhancement Proposal –
Restoration of The English Garden in
Assiniboine Park - File PR-7.1

1315 - 9. The English Garden developed initially during the early 1930's on the site of the former park nursery in Assiniboine Park is now sixty years old. Long a major tourist attraction in the City, and the most prominent educational display of ornamental flowering species hardy to the Winnipeg area, the Garden is now evidencing signs of decline. A proposal for the long term revitalization of the English Garden is required in response to the following four current situations:-

1. The investigation of potential sites in Assiniboine Park for the display of the Leo Mol Sculpture Collection focused the attention of several individuals, including that of locally prominent design professionals, to the

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

marked deterioration of the Garden as a "horticultural showplace". The development in 1991 of the intensely landscaped Sculpture Garden immediately to the west of the English Garden, by contrast, will dramatize this deterioration even more profoundly to the general public.

2. The reputation of the English Garden has rested primarily on its brilliance of floral display almost exclusively attributable to annual flowers. The identification labelling of the wide range of annual flower species which traditionally comprised the floral display established the Garden as an extremely popular educational exhibit for gardening enthusiasts. This important instructive role of the Garden, however, has sharply diminished in recent years, as fewer and fewer species of annual flowers were planted out into the garden. Such has occurred as a response to budgetary constraints, and, a heavier reliance on fewer types of annual flower species which are more efficiently propagated, require less intensive ongoing maintenance and are more highly tolerant to extremes in weather conditions. As a result, the English Garden no longer displays the vast array of annual flowers which initially established its reputation and popularity as the finest floral display in Winnipeg.

3. In recent years, the two most consistent comments received from the public regarding the English Garden are -

   i) The Garden lacks the variety of flower types it used to display - As aforementioned, such has occurred as a reflection of economies in labour associated with the propagation, planting, and maintenance of thousands of bedding plants annually displayed in the Garden.

   ii) the Garden should be open for a longer period than 2 months each year - Unfortunately, based upon the Garden's almost exclusive use of bedding plants to create the floral display, and, the characteristic short life cycle of most annual flower species, there is little opportunity to extend the garden season to the public beyond the approximate 2 month period of active flowering.

4. The 1988 Survey of Well Being of Canadians, as a follow-up to the 1981 Canada Fitness Survey by the Federal Government, identifies gardening as the second most popular leisure activity participated in by 52% of all Canadians over 10 years of age. As well, gardening experienced the greatest increase in popularity among Canadians since the 1981 survey when only 30% of the population participated in gardening as a form of leisure. With a general trend towards earlier retirement ages and an aging "baby boom" population, the activity of gardening is only likely to increase in popularity in the future. The instructive role of the English Garden as a demonstration garden, therefore, will have even greater public value in the future than it has had to date.

The primary goal for the preparation of a masterplan for the English Garden has been to extend the length of the viewing season to the public and to revitalize the diversity of flowering species displayed in order to re-establish the traditional duality of role of the Garden to include, as well, public education of horticultural flowering species hardy to the Winnipeg area. Such an educational benefit of "demonstration gardens" is a time honoured tradition of the English Landscape Style of public parks, of which Assiniboine Park is the first and foremost example in Winnipeg.

Traditionally, the Garden is planted en masse during late May to early June, after danger of major frost; whereafter a period of three to four weeks is required for the young plants to mature and bloom sufficiently before the Garden presents a reasonably attractive floral display for the public at the beginning of July. By late August the flowering life cycle of most annual flowering varieties is essentially complete and the plants become highly susceptible to early frosts in September. As considerable time is required to remove all the annual flower varieties and prepare the planting beds for the following spring; the Garden is closed to the public early in September.

However, rather than a heavy reliance on annual flowers for developing such an educational display, the masterplan proposes the gradual phasing in of a range of perennial flower species and varieties to supplement, and

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

compliment, the annual flower display. By so doing, the diversity, or "richness", of floral displays will not only be greatly enhanced; but, the season of availability to the public could be extended, ultimately to between 4 to 4 ½ months. Such must be a gradual process, covering a 5 to 8 year span, in order not to abruptly disrupt the aesthetics of the Garden to the visiting public during the transition stages (perennials generally require 2 to 3 years of maturation to attain full display quality).

It, moreover, is not the intent to eliminate the display of annual flowers altogether; but only to reduce the extensive, almost exclusive dependence of the Garden display on annual flowers. Selective, high profile areas for the display of annual flowers will be retained for the dramatic brilliance of floral colour provided by annual flowers during mid to late summer when blooming of most perennial species is dormant. The masterplan proposes that ultimately a total of 325 species of annual and perennial flowers would be displayed in an area which now displays approximately 100 species of annuals.

Being proposed as a gradual process, the transformance of the Garden could be accomplished at relatively insignificant cost to the City. Rather than a concentration of labour costs for planting, and, then removal of 35,000 to 40,000 bedding plants, as well as the attendant labour intensive weeding during the maturation stage of the young plants; these labour costs would be reduced accordingly as the annual flower beds are reduced in area, and, the labour savings redeployed over a longer span of several months to accommodate the maintenance requirements of perennial plantings. Fewer, albeit more highly skilled, staff would be required to maintain the English Garden for the extended period of 5 to 6 months; than the current labour intensive concentration in a 3 to 4 month period.

Moreover, the gradual conversion to perennial species could be accomplished at minimal additional costs for the supply of plant materials. Several species of potted plants utilized for seasonal displays in the Conservatory are hardy garden-type perennials; which following their usefulness for display purposes, could be readily naturalized if re-planted out of doors (it not being economically viable to repot and store the plants for re-use in subsequent displays). As well, most species of perennial flowers can be readily propagated from seed, and, could be grown in the Conservatory greenhouses in conjunction with the annual seed propagation program of bedding plants at insignificant additional cost. Moreover, the Morden Experimental Station has indicated tentative interest in providing numerous types of perennials for display in the English Garden as a means of promoting public awareness of the newer flower varieties.

Concurrent with the phased introduction of perennial species, the masterplan proposes the gradual removal of a large number of overly mature and deteriorating ornamental trees and shrubs distributed throughout the Garden, and, their replacement with newer landscape varieties of trees and shrubs with improved flowering habits or enhanced ornamental landscape value.

The proposed masterplan, identified as Plan No. 1, has been conscientiously "modelled" after the character typifying an English Country Garden; this being an immense collage of flowering annuals, perennials, trees and shrubs, informally placed, "as nature would", rather than as contrived, or regimented, patterns of colours. Closely allied to the need to expand the horticultural diversity of the Garden; is the need to restore various structural features and components of the Garden, as well as the incorporation of new features reminiscent and complimentary of the "old world charm" of a pastoral English Garden. These structural features and components are outlined in detail within the administrative report dated July 25th, 1991 entitled "Revitalization and Enhancement Proposal - Restoration of the English Garden in Assiniboine Park."

A composite detailed cost estimate for the restoration of the English Garden has purposely not been developed at this time for the primary reason that such improvements and changes, as are being proposed, should occur gradually, over an extended period of time and as funding sources and opportunities become available. Moreover, the increased horticultural diversity is the only component of the Masterplan to which the City need become directly committed in order to preserve the integrity of the Garden as the foremost floral display in the City, extend the season

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

of availability to the public, and maximize its educational benefits to the public. As stated previously, increasing the diversity of flowering species could be accomplished at little or no additional cost to either the Capital or Operating budgets of the Department. All the other special enhancement components recommended in the Masterplan; including the Garden Entrance, walkway paving, secondary pathways, Victorian Bower, Garden Arbor, Victorian Trellis, night lighting, benches and planters; could be incorporated as funding sources become available, and, are particularly amenable to project - specific sponsorship by private organizations and corporations, service groups and individuals.

The establishment of a steering committee, as recommended, to oversee and guide the redevelopment of the Garden could also assume responsibility for promoting sponsorships towards the various enhancement projects and for administering private donations towards Garden improvements.

The sixty year old English Garden is, unquestionably, still an extremely popular and valuable public attraction in the City's Parks and Recreation system; but, unmistakenly, it is in a state of declining quality. Also, the Garden is an extremely costly facility to maintain relative to its availability to the public for only two months each year. The Masterplan would attempt to reverse the trend towards deterioration, and enhance its attractiveness and educational value to the public, as well as extending the season for public availability; which, in turn, would garner increased public support towards its preservation into the future as the horticultural "jewel in the crown" of the Winnipeg parks system.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture recommends:

1. That the proposed masterplan for the revitalization and upgrading of the English Garden identified as Plan No. 1, be adopted in principle for implementation over time as funding opportunities become available.

2. That consideration be given to the establishment of an advisory committee, comprised of 3 to 4 citizens to be appointed in consultation with the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, to assist the administration in the long term planning of redevelopment of the English Garden; to review and revise implementation strategies; and to identify alternative funding sources for the phased implementation of the masterplan.

3. That the proper officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

The plan with respect to this proposal, which is too large to reproduce, is on file in the Office of the City Clerk.

Your Executive Policy Committee recommends that recommendation 1. be amended by adding the following phrase after the word "available" in the last line thereof, namely:-

", in accordance with the normal budget process."

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

In amendment,

Moved by Mayor Norrie,
That the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee be adopted.

Carried.

The motion for the adoption of the clause, as amended, was put and declared carried.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

Smoking in Community Centres
Files EH-1.2 and FB

1316 - 10. On September 28th, 1983 City Council passed By-law No. 3541/83 regulating smoking in areas of public access within the City of Winnipeg. (Appendix No. 1). The Parks and Recreation Department notified Community Centre volunteers that, as "places of public assembly" under this by-law, Community Centre facilities must maintain a minimum of 50% of their enclosed indoor space to be designated as a "no-smoking" area. Requirements regarding appropriate signage, availability of ashtrays etc. was also provided.

Since the smoking by-law was enacted, Community Centres have received regular reminders with regard to smoking restrictions within their facilities from both the Parks and Recreation Department and the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres.

In January, 1989, the City of Winnipeg established a Policy On Smoking in Civic Buildings (Appendix No. 2a). The goal of this policy was to "reduce smoke in the workplace to the standard where employees sensitive to, or affected by second-hand smoke, remain unaffected by smoke during the course of their full work day." This policy was revised in January, 1991 in consideration of the impending proclamation of Bill 16, an "Act to Protect the Health of Non-Smokers." In addition to reaffirming the intent of the original smoking policy, the revised Policy on Smoking In Civic buildings (Appendix No. 2b) limited designated smoking areas to those areas where non-smoking workers would not be affected by second hand smoke during the course of their work day, even at the inconvenience of the smoker. This policy now provided the same standard of exposure to second hand smoke at work as all citizens enjoyed in public places.

The Parks and Recreation Department did not request that Community Centres comply with the smoking restrictions applicable to civic-operated facilities. Prior to the concern raised at the Assiniboine Park/Fort Garry Community Committee meeting on March 25th, 1991, very few complaints had been received by the Parks and Recreation Department regarding smoking in Community Centre facilities.

The City of Winnipeg's Policy on Smoking In Civic Buildings is applicable to all civic-operated facilities. Community Centres, although ultimately owned by the City of Winnipeg, are administered and operated by volunteers. These volunteers implement and encourage participation in recreation and leisure programs designed for the residents within the area. The Parks and Recreation Department does not direct the programming at Community Centres, but rather relies on community volunteers to develop activities and services that reflect the specific needs and interests of that Community. In addition to the volunteer operation of Community Centres, these facilities can also be distinguished from civic-operated facilities in terms of funding. Although Community Centres do receive operating grants from the City of Winnipeg, these grants are insufficient to operate the facilities and provide programming. Consequently, Community Centre volunteers must raise additional funds to supplement their operational costs.

Two major sources of revenue for Community Centres are obtained through hall rentals and bingos. The implementation of no- smoking restrictions at Community Centres would severely impact on the success of these fund-raising ventures. Community Centre volunteers have expressed concerns that the consequences of no-smoking restrictions will result in fewer rentals, and decreased bingo attendance, thereby inhibiting the ability of Community Centres to generate revenue (Appendix No. 3). The significance of this potential revenue shortfall cannot be overlooked. An informal survey conducted by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (G.C.W.C.C.) in 1985 estimated that in excess of $500,000.00 in revenue was generated through hall rentals. As a number of Community Centres have expanded their facilities, this revenue figure will now be considerably higher.

Prior to the enactment of Bill 16, G.C.W.C.C. was approached by the Provincial Government regarding the perceived impact on Community Centres of the proposed smoking regulations (specifically, no more than 25% of floor space within one enclosed area be provided for smoking). A survey of G.C.W.C.C. membership (consisting of 79 Community Centres) revealed concerns related to reduced revenues as well as concerns regarding the

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

responsibility for enforcement of these restrictions. In consideration of these factors, the Provincial Government did not include Community Centres under the present Act and have indicated that these facilities will be addressed as a separate entity at a future date. (Appendix No. 4)

The issue of the enforcement of smoking restrictions at Community Centres also warrants discussion. Community Centre volunteers have stated that they are not willing to be placed in the position of "policing" other volunteers or members of the community. As there is currently a significant decline in volunteerism at Community Centres, it makes little sense to compound this problem with additional, undesirable volunteer responsibilities.

Similarly, the Parks and Recreation Department is not in a position to monitor and enforce smoke-free requirements at Community Centres. The Department has established a cooperative working relationship with Community Centres which includes the provision of operating grants, insurance, resources and the interpretation of policies and procedures. The Department does not directly regulate or police the operations or programming at Community Centres.

The Parks and Recreation Department encourages and supports smoke-free initiatives. However, recognizing the unique nature and function of Community Centres, the Department recommends that, within the parameters of existing by-laws, Community Centres retain the autonomy to determine the smoking restrictions applicable to these facilities.

At the meeting of the Assiniboine Park/Fort Garry Community Committee held on March 25th, 1991, the Community Committee requested that the Board of Commissioners examine the issue of smoking at Community Centres and, if required, recommend a policy regarding this issue.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture recommends:

1. That Community Centres be instructed to comply with all existing civic by-laws and provincial regulations regarding smoking restrictions in places of public assembly.

2. That Community Centres retain the power to determine whether or not they will go beyond the required civic by-laws and provincial regulations regarding smoking restrictions in places of public assembly, i.e. a completely smoke-free building, etc.

3. That the proper officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

The Introduction of an Advanced Life Support Program for the Citizens of Winnipeg – File GF-3

1317 - 11. In 1983 an Ad Hoc Committee on Ambulance Services in Winnipeg presented its findings and recommendations. Their report was adopted by Council on March 16th, 1983. Recommendation No. 6 of that report reads as follows:

"That upon his appointment, the Medical Director prepare a program for implementation of an Advanced Life Support Program for approval by City Council."

Your Committee has been advised that a program has been developed and tested through the provisions of an exhaustive pilot program for consideration.

The Ad Hoc Committee report of 1983 contained 13 recommendations (Appendix A). Recommendation No. 6 remains the only outstanding issue not yet implemented by the Department. The other

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

recommendations have been implemented and phased in during the last eight years. Recommendation No. 6, although extremely important, was also the most difficult to implement.

The Ambulance Department needed to establish an infrastructure that would support such an undertaking. In 1986, strong leadership and financial support permitted the Department to embark on a plan that would support the Department's needs and address many of the outstanding issues. A strong management team was assembled, staffing levels were addressed, new stations were built, and professional development plans were prepared.

At the same time, a training foundation was established. An E.M.T. Level I program was developed and taught. In 1986, this program received unconditional accreditation from the Canadian Medical Association. It is one of only seven accredited programs in Canada. An intermediate E.M.T. Level II program was established in 1989, expanding the skills and knowledge of ambulance attendants. This program was accredited by the Canadian Medical Association in 1990 and is only the second accredited Level II program in Canada. The Level II training now provides the citizens of Winnipeg with an intermediate level of service.

The question of whether the most advanced level of training, the paramedic or E.M.T. Level III, should be incorporated into the training and the services provided to the citizens of Winnipeg required careful consideration. It was felt by the Medical Director at the time, Dr. Moe Lerner, and the City's Medical Advisory Committee, that the need for advanced skills should be evaluated in a pilot project. The two purposes of the pilot project were:

(1) to evaluate the ability of ambulance personnel to perform advanced skills such as placement of breathing tubes (tracheal intubation) and administration of drugs that could revive the hearts of patients in cardiac arrest.

(2) to evaluate whether there was improved survival in patients with cardiac arrest when advanced life support was performed in the field rather than in the hospital.

Participation in the pilot project was initially by Operations Supervisors and Training Officers and then, in July, 1989, by eight field personnel through a letter of understanding obtained from the Board of Commissioners. The pilot project was an ambitious undertaking of training and data collection. It wasn't until 1990 that the full impact of the project could be evaluated. The data collected and its statistical analysis was presented by Dr. Nugent to the Medical Advisory Committee on April 2nd, 1991. At that meeting the Committee unanimously adopted the following motion:

> "Whereas the pilot project has demonstrated clear benefits to the citizens of Winnipeg from an A.L.S. system, it is moved that the Ambulance Service add full A.L.S. response to the pre- hospital services provided in the City of Winnipeg".

Cardiovascular disease and sudden cardiac death are a significant problem in Winnipeg. In 1990 alone there were 469 patients transported by the Ambulance Department in cardiac arrest (Appendix B). Each year many deaths are caused by heart attacks, strokes, and high blood pressure in our population. A large number of these deaths are sudden cardiac deaths, occurring outside of hospital and within hours of the onset of symptoms.

It was recognized in the late 1960's that these deaths could be substantially reduced by cardiopulmonary resuscitation (C.P.R.) of victims and the administration of Advanced Cardiac Life Support (A.L.S.). It became apparent that to save lives from out of hospital cardiac arrest, advanced cardiac life support had to be given immediately at the location where the patient collapsed. Rapidly responding emergency medical services with 911 systems became essential. Paramedics - the physician's eyes and ears - provided the advanced life support care. Advanced life support became an integral component of many emergency medical services, both in Canada and the United States (Appendix C).

The question of whether advanced life support should be incorporated into the Ambulance Department

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

and provided to the citizens of Winnipeg was the main undertaking of the pilot project. The evaluation criteria of the pilot project were previously mentioned. The results are as follows:

Competency of Ambulance Attendants

Personnel participating in the pilot project had many years of emergency experience supplemented by intermediate and advanced level courses. Despite these rigorous entry requirements, additional didactic teaching, hospital practicum and ambulance practicum experience was required to ensure a thorough knowledge and ability to perform advanced life support skills. The extent of training required for those providing advanced life support is outlined in Appendix D and Appendix E.

Since the beginning of the project, skills and abilities have been constantly monitored. Appendix F depicts the monitoring of competency of A.L.S. providers in just one of the many advanced life support skills - breathing tube insertion (tracheal intubation). It is a credit to the attendants as well as all those involved in their training that performance is so high. The Ambulance attendants participating in the pilot project exhibited skills and abilities that match the best paramedics in North America.

Patient Survival From Cardiac Arrest

In 1990 during the pilot project there were 165 cardiac arrest patients found in ventricular fibrillation. Ventricular fibrillation is a condition where the heart, instead of beating normally, moves in an uncoordinated fashion and cannot pump blood. A patient in ventricular fibrillation is unconscious with no blood pressure and within six minutes the brain begins to die from lack of oxygen. The current, intermediate level of service in Winnipeg provides for shocking of the heart (defibrillation) in this condition. Appendix G shows that when this was done in the 165 patients, only a small percentage (13%) of patients responded with return of a pulse. However, when additional advanced life support procedures such as tracheal intubation and drug injection were provided during the pilot project, pulses returned in another 24% of victims.

In patients where advanced life procedures were required for pulse return, the pilot project showed a clear and statistically significant benefit in patient survival when advanced life support was provided by ambulance attendants in the field (Appendix H). When patients received advanced life support in the field, the survival rate was 35%; when patients received advanced life support at the hospital only, the survival rate was 6%.

The poor survival rate from hospital treatment is a reflection of the delay in administration of advanced life support after cardiac arrest or 911 call. During the pilot project when the current, intermediate level of service was provided, the average 911 to hospital arrival time was 22.8 minutes (rapid transport, lights and sirens). When advanced life support personnel were dispatched concurrent with intermediate providers, advanced life procedures were performed an average of 11.4 minutes from the 911 call. The importance of time to advanced life support becomes apparent in Appendix I. In it, survival from cardiac arrest is compared with time to advanced life support treatment. The table shows that survival is clearly linked to rapidity of treatment.

During the pilot project, which was done with no additional resources added to the Ambulance Department, the ability to provide advanced life support in the field was inconsistent. Based on the pilot project data, however, it is possible to predict the change in survival rate for ventricular fibrillation if a complete advanced life support service was provided in Winnipeg. Appendix J projects the change in survival rate that would occur with an enhanced level of service. It is estimated that with advanced life support, survival from ventricular fibrillation would be 15% as compared to 6.6% with an intermediate level of care.

Appendix K shows actual survival rates in two Canadian cities that monitor cardiac arrest statistics. Both cities provide Advanced Life Support and demonstrate survival rates close to our projected survival rate. In Regina, the survival rate for ventricular fibrillation was 22% and in Calgary survival was 16%.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

Advanced Life Support in Non Cardiac Arrest Patients

Although the pilot project initially considered cardiac arrest patients, it became obvious during the project that many other patients benefited from advanced life support, though in less tangible ways than survival from cardiac arrest. Appendix L lists medical conditions other than cardiac arrest where patients benefited from advanced life support. Until the installation of the new computerized dispatch (CAD) system in Winnipeg, it is difficult to estimate the number of 911 calls where these conditions exist. However, in the City of Calgary where computerized monitoring of patient diagnoses has been done, it was found that 10% of all 911 calls required advanced life support (Appendix M). It would seem reasonable to expect the same percentage in Winnipeg. Thus many patients would be expected to benefit from advanced life support in Winnipeg. Appendix N reflects survivors from cardiac arrest in Winnipeg from January 1 to June 30, 1991.

Pilot Project Conclusions

The pilot project has clearly shown that Ambulance Department personnel are extremely competent as advanced life support providers. It has also shown that advanced life support in the field can save the lives of the citizens of Winnipeg.

The results of the pilot project have been reviewed by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba, the Manitoba Medical Association, and the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Manitoba. (Appendices O to R). Included as well is a letter from the Advanced Coronary Treatment Foundation of Canada endorsing paramedic care in Canada (Appendix S).

The Advanced Life Support Program in actual fact moves a part of the responsibilities of the different emergency wards to the actual scene of the problem. It is, therefore, reasonable to request the Province of Manitoba to fund this program as part of its health program.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has reviewed the Implementation Plan for Advanced Life Support (A.L.S.) Services (Appendix T) and therefore recommends:

1. That the City of Winnipeg implement a non-transporting advanced life support program.

2. That the Province of Manitoba be requested to fund the costs of said program.

3. That the proper officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Your Executive Policy Committee recommends that recommendations 1., 2. and 3. above be deleted in their entirety and the following be substituted therefor, namely:-

"1. That conditional upon complete Provincial funding, outside the annual Current Budget process, the City of Winnipeg endorse implementation of a non-transporting Advanced Life Support System.

2. That the City of Winnipeg seek public endorsement of recommendation 1. above as a proper Medicare cost and as a program supportable for implementation from the following:-

Canadian Medical Association
Manitoba Medical Association
Manitoba College of Physicians and Surgeons
Medical Advisory Committee

3. That the Mayor, the Chairman of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, the Medical Director of the Winnipeg Ambulance Department, the Director of the Winnipeg Ambulance Department plus representatives from the associations identified in recommendation 2. above, meet with the Premier and/or the Minister of Health to pursue funding of an entrenched Advanced Life Support program for the City of Winnipeg.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

4. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing."

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

In amendment,

Moved by Mayor Norrie,
That the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee be adopted.

In amendment,

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Seconded by Councillor Diamant,
That the amendment proposed by Executive Policy Committee to Clause 11 of the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991, be amended by adding the words "the Commissioner of Protection, Parks and Culture" in Recommendation No. 3 immediately following the words "Chairman of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture".

Carried.

The recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee, as amended, was put and declared carried.

The motion for the adoption of the clause, as amended, was put and declared carried.

(Note: Appendices "A" to "T" are on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

School Crossing Guard at Hampstead School - Files ST-4.1 and FE(1992)

1318 - 12. On December 9th, 1970 the City of East Kildonan applied to the Railroad Transport Commission for authorization to construct a pedestrian crossing across the Canadian Pacific Railways Mainline (2 sets of tracks) near the Hampstead School. As a result of this request, the Railroad Transport Commission issued order No. R-10342 which was amended with order No. R-12565 on September 14th, 1971. These orders stipulated the following conditions must be adhered to if this crossing was established:

1) The City was to erect a chain link fence and provide a watchman at the pedestrian crossing in the morning, at noon and in the afternoon at times when children were going to or from school.

2) The cost of the construction of the crossing was paid by the City of East Kildonan and all maintenance of the crossing since it was constructed has been paid for by the Railway.

3) Full height chain link fence gates were also to be installed on each approach to the crossing. The gates were to be kept locked when the watchman was not present.

4) The cost of the Watchman was to be paid by the City of East Kildonan.

This pedestrian crossing across the Canadian Pacific Railway Mainline has been manned by the same crossing guard since it was opened. On amalgamation of the City of Winnipeg the responsibilities of the maintenance of the gates and fence as well as the City's portion of the salary for the crossing guard, approximately $5,000.00 a year, became the responsibility of the City of Winnipeg. The River East School Division No. 9 also pays $5,000.00 a year to ensure the Crossing Guard is on duty from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday to Friday.

This cost item was considered when the Police Department reviewed the 1991 budget. A decision was made to advise the River East School Division No. 9 effective January 1st, 1992 the Police Department would remove

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

their portion of payment of the crossing guard's salary from the budget and the school division would be required to assume this cost.

On May 13th, 1991 the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture heard Councillor Timm-Rudolph in delegation regarding the proposed elimination of the costs of the Hampstead School Crossing Guard from the Winnipeg Police Budget. The Winnipeg Police Department was requested to investigate and after further enquires, now recommends that the City continue to fund their portion of the cost of maintaining the Hampstead School Crossing Guard as not to do so would create a hardship on the River East School Division No. 9. This crossing is used twice a day by approximately 226 children or 73% of Hampstead School as well as a number of students from Morse Place Junior High.

If the City of Winnipeg were to cease funding their portion of this position, the City would have to request to have the crossing closed and the gates locked, thereby cancelling the orders now in existence. This would classify this pedestrian crossing as a private crossing. The School Division would then have to apply to the Railway to strike a new order concerning the crossing and would have to agree to accept liability at the crossing.

Should the City of Winnipeg continue to fund this position, the City would still be the responsible Road Authority and the crossing would continue to be classified as a public crossing which leaves the liability question to be determined by the facts of the incident.

On occasion Police have been requested to replace this crossing guard when he was absent. However, arrangements must be made by River East School Division No. 9 to have a replacement when the Crossing Guard is absent from duty. Police resources should not be utilized for this position.

Alternative changes to this crossing were considered but found to be less adequate than the present arrangement. These alternatives were:

(a) A warning signal consisting of a modified bell and flashing lights but without the arms. This would cost $40,000.00 to install with an upkeep charge to the City of $2,000.00 to $4,000.00 a year by the Railway. This would not be effective or safe as this is a two track crossing and on occasion trains are proceeding in different directions. This warning signal is more appropriate for single track crossings.

(b) An overhead crossing would cost $500,000.00 however this would be hazardous, especially in the winter due to snow build-up and the possibility of slipping. A crossing such as this would require special ramps for wheelchair access.

The Winnipeg Police Department continues to endorse the use of a watchman as the best means of providing safety for the children using this crossing.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture is of the opinion that it is in the best interest of the community to continue the City's portion of the cost of maintaining the Hampstead School Crossing Guard and therefore recommends:

1. That the City of Winnipeg continue to provide their portion of the cost of maintaining the Hampstead School Crossing Guard subject to the following conditions:

    (a) That River East School Division No. 9 provide backup personnel in the event the full time crossing guard is unable to report for duty.

    (b) That River East School Division No. 9 provide replacements in the event the full time crossing guard terminates.

2. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

Moved by Councillor Brown,
That the clause be referred back.

The motion to refer was put.

Councillor Mitchelson called for the yeas and nays, which were as follows:-

Yea: Councillors Wade, Brown, Clement, Demare, Douglas, Fleisher, Fraser, Hyman, Lorenc, Mendelson, Prystanski, Young, Mayor Norrie and Councillor Eadie. 14

Nay: Councillors Boychuk, Diamant, Duguid, Mitchelson, Murray, Reese, Selinger, Thomas, Timmers and Yuen. 10

and the motion to refer was declared carried.

Program Change in the Capital Estimates
Bonivital Pool 1991 - Locker Replacement
File PR-2.2

1319 - 13. In 1987, a Capital Program at an estimated cost of $160,000.00 was submitted for the replacement of 400 original painted steel lockers with corrosive resistant stainless steel lockers at the Bonivital Pool. To meet the monetary constraints in the Capital Estimates, this program was split into 4 phases and increased to provide for inflation. The phased program was scheduled in:

1987	Phase 1	40,000.00	Completed
1988	Phase 2	44,700.00	Completed
1989	Phase 3	50,000.00	Approved in 1991
1990	Phase 4	50,000.00	Deferred to 1993

Quotation prices were called for in May 1991, with the low price submitted by Westline Sales of Winnipeg, Manitoba. According to a May 1991 quotation, replacement of most of the remaining original lockers (Phases 3 & 4) could be accomplished with an additional $11,390.00 to the 1991 program.

The Parks and Recreation Department has requested approval of a Capital Program change in order that the work can be expedited and Phase 4 for $53,000.00 in 1993 can be eliminated from the Capital Budget. Completing the locker replacement will be beneficial in accommodating the public, who are presently complaining as to the state of the rusting and malfunctioning locker mechanism of the remaining original painted steel lockers.

The Capital Program at the Norwood Outdoor Swimming Pool (1987/88) is complete and the funds identified below are surplus.

Construction Costs to Complete Locker Replacement

Phase 3	39,542	
Phase 4	20,949	
Total Construction Costs	60,491	
Funds available from 1991 Capital to complete Phase 3 (as per actual quotation)		39,542
Funds available from 1991 Capital to apply towards Phase 4		7,158

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

Funds available from 1988 Locker Capital to apply towards Phase 4		408	
Funds from Capital Program Change Request to apply towards Phase 4 (11,390 - 797 Finance and Administration = 10,593		10,593	18,159
Total Funds available for Construction, including G.S.T			57,701
Construction	57,701		
Finance/Administration	4,039		
Total Cost	61,740		
1991 Capital		50,000	
Capital Program Change Request		11,390	
1988 Locker Funds Remaining		408	
Total Funds Available	61,798		

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture recommends:

1. That $11,390.00 in surplus funds be transferred from the (completed) 1987 Norwood Outdoor Swimming Pool Project Account No. 5487520501, to the Bonivital Pool Locker Replacement Program Account No. 54885105501, to allow for the accelerated completion of this project.

2. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

An Initiative Linking Crime Prevention with Early Investment in Children
File GF-2

1320 - 14. In November of 1990, your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture was made aware of an initiative linking crime prevention with early investment in children. The Police Department contacted The Canadian Council on Children and Youth in Ottawa to identify the initiatives current status. It was determined that the initiative was being coordinated by The Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

On June 3rd, 1991, the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture considered a report regarding an initiative linking crime prevention with early investment in children and laid over consideration of the matter requesting the following additional information:

1. Who is participating in the initiative;
2. What are the costs of participating in the initiative;
3. What is the level of participation;
4. What other agencies in The City of Winnipeg are involved;
5. What are the benefits of participating to The City of Winnipeg.

On June 24th, 1991, the Police Department contacted the Coordinator of the initiative for The Federation of Canadian Municipalities and it was explained that the concept had been submitted to Canada Employment and Immigration for consideration and funding. As a result of several related requests from other agencies; The Canadian Council on Children and Youth; The Canadian Council on Social Development; The Canadian Youth Foundation; and The Federation of Canadian Municipalities; the Canada Employment and Immigration identified two requests that they have now combined.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

The two initiatives are as follows:

1. An Initiative Linking Crime Prevention with Early Investment in Children

   This is targeted at children under twelve years of age. It will explore such ideas as: Breakfasts at school, identifying children in need of proper food, what other needs of these children are not being met. This would initiate the interaction of support agencies to assist these families with employment, treatment of alcoholism, detection of child abuse, proper clothing and housing, etc.

2. Stay in School Initiative - A Joint Venture

   This is targeted at children twelve and over. The challenge is to involve different partners - police, school boards, social agencies, court, corrections etc., to work out a combined strategy for short/long term interventions.

   It is to address reducing the percentage of drop-outs through such initiatives such as daycare at schools, peer counselling, hot-lines, orange juice and milk programs for pregnant mothers (in existence in other cities).

   In Winnipeg, for example, the Police Department is addressing initiatives to reduce truancy. An outline of some of the school objectives are detailed in Appendix "A".

Due to the short time-frame in which this was developed by The Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the five cities who had expressed interest in 1990 were selected as pilot sites. These cities were identified by the Canadian Council on Children and Youth, and identified to The Federation of Canadian Municipalities as:

1. Prince George
2. Surrey
3. Regina
4. Halifax
5. Dartmouth

These cities agreed to incorporate the Stay-in-School Programs with their Safer Community Projects. It is possible that two additional sites will be selected. Funding would be $2,500.00 to $3,000.00 per city, for the purpose of the cost of meetings. The sites will start-up by April, 1992.

In addition to the Stay-in-School Program, the Urban Safety and Crime Prevention Program of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities is currently developing, under the auspices of Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, an early investment project to take place, preferably within the public housing structure. A site is not yet selected as it is still in the initial stages and few details are available. In a communication from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, dated July 4th, 1991, the Police Department was advised that it would be kept up to date on the progress made (Appendix "B").

In response to the questions raised by the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture on June 3rd, 1991, the following has been determined:

1. Participants in the March 23rd, 1991, National Workshop are listed in Appendix "C". They are made up of researchers, experts, Federal Government agencies, and the five selected cities.

2. Costs for the pilot sites are born by the municipalities with an expected $2,500.00 to $3,000.00 to offset meeting costs in each city over the three year term of the project.

3. The pilot sites will develop programs and initiatives and share their information at two national workshops over the term of the project. (Appendix "D", March 23rd, 1991, report.)

4. There are no City of Winnipeg agencies identified as participating in this initiative; only national bodies that may have a branch office in Winnipeg.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

5. The benefit to The City of Winnipeg in participating would be to pull together a large number of smaller agencies existing in the City and work together and/or develop a multidisciplinary team.

It is being proposed that The City of Winnipeg forward correspondence to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities in Ottawa requesting: -

1. The City of Winnipeg be selected as a site for one of the seven pilot projects.

   Five sites are already selected and two to be added. However, indicating The City of Winnipeg's interest to Ottawa may secure a pilot project site.

   This is a major undertaking for The City of Winnipeg to call together social agencies to work collectively with the two initiatives outlined.

or

2. The City of Winnipeg be included in the two anticipated national workshops over the next three years to develop programs as a result of the experiences detailed by the pilot project sites at the workshops.

   This alternative was the original approach. The Police Department would not initiate setting up a large committee of support agencies and develop initiatives. The Department would identify initiatives developed by other cities and consider how each could best be implemented in Winnipeg. The Police Department would then target an initiative with a much smaller committee of agencies, related to the initiative.

   Funding for the pilot sites is only enough to cover some meeting costs and not the costs associated to a committee of the size outlined in Recommendation No. 1.

and/or

3. The City of Winnipeg be considered as a pilot project site, for the early investment project to take place within the public housing structure, currently being developed.

   In its letter of July 4th, 1991, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities indicated that they are in the planning stages of this project at this time. Little is detailed about the project and it may be of interest to The City of Winnipeg once the format is clearly defined. To indicate an interest now, would give us a head start on other cities, once the details of the initiative become available.

   Again, it must be stressed that The City of Winnipeg is trying to be designated as a safer community and outline structures which are in place indicates this to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. One such example is the Urban Safety for Women and Children Fact Finding Group under the auspices of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg. In a report forthcoming in August, the City will consider some 142 recommendations made by the Fact Finding Group.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture is of the opinion that while having the City selected as a site for one of the seven pilot projects is only a remote possibility, it is imperative that the City of Winnipeg determine a direction at this time.

Your Committee recommends that:

1. The City of Winnipeg forward correspondence to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities in Ottawa requesting:

   a) The City of Winnipeg be selected as a site for one of the seven pilot projects.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

and/or

b) The City of Winnipeg be considered as a pilot project site, for the early investment project to take place within the public housing structure, currently being developed.

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Re-Apportioning of Funds Within the Community Incentive Grant Program File PR-2.6

1321 - 15. On March 6th, 1985, Council adopted the Community Incentive Grant Program to begin in 1985 and run for five consecutive years through 1989, subject to funds being approved in each year's Capital Budget. The amounts which were subsequently approved were as follows:-

1985	-	$ 600,000
1986	-	1,200,000
1987	-	600,000
1988	-	600,000
1989	-	600,000

These funds were divided equally between the six Community areas with each Community Committee reviewing applications received within their respective boundaries and recommending to the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture for approval one or more applications totalling a maximum of that Community Committee's allotment of funds.

In August of 1989, the Program was renewed for an additional five year period, 1990 to 1994, under virtually the same apportionment formula. A single variation to the formula came as a result of the decision to increase the funding by $100,000 to the Program in 1990. The additional $100,000 was designated for the direct allocation of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture to groups of a "City-wide" sport or recreational nature.

On September 4th, 1990 your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, instructed the Administration of the Parks and Recreation Department to review and report on the existing apportionment formula for the Community Incentive Grant Program. This formula, which to date has divided funds equally amongst the six Community Committees, had come to be seen as inequitable and in need of revision. This viewpoint was largely based upon the fact that the population of the six Community Committee areas was far from equal. In fact there was as much as a 100% variation between the most populated and the least populated Community Committee areas.

The administrative report which studied the issue acknowledged this disparity but stopped short of recommending a revised formula based solely on population. It did provide a number of re-apportionment options. It also recommended that consideration be given to ensuring that any formula ultimately selected by the Committee be justifiable, understandable, easily administered and fair in relation to the relative size/population of each area.

Upon receiving this information, the Committee called for a report detailing the specifics of a formula for the re-apportioning of funds based upon population, socio-economic need, and existing parks and recreation facilities. The Committee instructed that these three factors be combined with respective weights of 50%, 25% and 25%. The document submitted to Committee addressed the three criteria as follows:

I. Population

This is the most basic of the three funding criteria to calculate. Based upon Statistics Canada information, the total population of each of the six Community Committee Areas is as follows:

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

District No.	Population	% of Population
1	97,596	16%
2	66,746	11%
3	103,075	17%
4	110,837	19%
5	93,573	16%
6	122,724	21%
Total	594,551	

The impact of these statistics as applied against 50% of the available funding is outlined in Attachment No. 1.

The difficulty of this calculation is that the best possible information available, and as such the source utilized, is the information provided by Statistics Canada. Unfortunately this information was gathered in 1986 and makes no allowances for population shifts since that time.

Further, it should be noted that with the new census of 1991, this portion of the funding formula should be re-calculated with the expectation that minor shifts in final allocations may occur.

II. Socio-Economic Need

Socio-economic need, the determination of the need for resources through the measurement of social and economic regional disparities, is by its very nature an inexact process.

To begin, there is no accepted standard against which one may gauge the social or economic status of a community. As such, it was necessary, for the purposes of this exercise, to create "disparity indices" which in turn were utilized to calculate a final index of social need. In simple terms, this process involves the selection of the lowest number within a series of like statistics. This low number becomes the "base" by which all others are divided. The resulting figures identify the lowest statistical figure as "1." The remaining, higher statistics, are represented by increasing whole numbers. Together these figures represent the social indices.

In some cases these social indices translate directly to "disparity indices." This is only true however, where a high original statistic is representative of a high social need (eg: number of single parent families).

In other cases, where a high original statistic is representative of a low social need (eg: median income) the social index which results must be inverted to create a disparity index for that area of review.

While admittedly complex, this process provides the most mathematically sound approach to social need calculation. Details of the calculation are included as Attachment No. 2.

While the mathematics of the process are sound, the original choice of social indicators is necessarily subjective. For the purposes of this report, the Parks and Recreation Department drew upon the experience of a variety of sources (eg: the Social Planning Council, Child and Family Service Agencies) and decided upon the following factors as being indicative of social need:

a) Number (female) single parent families.
   Note: Male single parent families are not as statistically significant. Further, the traditional role of the male parent as wage earner may be interpreted as a buffer against resultant social need. Although the authors of this document did not necessarily subscribe to this view the statistic was excluded so as not to cloud the issue.
b) Number of children in single parent families.
c) Number of Seniors
d) Number of new Canadians
   Note: While it is true that new Canadians do not necessarily represent an extraordinary social need, it is a commonly held position that our social and recreational services must adapt to meet the challenges of this population.
e) Adult population with less than grade 9 education.
f) Aboriginal population.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

g) Persons with a disability.

Naturally, extensive debate could surround any of the social need indicators selected. Dependent upon personal experiences, opinions, or beliefs, one might argue that one or more of these indicators should be excluded. It is also possible that other factors, not considered as part of this exercise, could be argued for inclusion.

Further, it should be noted that all the aforementioned indicators were assigned equal weighting. One might argue that one indicator was more or less important than another, but such arguments would be highly subjective in nature and as such, they were not considered as part of this exercise.

Finally, it should be noted that no allowance has been made for overlaps in classifications. In other words, individuals who fit two or more of the social need indicators were counted that number of times. While this may appear to skew the data, it is in fact statistically valid. While increasing the disparity index for the most disadvantaged communities, it provides for a true measure of social need. To appreciate the rationale of this situation one might consider a comparison between two individuals. Obviously, an adult woman with less than Grade 9 education may represent a social need. Another woman, with the same education but with three children to support and the additional challenge of a physical handicap would represent a comparatively higher level of social need.

The calculation of economic need was done solely on the basis of median individual income levels. Statistics Canada provides this information with certain limitations; the most serious of which involves high level income.

Because the top limit for median income reported is $50,000, it is necessary to extrapolate the high end incomes in more affluent communities through the use of normal curves. The net result is that, while the final figures are defensible in their low end validity, they may not allow a sufficiently large negative influence for the extremely wealthy of a given Community.

This approach was intentional as it was determined that extremely high end incomes, held by comparatively few individuals, should not be allowed to skew the funding formula's outcome and effect large numbers of middle income individuals in the same communities.

III. Existing Facilities

The calculation of a "need index" based upon existing park and facility space is a complex and controversial process. To begin, one must recognize that the grant program in question can be used either for new facility construction or existing facility renovation. As such, it is open to debate whether a large number of recreation sites should qualify a community for comparatively more or fewer grant dollars.

If one assumed that the existing facilities were historically established in an entirely orderly manner and in response to need, it could be argued that the grant dollars for renovation and renewal of aging facilities should be highest in those communities where the largest number of these facilities exist.

This was not considered to be the case, however, and instead the Parks and Recreation Department has chosen to interpret the intent of this criteria's inclusion as an attempt by Committee to equalize the number of recreation facilities within the respective Community Committee areas.

In other words, if the number of facilities within a given community was comparatively high, their "need index" was comparatively low (as that need related to Community Incentive Grants). Given this interpretation, a method of comparison was required. While a number of possibilities existed, most were vulnerable to subjective measurements of the utility or worth of a given type of facility in comparison to another different type of facility (eg: is a playground worth as much or more than a tennis court?).

In an attempt to provide the least subjective measurement of facility need the methodology that was chosen related only to the surface areas of existing facilities (i.e. hectares of green space and square metres of indoor facilities).

The facilities which were included were those which were considered by the Department to meet the following criteria:

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

A) Readily accessible to the public
B) Providing a definite local advantage (as opposed to facilities which by their nature have City-wide benefits which exceed local benefits).
C) Not private in nature; not requiring membership or high user fees.
D) Not restricted on religious, ethnic, professional, or other, similar criteria.

The imposition of these criteria eliminated all golf courses, the Assiniboine forest, private health, fitness or sport clubs, the zoo, the City Hall plaza, the Museum of Man and Nature, and all riverbank areas (including the Forks); to name a few.

Included were recreation and sport facilities operated by the City, including Community Centres. All athletic fields, school gymnasiums available for public permits, swimming pools, arenas, and leisure centres were also included. Passive green space, not including boulevards, was included as well.

Again, once the required calculations were made, the figures were translated into a disparity index by Community Committee Area. This index was applied against the funds available.

Details of the calculations are contained within Attachment No. 3.

At its meeting of June 24th, 1991, your Committee considered this information and requested that the administration of the Parks and Recreation Department provide additional information relevant to three additional funding formula options. Specifically, administration was to report on the funding amounts which would result from formulas combined with respective weights as follows:

Population	Socio-Economic Need	Existing Facilities
60	20	20
70	15	15
80	10	10

The impact on the allocation of the Community Incentive Grant varies under the different formulas, as follows:

Model No.	1	2	3	4	5
Factor Weights:					
Population	50%	60%	70%	80%	
Facility	25%	20%	15%	10%	Current
Social Need	25%	20%	15%	10%	Allocation
Schedule	A	B	C	D	
District					
City Centre/Fort Rouge	$157,491	$145,692	133,891	122,090	100,000
St. James-Assiniboia	72,919	71,807	70,694	9,582	100,000
Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan	105,508	105,210	104,913	104,615	100,000

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

East Kildonan/Transcona	95,359	98,659	101,957	105,255	100,000
St. Boniface/St. Vital	78,129	81,389	84,649	87,909	100,000
Assiniboine Park/Fort Garry	90,592	97,244	103,895	110,547	100,000

The details of the allocation formulas based on 50%, 60%, 70% and 80% population weighting are contained within Schedule "A", "B", "C" and "D".

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture is of the view that the funds should be re-apportioned based on a funding formula that takes into account population, socio-economic need and existing facilities, combined with respective weights of 80%, 10% and 10%.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture therefore recommends:

1. That the capital funds within the Community Incentive Grant program be allocated to the various Community Committees, effective the 1992 Capital Budget, in accordance with Schedule "D" (Model 4: 80% population weights).

2. That the proper officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Moved by Councillor Douglas,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Councillor Eadie asked to be recorded as having voted against the clause in accordance with Section 50.7 of the Procedure By-law.

Formula for Equalization of Grants
to Community Centres File PR-2

1322 - 16. LAID OVER BY EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF THE

COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, PARKS AND CULTURE

The Executive Policy Committee has had before it the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 16th, 1991, has concurred in the recommendations contained therein, except as noted below, and submits same to Council for approval and adoption.

On motion of Councillor Douglas, the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 16th, 1991, was considered.

North Committee Room,
Council Building, Winnipeg.
September 16th, 1991.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture submits the following report and recommends:

Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Report
File GF-2

1323 - 1. Council on July 31st, 1991, adopted the following motion:-

"WHEREAS the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Report and the Hughes Inquiry Report will be forthcoming;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg should respond in a coordinated manner;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

i) That each of these reports be directed to the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture immediately on their transmittal to the City, and

ii) That Special meetings be convened by the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture to review each of these reports and to prepare recommendations to Council."

On September 5th, 1991, your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture convened a Special Meeting to commence the review of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry report. Committee adopted the following resolution, namely:

"WHEREAS the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture is of the opinion that the issues identified in the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Report should be broken down into three broad categories in order to prepare plans of action and subsequent recommendations;

AND WHEREAS the three broad areas or categories are identified as follows:-

1. Police Department regulations, procedures and standards;

2. Police policy issues relating to the City of Winnipeg, i.e. recruiting/employment equity (aboriginal recruitment); cross-cultural training; Community-based policing; concepts such as a police shooting board;

3. Inter-jurisdictional Issues which relate to the City of Winnipeg but which are outside the City's jurisdiction, i.e. judicial system as it relates to urban aboriginals; areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; Fatality Inquiries Act.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That three special working committees be struck comprising members of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, Administrative personnel and other representatives of the community deemed appropriate;

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the terms of reference and membership of each working committee be established and submitted for consideration at a Special Meeting of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture to be held on Monday, September 16th, 1991."

On September 16th, 1991, your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture convened a Special Meeting to consider the status of its three working committees mandated to prepare plans of action and subsequent recommendations relative to the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry report.

Committee adopted the following resolutions as a first step in actively pursuing an aggressive employment equity/recruitment program, namely:-

"That the women, visible minority and aboriginal candidates who had applied and were not successful previously (during the past 2 years) be reviewed in an effort to see how many can be accommodated in the upcoming January/February '92 recruitment class."

"That the City proceed to accelerate its recruitment outreach from the above identified groups for the next recruitment class."

"That the Administration examine all methods to assist former applicants to achieve police recruitment standards."

Your Committee is of the view that consideration should also be given to continuing the initiatives for training to enhance minority representation on the Winnipeg Police Department such as the Human Justice Training Program offered under the Core Area Initiative and recommends as follows:-

1. That a training program be established, under the City's purview, similar to the Human Justice Training program offered under the Core Area Initiative program;

2. That the Province of Manitoba be requested to cost share the proposed training program;

3. That the proper officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Your Executive Policy Committee recommends that the following recommendation be added to the above recommendations, namely:-

"4. That His Worship Mayor Norrie be directed to request an early meeting with the Cabinet Committee to proceed with co-ordinating a work plan with respect to the recommendations of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry."

For the information of Council, your Executive Policy Committee has forwarded a copy of the report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 16th, 1991, to the Community and Race Relations Committee for information.

Moved by Councillor Douglas
Adoption of the clause.

In amendment,

Moved by Mayor Norrie,
That the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee be adopted.

Carried.

The motion for the adoption of the clause was put and declared carried.

COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, PARKS AND CULTURE

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Reese,
Seconded by Councillor Timmers,

1324 - WHEREAS the A.J.I. Report (Volume 2, pages 65 and 66) states that "The Crown Attorney must not allow charges to be laid which are not properly supported by the facts or the law";

AND WHEREAS the A.J.I. Report further states that "The Crown Attorney should advise the laying of charges only when the following question can be answered in the affirmative: Could a judge or a jury properly instructed and acting reasonably, convict the accused or the accused, based on admissible evidence as presented by the police to the Crown Attorney? Where doubt exists that a conviction would result, it is the responsibility of the Crown Attorney to advise the police to continue their investigation. If the evidence reveals that a conviction might result on a different charge from that suggested by the police, it is the responsibility of the Crown Attorney to advise the police of that fact. If certain evidence is necessary for a conviction, the Crown Attorney should advise the police of the deficiencies in their case and offer any advice which might seem appropriate." (writers emphasis);

AND WHEREAS Crown Attorney Finlayson negligently failed to act in accordance with the A.J.I. report's definition of the responsibilities and duties of the Crown and in particular failed to advise the police of the deficiencies in their case and demand that they continue their investigation prior to charges being laid;

AND WHEREAS Crown Attorney Finlayson in the absence of sufficient information, nevertheless gave the following advice "...if those are all of the facts that we have, and there was no explanation as to the lawyer's behaviour, then the charge would be one of sexual assault that I would authorize." (Pg. 39 - Hughes' Report);

AND WHEREAS the Minister of Justice is responsible for the quality and level of justice delivered in the Province of Manitoba;

BE IT RESOLVED That City Council advise the Minister of Justice that the Hughes' Report has too narrowly defined the role of Crown Attorney Finlayson in regard to his advice to Inspectors Bell and Dawson and failed to examine Finlayson's conduct by not taking into account the Crown's full responsibilities and duties of the Office of the Crown Attorney;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Minister of Justice share with the City the responsibility for the charges being laid, as well as the legal costs incurred by Mr. Pollock beyond the costs of the Inquiry;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City Council accept the Hughes' Report's conclusions in regard to the roles of the Chief of Police, the Officers Kushneryk, Toyne, Bell, Dawson and Johnston, Chief Commissioner, Commissioner Reynolds and Mayor Norrie and City representatives as well as its recommendations.

Required to Stand as Notice of Motion.

Moved by Councillor Kaufmann,
Seconded by Councillor Reese,

1325 - WHEREAS the Office of the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg is the highest municipal office attainable by one of our citizens;

AND WHEREAS the office is highly esteemed, it is an affront to this office and to the Council of the City of Winnipeg that the Winnipeg Sun writer George Stephenson, on September 22nd, in the Winnipeg Sun called the Mayor of our fine City a liar.

COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, PARKS AND CULTURE – MOTIONS (continued)

"We the public were lied to.

Despite the Mayor having in his possession a report that said the investigation was flawed and three officers should be transferred because of it, he came out and said the exact opposite.

That is called lying, no doubt prompted by the thought that the report would never see the light of day."

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Mayor ask the Winnipeg Sun for a retraction and an apology forthwith.

The Speaker advised that the mover of the motion was no longer in the Chamber and that Councillor Reese had withdrawn as seconder of the motion.

The Speaker ruled that the motion was withdrawn.

Moved by Councillor Lorenc,
That Council do now adjourn.

The motion to adjourn was put.

Councillor Lorenc called for the yeas and nays, which were as follows:-

Yea: Councillors Wade, Boychuk, Brown, Clement, Demare, Douglas, Gilroy, Kaufmann, Lorenc, Mitchelson and Timmers. 11

Nay: Councillors Diamant, Duguid, Fleisher, Fraser, Hyman, Mendelson, Murray, Prystanski, Reese, Selinger, Thomas, Young, Yuen, Mayor Norrie and Councillor Eadie. 15

and the motion to adjourn was declared lost.

QUESTION PERIOD

1326 - Councillor Murray referred to information circulated by the Chairman of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture on the use of fire equipment vehicles. He advised that the aerial ladder assigned to the River Heights area has been out of service more than it has been in service and that the City continues to operate with several pieces of equipment that cannot be used the majority of the time. He asked the Chairman of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture to explain why this situation continues to exist.

Councillor Douglas agreed to take the question under advisement and respond to Councillor Murray.

Councillor Murray advised that he has become aware that one of the officers named in the Hughes Inquiry will be upgraded from constable to sergeant status after 12 months and resume his current position after 24 months. He asked if the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture intends to review the Board's decision and comment on this issue and on the issue of personnel policies relating to individuals who contravene department policy.

Councillor Douglas confirmed that while the issue had not yet been raised at the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, informal discussion regarding this matter had taken place at Executive Policy Committee. Councillor Douglas expressed the view that this matter is more appropriately handled by the Executive Policy Committee and the Board of Commissioners.

QUESTION PERIOD (continued)

Councillor Murray inquired as to whether Councillor Douglas was aware that the demotion referred to was for a one year only duration.

Councillor Douglas reiterated that this issue relating to personnel should be dealt with In Camera.

Councillor Kaufmann referred to a motion placed before Council today but which was withdrawn after Councillor Reese withdrew her name as seconder, regarding an article written by George Stephenson and published in the Winnipeg Sun on September 22nd, 1991. He asked whether or not Mayor Norrie intends to request an apology from the Winnipeg Sun.

Mayor Norrie replied that while he had not seen the article in the Sun, he had seen the proposed motion by Councillors Kaufmann and Reese in this regard. He stated that the article reported an untrue situation.

Councillor Hyman inquired as to the status of the Core Area Initiative discussions that had been scheduled to take place between Mayor Norrie and the Honourable Jake Epp.

Mayor Norrie replied that while Mr. Epp was unable to attend the scheduled meeting due to another commitment, his office was undertaking to arrange an early meeting.

Councillor Hyman asked if the Mayor would outline his views on the proposed bilateral agreement being proposed by the Federal Government for revitalization.

Mayor Norrie replied that the concept of bilateral agreements is not new. Prior to the Core Area Initiative Agreement being negotiated, the Federal Government would enter into an agreement with the various provinces and the provinces in turn, entered into agreement with their municipalities. He stated that in discussing the matter of agreement, he would be advising both from his personal point of view and that of Council, that the concept of bilateral agreement would not be an acceptable arrangement. The City will request to be an equal partner and finance an agreement on an equal basis.

Councillor Hyman questioned whether the Mayor will be prepared to state his personal opinions how much the concept of bilateral agreements would prove to be detrimental to the citizens of Winnipeg.

Mayor Norrie replied that he had expressed his opinions on this matter publicly, not only through the media, but also directly to both the Honourable Jake Epp and the Honourable Jim Ernst.

The Speaker reminded Council of its motion passed on May 29th, 1991, requesting renewal of the tripartite agreement.

Councillor Fraser referred to correspondence he forwarded to Mayor Norrie requesting that Executive Policy Committee convene a special meeting to apprise all members of Council of the status of the Fort Garry Hotel assessment issue and in particular, the decision made by the City to appeal the Municipal Board's decision. He asked what the City's exposure is likely to be, who made the decision to appeal and on what basis was the decision made.

Mayor Norrie replied that while he was not aware of the request that had been made to Executive Policy Committee for a special meeting, such a request could certainly be complied with. He stated that it is not known at this time what the City's liability would be. He also stated that he had given evidence at the examination for discovery held in the summer months. With respect to the appeal, a prescribed procedure is followed and the advice of the Law Department taken. The matter is discussed by the Mayor, the Commissioners and the appropriate Chairman and then the solicitor is authorized to make the appeal if that is the decision of the Mayor and the Chairman.

QUESTION PERIOD (continued)

Councillor Fraser asked Councillor Gilroy for information relating to the Manitoba Gardens proposal and whether or not financial statements could be provided to the Councillors.

Councillor Fraser also asked whether a copy of the minutes of the Board of Directors of the Convention Centre approving the expenditure of funds to prepare the Manitoba Gardens proposal could be provided.

Councillor Gilroy agreed to pursue the question with the Board of Directors, Winnipeg Convention Centre and advise Councillor Fraser. Councillor Gilroy assured Councillor Fraser that the Board of Directors is fully aware of all funds spent on the project.

Councillor Reese referred to the minutes of the meeting of the Winnipeg Region Committee dated January 30th, 1991, specifically regarding the inquiry by M.L.A. Jack Penner whether or not municipalities would be interested in participating in the planning and development of a new aqueduct. She asked the Deputy Mayor to explain his comments made to the Provincial Government regarding this matter.

Councillor Brown replied that he was the City's representative at the meeting referred to and that at that time there was some discussion about the possibility of the City being involved in a joint agreement with outlying municipalities on water supply. He confirmed his comments that the City could possibly become involved in discussions regarding such an agreement.

Councillor Reese asked whether or not the Deputy Mayor was aware that the City, through conservation and better management of its water supply, will not require an additional aqueduct. Councillor Reese suggested that the Provincial Government is seeking the help of the City of Winnipeg to share the costs of an aqueduct in order to help the Province provide water to the municipalities.

Councillor Brown reiterated that the only commitment he made on behalf of the City was for discussion on this matter to take place.

Councillor Yuen advised that he had received a number of phone calls from his constituents regarding the final settlement with the Chief of Police and asked whether the Mayor would inform all members of Council of the details of this matter.

Mayor Norrie outlined that in accordance with the decision of the Executive Policy Committee in September 1990, the Chief Commissioner was delegated authority to negotiate severance packages or early retirements with City employees. The Chief Commissioner is required to report verbally to the Executive Policy Committee, in camera, once a year, in this regard.

Mayor Norrie stated that the settlement negotiated with the Chief of Police was, in his view, a very reasonable settlement and certainly not of the magnitude speculated by the media and members of the community. The Chief Commissioner has stated that he is prepared to make full disclosure of the settlement to the Executive Policy Committee. Mayor Norrie added that the settlement referred to had been made at the time the retirement was announced and that there were no changes as a result of the pre-retirement leave being approved.

Councillor Mendelson enquired whether Mayor Norrie will take the initiative to call a meeting of the councillors appointed to the Committee of Council charged with the responsibility of negotiating a pedestrian opening of the intersection at Portage and Main.

Mayor Norrie responded that he believed the responsibility for convening a meeting was left with the Chairman of the Committee on Works and Operations. Councillor Mendelson advised that in light of confusion regarding this matter, she would correspond immediately to Mayor Norrie in his regard.

QUESTION PERIOD (continued)

Councillor Mendelson referred to media coverage regarding the arena issue and questioned whether Councillor Gilroy on behalf of the Convention Centre Corporation or Councillor Mitchelson on behalf of the Winnipeg Enterprises Corporation would undertake, either jointly or severally, to provide all members of Council with ongoing status reports on this matter.

Councillor Gilroy replied that the Convention Centre will hold a briefing session, specifically for members of Council, regarding the Manitoba Gardens proposal and that the briefing will take place within the next two or three weeks.

Councillor Mitchelson replied that while he couldn't address or substantiate the media reports on this issue, he believes there will be some short term solution to the Jets' financial problems and that a long range plan would likely include a new facility. He replied that questions regarding the arena should more appropriately be directed to the Task Force established by Executive Policy Committee to explore all options for keeping the Jets Hockey Team in Winnipeg.

Councillor Mendelson referred to the grievance settlement with the three police officers involved in the Pollock case and the pre- retirement settlement negotiated by the Chief Commissioner with the Chief of Police. She asked whether or not the Mayor will undertake to raise the propriety of not making public any such settlements made with civic officials.

Mayor Norrie replied that the two situations referred to by Councillor Mendelson are very different. The first situation was a grievance process that came before the Board of Commissioners in accordance with the terms of the collective agreement. The second situation was a delegation of authority by the Executive Policy Committee to the Chief Commissioner.

Councillor Mitchelson questioned why the Chairman of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture did not speak against the motion to refer back Clause 12 of the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated September 9th, 1991.

The Speaker ruled Councillor Mitchelson's question out of order as the item had already been dealt with by Council.

Councillor Mitchelson asked that the Chairman of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture give his assurances that this clause will be reconsidered and brought back to Council as expeditiously as possible.