COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday April 30, 2003

The Council met at 9:35 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Pagtakhan.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt and Lazarenko.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have Pages with us this morning. We have Samara Carroll, of Joseph Wolinsky Collegiate who resides in the Charleswood-Tuxedo Ward.

Shoshana Coodin also of Joseph Wolinsky Collegiate, resides in the Old Kildonan Ward.

Nicholas Plett, home schooled, resides in the Transcona Ward.

Welcome.

MINUTES

Councillor Vandal moves the Minutes of the meeting held on March 19, 26 and 28, 2003, be taken as read and confirmed. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

We have delegations this morning. The first delegation is John Gillis, on behalf of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada, Manitoba/North West Ontario Provincial Command, in opposition to By-law No. 88/2003, a by-law to ban smoking in public places. Mr. Gillis.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. John Gillis: Good morning Mr. Mayor, Councillors. Thank you very much first of all for the opportunity to express our views on this pending legislation banning smoking in public places. Our main concern of course is private clubs.

I represent the Army, Navy, Air Force Veterans in Canada, Manitoba/North Western Ontario Provincial Command, and today I will contain my comments to the four clubrooms here in the City, four units as we call them.

Our veterans organization is the oldest veterans' organization in the Country. We are 163 years old coming up this year. The Manitoba Charter for the Army, Navy and Air Force was granted in April 1901.

Today I want you all to the know the good things that our veterans' club do here in this city, how we look after our veterans, their dependence, the widows of veterans and the organizations that we support. We support youth, We support seniors. Cadets are the youth that we support and we give lots of money to various cadet units around the City of Winnipeg. Seniors, most of us that belong to these units except the young veterans who just returned from the Gulf War, Afghanistan and other peacekeeping operations around the world, most of us are seniors. Most of us, very old seniors.

We still have a large number of veterans that are members of our various units. And, these veterans from the Second World War, Korea, and as I said the Gulf War and many of them from peacekeeping operations around the world are the people who do the work. We don't have paid staff other than a manager, a secretary and our bar staff. Everything in our units, in our clubrooms is done by volunteers. You'll see in any of the units you'll see our volunteers there early in the morning and still there late at night. Some of us stay late at night after working hard all day for a few beer.

One of the things that I want to empathize and I'm going to talk about your legislation, remember and don't ever forget it, freedom is not free. We worked for it. We fought for it, and we enjoy it today, and we're going to continue to enjoy our freedom and we want to sit with our comrades and we want to sit down and have a beer and we want to have a

cigarette for those who wish to have a cigarette.

Our ladies auxiliaries, work very very hard. As a matter of fact if it wasn't for the ladies auxiliaries in our units we wouldn't exist because they work harder than the men. They put on lunches for funerals and our clubrooms are used to do funeral services for veterans who pass away. For those of you who are not aware, we're losing 77 veterans everyday in Canada. We still have lots left. There are over three million ex service personnel, a lot of them veterans, 400,000 of them are second world war veterans. There's about 5,000 Korea veterans, Gulf War veterans, Afghanistan and what have you. And many many from peacekeeping operations where they have served around the world.

Our seniors go on exchange visits with buses paid for by our units to other units or to various places here in the City or outside of the City. We like to take them around, show them what's happening new in the City, we go to museums, we go to wherever and we usually stop and have a beer and a cigarette wherever we go. We want to continue to do that.

Approximately every six weeks one of our units here in Winnipeg, John Osborne Unit No. 1 sponsors a lunch a free lunch for the veterans of Deer Lodge Centre where we have a 155 beds for veterans only, and the various lodges, seniors lodges around the City. This lunch is free. We give them a couple of drink tickets, they have a couple of drinks. For those who wish to have a cigarette they can have a cigarette. We want them to continue to have a cigarette if they wish.

As we said at our last meeting here at City Hall, clean air is great, but let me tell you something. When it's minus 30 and occasionally it gets there in Winnipeg as you all know, we have veterans in Deer Lodge Centre as an example, going outside at minus 30 to have a cigarette. Now we've corrected that. We've spent over $200,000 for a special room in Deer Lodge Centre. And this money was donated by the Royal Canadian Legion, the various veterans organizations, seven in total around the City. These are seven organizations, not branches. We have four units of the Army and Navy, I believe there's 20 legion branches within the Army, Navy units, and the legion branches, we have other veterans organizations using the facilities free of charge to have their individual meetings.

(9:43)

An example is, Rockwood Unit 303 on Wilton Avenue, host the Korea Veterans Organization Unit 17 here in Manitoba. John Osborne looks after the Hong Kong veterans. Unit 283 looks after the Peacekeepers Association. And so on and so on. The Aboriginal Veterans meet at Unit 60 here in this city on Garry Street. We believe that this comradeship that we enjoy, we want to be able to continue with it. If this no smoking goes through and we hope that it doesn't that we're going to lose financially.

An example is in Brandon, the legion in Brandon and the Army, Navy unit in Brandon and I can only speak on behalf of the Army and Navy, lost $17,000 in the first month after the no smoking ban went in in Brandon. $17,000.

Peter Warren once said, that veterans clubs are dark, dingy places with cheap beer and bingo. Well as usual Peter Warren was only half right, most of us don't play bingo.

Smoking may not be a good thing, it's hard on your health, look at me, it's hard on my health. I've had a couple of heart attacks already. Most of us started smoking when we were kids, teenagers because that's what we all were when we went overseas. I was 17 years old when I left Winnipeg to go to Korea. I was 18 when I got there, they said if you're going to be 18 get on the ship and go, so I did.

Anyway, if you go in the graveyards in Brookside, the largest field of honouring Canada by the way at Brookside Cemetery. If you go there and look at the ages of some of the veterans and calculate back when they served, you'll find out that there are 16 year olds and 17 year olds and 18 year olds. If you go to

the veterans graves in Holland, in Belgium, in France, you will have a hard time finding anybody that's buried there in the Commonwealth graves over 20 years old, a very hard time believe me. I've been there.

The Red Cross, you're all familiar with them. They sent us cigarettes in Korea, and we were given cigarettes in the second world war as well. Many of our teenagers who went to fight in war and there are still teenagers going in Afghanistan and peacekeeping operations, started smoking when they got into the military. For whatever reason we don't know. We all became addicted to cigarettes and it's very very hard to stop. But, it's not the smoking that we're so upset about, it's taking away our freedom. The freedom that we fought for. The freedom that got you people all of you here elected. That's what freedom is. If you look around the world a couple of years ago our PCI Kapyong Barracks went around in army trucks and with soldiers getting out of the trucks going up delivering for the Winnipeg Harvest. Believe me, people in their homes welcome these soldiers delivering goods. Go to some of the countries around the world that I've been in and you see a soldier walking up to your house you run away, they run away. Believe me, we want to keep our freedom.

I want to thank you once again for allowing us to come here today, and to say our peace.

Mr. Mayor, Councillors, in order to keep our clubs active in all the things that I have mentioned today and so that we have a place for our veterans and their spouses, the widows of veterans, and their children, not young children anymore but their dependence, we would like you to exempt the private veterans clubs in this city from your pending legislation. Thank you very much for hearing us.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Gillis if you would permit I believe we have a question.

Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you very much for coming here and taking the time to make a presentation to City Council.

I'm wondering if you could comment on the principles of freedom. Do you believe that the freedom of people to smoke in the legion clubs should come at the expense of the health of people who volunteer there and work there?

Mr. Gillis: No I don't. Okay. I don't. I think people that don't like smoking should go into one of our private no smoking rooms that we have in our units and facilities in various branches. We have excellent, excellent ventilation systems. One of the legions that I belong to Charleswood Legion we put in a $35,000 air ventilation system so that we could get members. We've got to keep members there. Whether they smoke or don't smoke we still want them. And yes, it's not good, I've said that. It's not good. But we want the freedom to do it. We want the freedom to make our own rules in our private veterans clubs. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt I believe and Councillor Smith would also like to ask questions.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Thank you for an excellent presentation. Are you aware that at the last Council Meeting when we debated this subject that some of us did try to move an amendment which would have allowed for private clubs, private organizations such as yourself the ability to be exempted under this by-law and it was defeated by the Council?

Mr. Gillis: Yes. It's called democracy I guess. I always thought the best meeting was a meeting of three. One guy is sick and other guy on holidays.

I want to comment a little more on that. In the City of Calgary they went no smoking. I was there two weeks ago to a veterans advisory council and we went to the legion and I sat down and had a cigarette and a beer. Because the private clubs in Calgary are exempt. You

can't smoke in the hotel, you can smoke in your room in a hotel in Calgary but you can't smoke in the lobby, you can't smoke outside but in the legion which I went to in Calgary you can smoke and you can have a beer.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Sir, I'm wondering what percentage of your membership are smokers? I know you can't give me an exact figure. Are there heavier smokers…..

Mr. Gillis: I can't attempt to give you an estimate. But I'll tell you, I go to veterans clubs everyday if they're an legion or an army, navy unit, every single day. Sometimes I go to three or four of them in one day. I have my beer and my cigarette and I enjoy it. By the way, it's not only the smokers that want this exempt, I have a petition here with me in my briefcase that I'm going to leave here today that non-smokers for the most part have signed.

(9:50)

The non smokers signed it. You bet, us smokers signed it too. But the non smokers as well signed it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko. Is there anyone else who has a question? This will be the final question.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Gillis I want to thank you on behalf of the Army, Navy, Air Force Veterans in Canada, I really appreciate you coming down here and voicing your opinion.

When this was dealt with the clause of last month in March, were you aware or anyone in your branch was aware that Council was dealing with the inclusion not only the public ban but also going into the private sector?

Mr. Gillis: I was aware of that. I read the papers that's where I get most of my information. Listen to the broadcasts on the various radio and TV stations. As far as I know they report everything you people say correctly, you might disagree with that at times. Anyway, that's where I get my information. By the way I keep up on the information that is around being an old newsman myself here in the City of Winnipeg.

Councillor Lazarenko: Sir on the what Council dealt with here last March I was one…

Mr. Speaker: No preamble on supplementary questions.

Councillor Lazarenko: …I'd like to ask you, if this by-law goes through here today will it have a serious adverse affect on the organization?

Mr. Gillis: Yes it will. It's going to have a very serious financial effect on our various clubs around this city. Very serious. I gave you the example in Brandon, our unit in Brandon is teetering right now because of the no smoking. The majority of the people come in put their quarter in, we have a daily draw, put their quarter in and leave, they're gone. We're not bringing in the financial proceeds that we used to before the no smoking went into effect last September. It's going to effect us financially in a very serious way. As a matter of fact just last night when we were talking about coming down here today and going over what we were going to talk about and how we were going to get across to you people, you fine people, we talked about the freedom okay. It's a big issue with the veterans, it really is a big issue. I don't know how we can get through to you. I really don't know. Somebody said, the only way we'll get through when there's an election and we can vote again. Well that doesn't work. Soon as you're elected again there's a little more erosion on what we call the freedom that we fought for.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

We also have Mr. Gordon Anderson, on behalf of Nicotine Users United Front, also in opposition to the same by-law.

I don't see Mr. Anderson at the moment. We have had an additional request to speak in opposition to the by-law from Mr. Ray Schmidt, the Manitoba, North

Western Ontario Command of the Royal Canadian Legion. Perhaps if Council would agree we could suspend the rules to let Mr. Schmidt have that five minute spot. Moved by Councillor Angus that the rules be suspended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Perhaps on the other side, Murray Gibson and Lynne Billings could come down behind the podium to be ready when their turns come up next.

Mr. Ray Schmidt: Councillors of the City of Winnipeg, I thank you very much for allowing me a short time to speak on this issue.

I come representing Manitoba North Western Ontario Command of the Royal Canadian Legion which covers all the City branches plus all the branches in the Province and North Western Ontario. We have 168 branches in Manitoba, North Western Ontario Command. I will speak more because there's no getting around it, smoking isn't good for you. We all know that. I will deal more with the financial implications that this by-law is going to have.

With skyrocketing insurance premiums, in most cases some branches have tripled due to September 11. Drastically increasing taxes, property taxes, some branches are having a hard time staying viable as my comrade already mentioned. With lower VLT revenue and bingo revenue some branches will eventually have to close. You've seen evidence of that in Winnipeg already. One branch unfortunately couldn't keep up with their property taxes and they had to close the doors.

Now a lot of branches have no smoking facilities and installation of ventilation systems and it's not that we want to have total freedom, it's a question of allowing a choice I believe. A lot of branches in Brandon, I was up there to a veterans affairs meeting not long ago and they doubted whether they would be able to stay open much longer.

Now you can say that it will all level out in six months, a year, I've heard that, but some of these branches that are on a thin line, six months or a year is too late. They won't be able to last that long.

The loss of jobs also for some of the staff in these branches. They will have to find employment elsewhere if they close the branches.

I think in summation I would just like to ask your at least consideration in allowing us an amendment or at least exempting private legion clubs. And I'd also mention, there's no one under 18 in these clubs. They're all members, they are legion members or invited guests. There's no children in these clubs so I don't believe that's an issue that we should have to debate.

In closing I thank you for your time this morning in allowing me to give you a brief overview of what goes on in the branches and the fact that this will have a detrimental effect to a lot of our legion branches. I would ask you to please consider that in making your final decision.

(10:00)

I thank you for your time, and I wish you all a good day.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Apparently Mr. Anderson is now here and we'll give him his five minute time.

Mr. Gordon Anderson: I'm sorry I'm late, I had a big disk with 40 megabytes of stuff that apparently your computers here couldn't handle. I spent all night reformatting into….

Mr. Speaker: Take your time, we haven't started your time yet.

Mr. Anderson: I charge that you people do not have enough information to base your decision on today. I have 40 megabytes of information in a CD disk, and apparently your computers couldn't handle it. I reformatted it here, hopefully you can see it. I'm going strictly off memory now, I can't remember everything.

For one thing, you seem to think that nobody is hurt by this. There is an awful lot of people that are hurt by it.

What about the old people that have to go out in 40 below weather. Winnipeg is not California. When you're comparing California's actions, you don't have to do as the other guy does. My mother taught me, just because Johnny jumps off the bridge you don't have to.

We don't want to fight, I don't like fighting. I try not to fight when I can, I try to negotiate when I can.

If you people go through with this you're going to have a fight on your hands. There's an awful lot of people that are ticked off at you. They all can't come down here and spend all day sitting here. You should have evening meetings when you have something this important. You should have had local meetings inviting the smokers to come and give their opinions. The people that complain to me, why are they not complaining to you?

In the disk I have scientific information showing that these nicotine Nazis up here have been fudging their facts. I've got admissions by an awful lot of people in print that I've gotten off the Internet proving this fact. There is an awful lot of benefits to smoking.

Smoking enhances the (inaudible) features. It improves your brain power.

If you pass this thing I'm going to take you to court. If you pass it today without studying some of the facts that I brought you. There's an awful lot of stuff. Stuff on benefits, stuff on ventilation. How many ventilation engineers have you had in to find out whether what these people have been telling you is true or not. Gale force winds indeed. They're full of gale force winds. It doesn't take gale force winds to ventilate a place. It just needs proper planning and engineering, that's all.

Why do you want to tread on people's rights? Why do you want to destroy my way of life? My friends up here, why do you want to destroy their way of life? Why do want to destroy the way of life of all a quarter of the population of Winnipeg? Just think of that. Who's going to be mad at you? Who's going to be mad at you? These punks? No way.

If you want to fight, I'm willing to fight. If you're willing to sit down and talk and act like gentlemen, fine, I'll do so. But if you want to fight, you'll get it.

What I suggest is that we get my material in some format that you people can handle. We go through it. You form a citizen steering committee composed of smokers together, the information that you need because we don't trust these people. We just don't trust them. Ever since it got into the hands of the ad people you can't believe a word that they say.

Mr. Speaker: Your time is up.

Mr. Anderson: What I propose is that we study ways, there's more ways…

Mr. Speaker: I said sum up in a couple of sentences. You're digressing again.

Mr. Anderson: I'm not digressing, I'm giving a point here.

Mr. Speaker: You're also finished Sir. Thank you.

Mr. Anderson: You'll have to drag me out then.

Mr. Speaker: We won't drag you Sir. It's time to leave.

Next delegation is Murray Gibson, Executive Director of Manitoba Tobacco Reduction Alliance (MANTRA), in support of the by-law.

(10:08)

Mr. Murray Gibson: Mr. Speaker and members of City Council. I first of all want to thank you once again for allowing the citizens of Winnipeg an opportunity to voice their opinion on this proposed by-law. I want to recognize that this Council has logged many hours, not only in hearing public delegations but also in

patiently listening to its constituencies, consulting with their colleagues and researching the issues.

The majority of this Council has not shied away from grappling with a difficult issue, and you're to be commended for that.

The Manitoba Tobacco Reduction Alliance or MANTRA, is an alliance of organizations that include not-for-profit organizations, health care organizations, professional associations, regional health authorities and government departments. We all share one thing in common. We passionately believe in the necessity to reduce tobacco use and its harmful effects. That is why many of our faces are not new to members of this Council.

Since Council began to debate this issue, we have repeatedly and consistently appeared at Council meetings. This is as I said not the first time we are here.

We have attended Executive Policy Committee meetings. We have held public meetings and debates. We have privately spoken with individual councillors. We have raised the issue with the media and encouraged citizens to make their voices heard to Council.

I believe that those of us who favour this by-law have consistently demonstrated our commitment to the direction that is now laid out before us.

It may sound somewhat presumptuous but it would be surprising if we were to hear any new arguments that would delay the passing of this by-law.

To those who would argue that private clubs should be exempt, it should be pointed out that many of the so called private clubs exist by encouraging the public-at-large to attend their functions, make use of their facilities and publicly advertise their services. The public at-large in some cases is not only encouraged to come in as guests but also to apply for various classes of membership.

Nor is this an issue of freedom and rights. No one doubts that the freedoms that we enjoy in this country were paid for at a great price. We are therefore cautious about giving up what we believe to be our freedoms or our rights. It is not against the law in this country to smoke. We can choose to exercise that right. Hopefully we do it with the knowledge that at least 45,000 Canadians every year will die prematurely for choosing to exercise that right. Thousands more will suffer a variety of debilitating diseases. Strange as it may seem that is our right.

However, nowhere are we given the right to damage someone else's health or to cause their premature death. Second-hand smoke damages the health of the non smoker. And in the case of several thousand Canadians causes their ultimate death.

Fortunately law makers recognize that this is not acceptable. Consuming alcohol for example is perfectly legal in this country when you've reached an appropriate age. However, when there's a risk of damaging someone else's health or causing their death, the law states, it steps in and says, that that is not acceptable and prescribes where and when you may consume alcohol. This is not a loss of freedom. This is protecting our freedoms. Drinking and driving is a classical example. The use of seatbelts is another one. This is not a loss of freedom.

Someone once said that we don't object to change, we just object to being changed.

This by-law calls for change. We believe that these are good changes and we commend you for making them.

Yes, some people will be asked to change in order to avoid being responsible for damaging the health of others. Is this too much to ask? We believe not. MANTRA is pleased to be here today and to support this by-law 100%.

It has come about as a result of much careful thought and deserves to go forward unchanged. We are also here to

again confirm our support for City Hall as we move forward to our July 1.

I would also just tell you that we as an organization have booked space tentatively in community newspapers to declare our support for this new by-law. If it goes ahead as approved in principle we would be pleased to do that as part of our commitment to this ongoing process.

We believe that many Winnipeggers are proud of the bold steps that are being taken by this Council and it all adds up to making our city an even greater place to live. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Now in the five minute slot, we have Lynne Billings, on behalf of the Canadian Cancer Society.

Ms Lynne Billings: Thank you. My remarks will be very brief.

The Canadian Cancer Society Manitoba Division is very excited about the prospects of joining forces with the City of Winnipeg in its battle against the adverse affects of tobacco on people's lives in our city.

Recent studies have shown that 30% of cancer deaths are a direct result of tobacco usage. The elimination of smoking in public places allows the Canadian Cancer Society to make major strides towards our goal of eliminating this deadly disease.

The Canadian Cancer Society is very proud of the variety of tools and services that we have developed to assist smokers as they attempt to kick the habit. Our organization is committed to providing best practice cessation models for smokers that are based on the values of compassion and support in light of the challenges that smokers will be facing in the not too distant future.

The Canadian Cancer Society truly values the well-being of smokers. We would also like to take this opportunity to formally congratulate His Worship Mayor Murray and the entire City Council for their courage and determination to develop this monumental piece of legislation that will improve the quality of life in Winnipeg and ultimately save lives in our great city. This is our one great smoke free city.

To sum up, the Canadian Cancer Society fully supports this legislation. Thank you for your time today.

Mr. Speaker: That concludes delegations. We'll move onto the Executive Policy Committee Report of April 9, 2003.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 9, 2003

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'll move that the Report of April 9 of the Executive Policy Committee, Items 1 through 6 be adopted by consent.

Mr. Speaker: I had a request to stand down clause 6. Any others? The motion is that Items 1 to 5 be adopted by consent.

(10:17)

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Moving onto Item No. 6.

Item No. 6 - Additional Appropriation - Winnipeg Harvest and Addition of Winnipeg Harvest as an Ongoing Line Item to the Operating Budget File FE-1 (Vol. 31)

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'd like to hear what the concerns are for this. I think this is a great thing that we're doing for Winnipeg Harvest, and I'm surprised that this was taken off the consent agenda. I'll see what the concerns might be.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Deputy Mayor.

The concern is not with the $50,000 additional appropriation, the question that I would like to have answered by the Deputy Mayor is why, when we're getting ready to go into current budget

deliberations, would an additional appropriation be passed at this time. This is an additional $50,000, we're going into budget deliberations for the years '04, '05 and '06. And of course we were told when we were tying up on the '03 budget that there were to be no additional appropriations. Is this worthy? Absolutely. I would like to know from a process point of view why this is being done in this fashion.

In addition to that of course I would like to ask the Deputy Mayor if she can tell us when the current budget deliberations for the years '04, '05 and '06 will be coming forward to this Council as a whole.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to attempt to answer the budgetary concern questions, but I will suggest that Councillor Pagtakhan came forward with David Northcott and suggested that they have this problem now. They have hundreds of volunteers. They were looking for some relief to help their volunteers go to that particular institute of the Harvest and the food bank by providing them some relief a) on their property taxes, and b) on trying to get transportation for a large number of their volunteers.

Many of you on Council will remember that we use to have a system of a grants committee when Council would determine that we had half a million dollars or $750,000 or however much it was and the grants committee would sit there all day listening to every worthwhile organization and group in the City come forward and say, we want money and they would all be making cases. Well, with my friend Councillor Clement we were able to sort of eliminate that grants committee and create some line items for services that are rendered back to the committee, to the community in the eyes of Council worthwhile services, such as the Humane Society, it became Sister McNamara and the boys and girls group, they became line items because they provide worthwhile consideration to the community.

I cannot think Mr. Speaker of a better institution or organization than what David Northcott and the Winnipeg Harvest people provide to this city in their continual effort and their untiring efforts to help those that need the help the most without coming to governments for additional money as Mr. Northcott says, this is the first time they've ever come to the governments and ask for some consideration.

The reason that it was on here is my opinion, was that Councillor Pagtakhan came forward and made a very eloquent presentation along with Mr. Northcott, Executive Policy Committee said, we believe in this particular issue, let's put the money upfront and let them get started continuing their good work this year Mr. Speaker as opposed to waiting to next year's budget. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers, Deputy Mayor Thomas.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: Thank you. David Northcott is one of the few people I know who's trying to work himself out of a job, and he's stated that on more than one occasion.

One of the ways to do this is to get Winnipeggers who are at risk off social assistance and into gameful employment as the clause states.

One of the ways that we do this is by supporting organizations such as Winnipeg Harvest to assist in their workplace. And while Winnipeg has the lowest unemployment rate in Canada and I think we deserve a lot of credit for that, we also have a lot of people who do not benefit from that. We have touched several times in being the child poverty capital of Canada, and there's this real disconnect between the many who are benefiting from the wonderful Winnipeg which we live in and those who do not. Assisting Winnipeg Harvest by getting these people bus passes, by assisting them to defray these costs and getting these people back into the marketplace and giving them gameful employment helps us all. When they're out there fully employed developing the skills to be fully

employed they're buying furniture, they're renting or buying houses, they're contributing to the tax base, they become contributing taxpayers in so many ways as well as being able to participate in the many things in Winnipeg that we are so proud to have as part of our community. I think this is a very very minor amount of money, $50,000 in order to facilitate that, and that's why I'm here supporting the clause.

I thank Councillor Pagtakhan through the Chair to Councillor Pagtakhan, I'd like to thank Councillor Pagtakhan for bringing this to Executive Policy Committee's attention and we were able to listen to his delegation and make this decision and we bring it forward to Council and hope that Council will agree with our decision that this is something valued that we would like to support in our community. I thank Council and I'm asking them for their support on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item No. 6? Contrary? Carried unanimously.

Moving onto the Report of April 16, 2003. Councillor Thomas with a note to Council that Clause 8 is here for information only, does not require Council approval and therefore will not be part of the consent agenda motion.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 16, 2003

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I will move the Report of April 16, 2003, Items 1 to 11, except for Item 8.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Point of Order

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order Mr. Speaker.

I rise on a point of order, the City Organization By-law Section 4 refers to Mr. Speaker items which are specific powers the duties of Executive Policy Committee. The formal present recommendations to Council and policy plans, budgets, by-laws, any other matters that affect the City as a whole. That's Item one.

(10:25)

Item 8 though Mr. Speaker I'll point to you is in consultation with appropriate standing committees recommend to Council all rates, fees, utility rate structures and other charges for civic services and facilities.

Mr. Speaker I rise on a point of order today to contend that Item 8 is not being followed through with. That this was not part of the operating budget brought forward to Council. I sit on the Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services and the specific question was asked at that standing committee, was this zoo admission fee part of this….

Mr. Speaker: This is not the clause, clause 8 is appointments to the Alternate Service Committee.

Councillor Wyatt: Sorry Mr. Speaker, Clause 6.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 6 is coming forward.

Councillor Wyatt: I rise to say that it should be stricken from the agenda, that it's not in order. That this is not in order because this was not part of the operating budget. We specifically asked the question in our standing committee, is this part of the operating budget, the projections given to us today to have zoo increases come forward. That is not the case, this was not part of it, we were informed by the Administration that we would be brought back to our standing committee any changes in zoo admission fee increases.

Mr. Speaker: My ruling is that the clause is in order, there's great precedent on it. However, it has to be stood down at that time, you'd be well within your rights to ask that it be referred back to standing committee for their review. I would hope that you accept that. You have a right to challenge my ruling that the clause is improperly before us.

You have asked that Item 6 be stood down for debate. Councillor Steek you had items you wanted stood down. Items 3 and 5. Councillor Lazarenko did you have?

Motion by Deputy Mayor Thomas is that Items 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11 be adopted by consent. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 3 - Arena Rental Rate Increases
File PR-2.1 (Vol. 23)

Deputy Mayor Thomas: Now these increases were actually voted on on the budget. This is the clause that is coming afterwards. All people who voted on the budget voted on these increases. Here they are. The report has come after the budget as we do often with detail when we vote on the budget, the details follows.

Mr. Speaker: We have Councillors Steek and Lazarenko on the Item so far.

Councillor Steek: For those of us who objected to this increase during the course of the budget Mr. Speaker, I think what's interesting about this document is that first of all there's the reflection in the fact that there is a reduced demand for arena facilities now. This isn't just a nominal increase that's a reflection of CPI, this is an additional 10%.

The question becomes why would you want to raise rates fully 10% when you know full well that arena usage is already on the slide.

The essence of this Mr. Speaker is brought up in the report itself where it talks about the fact on page 1046, increase cost to maintaining aging facilities are part and parcel. Really there's a lot of this that has to be addressed in a facilities management review.

I just have a great deal of difficulty with something that puts through a 10% increase up above CPI. CPI on an average basis is running a little better than two percent a year.

I'd be interested in hearing from the Chair how you justify a 10% increase. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was going to speak to it but I believe Councillor Steek has said exactly what I was going to say, I'll be asking for a recorded vote, and I'll be voting against this increase.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Steeves followed by Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just have a couple of questions that maybe could be addressed in summary by the Deputy Mayor if she happens to know, or maybe by the Chair of Public Works.

We have some arenas that are under use agreements. They're owned by us but kind of outside of the other arenas. I'm wondering a) how they'll be affected. I'm not sure after looking at the report how that will affect those arenas. It's a bit self-indulgent that St. Vital Arena happens to be one of them.

The other question I have is, I couldn't tell from the report, the 10% increase, does that have to do with a 10% across the board. It seems to me that there's peak times and non peak times. I'm just wondering if it is, obviously it would make, it might make some sense to consider the idea that we would look at increases for the peak times, and if we're having trouble filling the rink at other times maybe those could be treated a little differently. That's all Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll address a couple of things. I know there's three different clauses that are coming off. The process issues I guess apply to a couple of them. There's some overlap.

In terms of the questions that were asked the 10% increase I believe covers all the seasons here.

In terms of the process though I would like to comment on that. It is a little bit of a different process. The fact of the matter is I checked with the City Clerk and according to the Organizational By-law, I certainly beg to differ with Councillor Wyatt, the City Clerk's ruling is that these items were part of the operating budget. The City Organizational By-law states that Executive Policy Committee has the power and duty to recommend Council on budgets. And should the proposed fee increases be part of the operating budget that this would form part of EPC's recommendation.

The confusion is, that these reports weren't available in the actual budget process or two of them weren't, the recreation fees were of the three reports that have been pulled off.

My point is that the City Organizational By-law according to the City Clerk does not require EPC to consult with the Standing Policy Committee if it is considered part of the operating budget and that was the ruling that I received from the Clerk.

Now the fact of the matter was, these items were discussed at the Standing Policy Committee when we had our budget meeting during the budget process. The recreation fees were discussed at the time and the report was available. The other two reports weren't available and were still in the system. But the Standing Policy Committee was alerted that those two reports they were alerted by Ursula Stelman that those two reports were still in the system, and that there were fee increases that were going to be coming forward in more specific reports and that those fee increase revenues were factored into the budget.

They didn't have the detailed report but they knew that there were fee increase reports coming in the future as soon as they were through the system, and they knew the budget revenues included those fee increases.

The ruling of the Clerk, when I inquired was that they could therefore be considered part of the budget process and it was appropriate for EPC to rule on them.

(10:33)

The fact of the matter is the reports are here, they're available for councillors over the last since they were passed at EPC a week or two ago so everyone's had a chance to read the more specific details. And they certainly could have questioned the Administration about those revenues at the time that we had the meeting on the budget if those were of concern to them. I'm sure they did that.

Point of Order

Councillor Wyatt: The speaker is talking about an item which I addressed as Item No. 6 and her comments are geared towards that. We're talking here I believe about Item No. 3. I rule that this is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I believe Councillor Gerbasi started her comments and she started upon the item that were stood down.

Councillor Gerbasi: As a matter of fact this was the arena and the zoo report were I think the were the two reports that weren't available yet in the system. They were actually referred to by the Director of Community Services at our budget meeting at the Standing Policy Committee and we were advised that there was revenue implications that were already included in the budget.

Frankly we have a clear ruling from the City Clerk, this is appropriate in terms of the Organizational By-law. I'm not saying it's ideal, the reports were stuck in the system and that's unfortunate and it is confusing.

The fact of the matter is, anybody who had any questions had plenty of opportunity to ask them. There were questions asked. There could have been more questions asked. It's not like information was being kept from members

of the Standing Policy Committee. Honest, the report wasn't through the system and they were advised that the report wasn't ready yet. But that the revenue projections in the budget included increased fees that were coming.

The problem with questioning this now is that the revenue increases are already incorporated in the budget. If Council were to change their mind at this point and not bring in the increases we would be definitely short in last year's budget and we're about to go into a three year budget which is not going to be all that easy to deal with. I don't know if we want to start finding. If you add up all these three reports I think it's about $800,000 in revenue we'd have to find. We already voted on it. Councillor Wyatt actually voted for the budget.

I just think at this point in terms of process, it's a little awkward but it's fair and it's within the rules of Council, and budgets can be like that. The Director of Community Services was very clear to the Committee that these reports were coming later and that they were already included in the budget. The Clerk has clearly ruled that this is part of the budget process.

I think I'll leave my comments there, if there's further debate I may want to participate in some of the other clauses. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm going to try and take a little bit more consolatory tone. I'm going to thank the councillors that asked for these particular clauses to be set aside. I'm only to speak to Item No. 3 and I think my comments will relate to the others as well. But I'm only going to speak to Item No. 3 in case I have to get up and speak to the other two.

First thing I'm going to do is I'm going to apologize to my colleagues, not because I've done anything wrong, I'm the Chairman of Fiscal Issues and the budget is part of my watch if you like. There's a lot of numbers in those documents. There's about 8,500 line accounts. I don't deal with each one of them unless somebody raises an issue with them unless I'm made aware that there are certain things being changed administratively while the document is being prepared, and that's obviously what's happened here.

Everybody is quite correct, it's my view frankly in a normal instance that these things should be reviewed by the Standing Committee. The problem is, we've already passed the budget and these numbers exist within the budget and we're spending the money.

When this came to our attention there were a number of ways we could deal with it. We could I guess send it back to the Standing Committee and have them debate something that's already in the budget. Or we could deal with it the way that we chose in the end because in the end notwithstanding that people can rise on a point of order and recite what's in the Org By-law or some other such method of making their case, the fact is, is that Council is supreme, and Council has the ability to vote on whatever it wants to vote on in this chamber after appropriate debate.

I'm not thrilled about the way that this has come before us. The fact is, it's in the budget, it is money that we've already accounted for.

I'd like to speak to the arena rates in particular though Mr. Speaker because my understanding is, and I don't know why this is the case, and I believe it's being corrected. There hasn't been a CPI type bump in the rates on an ongoing basis, there should have been. So this is as I understand it a one time correction which is why it's 10% as opposed to something like 2% or 3% or something like that. That I believe is the correct explanation.

I can also tell you that our arena rental rates are not out of line with other arenas that are privately owned, and that's an interesting thing because I continue to get the same reports administratively that we don't need more ice. We probably don't if

everybody used the outdoor ice appropriately, but it doesn't seem to be the real world anymore. As a result of the fact that we've administratively and politically taken the view that we don't need more sheets of ice and that type of thing for people to use, the fact is, is that we have been guaranteeing mortgages for various community clubs. In fact just so that you know and you're all invited if you like to come to the Varsity View Sportsplex on Saturday night, they're going to burn their mortgage for the Varsity View Sportsplex because they've paid it off and we guaranteed it so that's good news for us. I can also tell you that none of the others and I can think of at the top of my head there's one in Transcona, Gateway, there's Maples, there's St. Norbert, there's Dakota, there's Keith Bodley, there's any number of these that the public has gone out and raised the money for through various methods and we've guaranteed the mortgages and they've all been making their mortgage payments. But interestingly how they made them is by bumping the rates so that they could accommodate the operational costs of these facilities, which ultimately then allowed us to move our rates up to theirs so that we actually now get dollar for dollar back. Our arenas don't cost us money today well they won't if we have this bump, but prior to that back in around 1983, '84, we were subsidizing arenas by almost sixty cents on every dollar which is what we do with pools today although it's a little worse than that.

I don't think it's an issue about whether the rates are fair or whether they're the same as everybody else's. I think that they are in line. This is a one time correction on this particular issue. I wish that it would have come a little different way. I wish there had been a little bit more information when we dealt with the budget. I can tell you I wasn't aware of any of these three when we dealt with the budget, but they're here, they're real, and we have to deal with them. They are in the budget. If we turn them down then we're going to be short and have to do something else. In my view Mr. Speaker that is the most honest explanation that I can give for what's going on here today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd like to Mr. Speaker refer Item No. 6 to the Standing Committee..

Mr. Speaker: We're only on Item No. 3.

Councillor Wyatt: I thought we could speak to any item.

Mr. Speaker: No. Only Item No. 3 is before us. Any motions would have to pertain to clause 3 and clause 3 alone at this point.

Deputy Mayor Thomas summing up.

(10:40)

Deputy Mayor Thomas: Thank you. I'm actually going to call people's attention to the clause. In looking over the clause you will see in the history that this by-law hasn't been amended since 1997, and as Councillor Clement put it, that is part of the problem.

In the discussion it refers to maintaining arena operations which continue to increase at a greater rate than revenue streams. We require our departments to provide service on a cost recovery basis. But this has not been occurring.

In 1998 expenditures were only covered to the tune of 72.6%. We were subsidizing at that point. And now the rate of subsidization has fallen below 60%. The operations continue to increase and this along with increased costs in maintaining the aging infrastructure, equipment, salaries, capital repairs, graffiti control, vandalism means that we have to have this 10% increase. I would like to call people's attention to the fact that even with the 10% increase that is being proposed here, the recovery rate will only be bumped up to 65%. We've told our administration to make their goal 100%. Now we're still continuing to subsidize. We're continuing to subsidize because we continue to feel that it's a concern that requires some subsidization.

I'd like to call Council's attention to the fact that we are competing with private arenas. We're still being on a competitive basis. We're still on the low end with these fee increases so there are private arenas that are out there that are charging more money than us.

They might even argue that we're unfairly subsidizing them if we continue to keep our rates too low, and not get the cost recovery from them that we should be getting.

With this plus the fact that Council was made aware during the budget process that these reports were coming forward and we had anticipated for the increased revenue in the budget, I will close debate on Item No. 3.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lazarenko has asked for a recorded vote on this clause. All in favour of clause 3 please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the results being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy,

Nays

Councillors Smith, Steek, Wyatt and Lazarenko.

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

Mr. Speaker: Clause is carried.

Clause 5.

Item No. 5 - Recreation Fee Increases
File PR-2.10 (Vol. 11)

Deputy Mayor Thomas: We're increasing 5% on all leisure aquatic and admission fees. I do believe that if you refer to the report it will give you more detailed analysis of why we're doing this and I'll wait for the questions.
Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Chair of Protection is correct, this was one of the three reports that should have been at Policy and was the only one that arrived so it begs a number of questions. Whether it be when the Chair of Protection speaks or the Deputy Mayor wraps up.

The first question that comes to mind is on items of this nature and this importance, why were the reports not there? Number one. Number two, we were told that if we don't pass these clauses because they were part and parcel of budget which I didn't vote for so I'm not concerned. The fact remains is that we were told there will be a shortfall, we were told that both by the Chair of Protection and by the Chair of Fiscal Issues. That's fascinating. There's great concern about the shortfall in the budget.

However, clause one of the EPC report or clause six of the EPC report just passed an additional appropriation of $50,000 and nobody was concerned about it. And that wasn't in the budget. So one could only assume it was either a line item that no one was aware of or a contingency fund which doesn't exist.

So what's it going to be? The fact remains is that you have to have a look at this report. And it's fascinating again. Take a look at the report where it talks about the fact that it's recognized that the fee increase may impact on certain demographics. But don't worry, if you want to come on bended knee you can have it waived.

Furthermore, City of Winnipeg aquatic hall fees are generally higher than other organizations within the local market. Reiterated about three times in the course of this report. Some are lower but the aquatic fees relative things like life guarding are definitely higher. So if you're increasing everything across the board in order to bring it in line when you're dropping these fees to bring it in to line with the market. And the answer of

course is no. We're told that if you don't have this $136,000 as a shortfall in the budget yeah there is in theory. But there was an additional $50,000 appropriation that was moved earlier Mr. Speaker.

I'm not supporting this clause, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker I'm not supporting this clause either because as we all know, user fees are a very conservative principle. They hurt the people who have the smallest incomes.

In this report also it says this. A local comparative analysis of recreation, leisure and aquatic programs pricing for organizations that have similar programs. What are these organizations? I would like more information on that. If we're going to compare all the time with other organizations we should have some idea of who they are within the City of Winnipeg.

Getting back to my main point. User fees restrict usage. Especially among those people of low income, and that's why I oppose this clause.

(11:50)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Just a comment on the process just to clarify on this particular item Mr. Speaker.

This was debated at the Standing Committee and it was debated at EPC and then again here and it was already voted on. I'm really not convinced that there's a lot of point to debating it again.

I sympathize with Councillor Smith, I wish we didn't charge user fees for anything. I don't think anybody enjoys having to charge a fee. I think I'd like to give all the children everything for free. I think realistically we do have some user fees. Occasionally those rates are raised. I think the key thing is that we're sensitive in they're reasonable rates. We have alternative for people who need assistance with lower incomes.

Of course if it was a perfect world everything would be free, and I think we'd all enjoy that world.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Deputy Mayor Thomas.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'll call your attention to the discussion again. In a comparative analysis of recreation, leisure and aquatic program pricing that have similar program content and amenities, key findings are and lowest price service provider for pre-school. Lowest price service provided for children's program. Lowest price service provided for summer camps. Below average with skating. Below average for six learn to swim programs. Highest price for life saving. Lowest for adult fitness. Lowest for adult leisure. Lowest for pre-school programs. Below average on children's programs. Lowest price for summer camps. Below average. Again on and on it goes.

Who are these competitors? They're also public sector organizations. We're talking about the school division, we're talking about the Red Cross. We're talking about the St. John's Ambulance. We're talking about the Y. We're not talking about someone who is not another public sector institution.

Here we are and we have employees, everybody has employees and we have to pay them. Boy it's really uncomfortable when you're charging children for things but I think we are continuing to be in most cases either the lowest service provider or below average in every case except one. There are options if people choose not to go to our life saving program. They obviously even with it being the highest price consider this a program that they would choose over others. At that point I am not going to mention the others who are providing service regardless of what councillors have asked here. I'm not going to get into a debate while on a specific item on that case.

We need to be able to balance the City's books for the benefit of all the citizens here. We try our best to keep the rates competitive and to keep them low and we have been successful in that. In some cases because of cost of living because of staff salaries, because of the equipment that we provide, we do at some point necessarily have to raise the fees and we try to make this the absolute minimum possible and we have done this and we are still maintaining our position of being the lowest or very low. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Once again Councillor Lazarenko had called for a recorded vote on this clause. All in favour of clause 5 please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt, Lazarenko, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

Councillors Smith, Steek.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 2.

Mr. Speaker: Clause is carried.

Moving onto Clause 6.

Item No. 6 - Increase of Zoo Admission Fees
File PR-7.1.1 (Vol. 17)

Deputy Mayor Thomas: We really feel uncomfortable when it comes to charging for our services and I know this.

With this small increase we are still the lowest price zoo in all of Canada. I would like to call the Council's attention to the fact that our zoo is looking more than a little haggard around the edges, and that these revenues are needed. We still to a very great extent still subsidize the operations of the Zoo, and we have huge decisions to make around the improvements that are necessary to the Zoo. This is a very minor increase to our zoo fees. It hurts but it's necessary. That's all I can say.
Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move to refer this item Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt has moved that Item No. 6 be referred back from whence it came. It would go through EPC. I don't think we can refer it beyond that to another body.

Referred to EPC, it's their report they could then go back.

If you wish to explain why as long as it's under one minute on a referral motion you may.

Councillor Wyatt: I rise on this to speak because clearly the items that we just dealt with recreation fees and arenas were dealt with our committee and we were very clear and we knew exactly what was taking place. We knew the impact, we knew what the fee increases were.

I recall from the meeting that we did have regarding the current budget very clearly. It's unfortunate that we don't have a Hansard in the standing committees but I recall very clearly when a member of our committee asked our administration regarding the proposed revenue projections for the Assiniboine Park Zoo, and was this tied to an admission change. And the answer came back no Councillor it is not. That any admission change will be brought back to you for discussion but it's not part of this budget.

Yes, the recreation fees were. Yes, the arena changes were. Yes, the aquatic programs were. Absolutely. They were all part of that, we were very clear on that. But the Zoo was clearly not. Nothing was said. The questions were asked, there was nothing about reports in the system that we were talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi had a point of order.

Point of Order

Councillor Gerbasi: I believe that he was really getting into the debate here about things that were said at another committee. But he's finished anyway. It's fine.

Mr. Speaker: Deputy Mayor Thomas did you wish to take a minute to oppose referral?

Deputy Mayor Thomas: Thank you. Yes. I do oppose referral. These are in the budget and were passed in the budget. It's necessary to have these fees for the operation of the Zoo. Referring the clause back would undermine that.

(10:57)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

I will call for a recorded vote on the referral motion. Those in favour of referral please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Smith, Steek, Wyatt, Lazarenko, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal.

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

Mr. Speaker: Referral is defeated. Councillor Wyatt did you wish now to speak to the clause.

Councillor Wyatt: I rise Mr. Speaker, I'll try to be consolatory. It's hard to be consolatory though, I guess it's easy to be consolatory when the rules are being broken in your favour. It's hard when it's the other way around.

I rise Mr. Speaker to say that this is an outrageous increase. I would have spoken to this in the standing committee had we been given all the information and had we known that this was part of the budget. We were misinformed and clearly it was part of the budget.

The increases are huge. Let me speak to them Mr. Speaker. They have nothing to do with inflation. The report refers to inflation rates of approximately 18.3% since 1993. The average increase for the high season is 49.4% on zoo fees. The average increase on the low season is 98.8% Mr. Speaker. I'll just read you the increases here, we're talking the adult increase on the high season is 25% more. The seniors is 27% more. The youth is 43% more. The children is 60% more. And for families 46% more. 49.4% is what I read into these increases. On the low the season the adult, the increase is from $1.00 to $3.20, 220% increase. Seniors 195% increase. Youth 60%. Children 5% increase, and family 14% increase with an average low season increase of 98.8%. I can now see why this was not brought forward to our standing committee.

These increases are huge. All the monies are going into the general revenues of the community services department. The Community Services Department whether or not they allocate this to the Zoo, I have no idea. A percentage of the money is going to the Zoological Society of Manitoba therefore clearly that is one of the reasons why I think they're in favour of this today because they will be a benefactor of this increase.

Mr. Speaker, the attendance has fallen in the last decade, 35.4%. There's no new dollars in this for marketing or promoting our zoo. I agree with the previous speaker saying that our zoo is in a dire situation, that there is a concern about the future of the Zoo. There's no doubt about it in my mind too Mr. Speaker, that there is clearly a big concern regarding the future of the Zoo and the resources

that we are putting towards the Zoo. This will not resolve the situation. I like this to the transit fare increase. We jack up transit fares and the ridership falls. I cannot see raising zoo admission fees while at the same time not reinvesting in the Zoo in any major way, and any major improvements will lead to higher attendance.

As a matter of fact the report indicates that there's been a trend in the last three years, the trend has been downwards, 7.8% drop. Without any major dollars for marketing or promotion, without any major dollars for reinvestment in the Zoo clearly admission fee zoo increase admission fees for the Zoo will only lead to a further decline in revenues and attendance.

I hope the Administration I hope EPC is correct when it comes to the projections here. They're estimating here that a total of $700,000 will come to the treasury of the City based on the amended increases.

I speak Mr. Speaker as well because I feel that the Zoo at one time was a place where families could go for very affordable entertainment. That young families working families, the working poor, the working people many of the people coming from my constituency would attend the Zoo because they want to see the facility, they want to take their children, it's a day out, it's a way to get away from the business of their lives. It's a chance and an opportunity Mr. Speaker for families to go out and to have an affordable form of entertainment.

When the increase was brought about, when fees were brought about in 1993, at that time the assurance was of course given that don't worry, we still have free Tuesdays. Tuesdays are free. In May of 1997 free Tuesdays were eliminated. That's gone. So there's nothing basically for a working family to partake in the Zoo if they want to take a group of people down to be able to get in without having to pay. I understand that our staff supplies admission passes to family services which is good, I think that's excellent. But at the same time that basically means that unless if you're on social assistance or dealing with family services if you're a working person, a working family or part of the working poor, you will not have access to that.

This Mr. Speaker is a regressive move. It is a highly backwards move. The resources are not going towards the Zoo being dedicated strictly to the Zoo in the same way for example that our sewer and water levy went towards putting aside a reserve fund for future water treatment plant. This is not the case Mr. Speaker for building a brand new zoo. If it were maybe I would look differently upon it. Maybe we would even increase it more if we wanted to make the Zoo a sustainable and to reinvest in the Zoo and to make it something that is a real attraction in our city.

Clearly there has to be a reinvestment in the Zoo, and there's no doubt about it in my mind. The question is, is this going to do it? No it's not. If anything it's going to hurt the Zoo even further.

I rise today Mr. Speaker to speak against this. I made my feelings I think very clear that this should have come to our Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services. Whether or not the reports are ready I think it's the side of the fact we were not informed that there was reports in the system regarding this. We were clearly told that this was not part of the budget, that the projections here were not part of the budget coming forward. We were very clear on the recreation fee increases. We were very clear on the aquatic fee increases. We were very clear on the arena fee increases. Therefore I know we were very clear when it came to the fact that there was no zoo admission fee increases that was presented to us as part of the budget.

Had that been the case the motion that came out of the standing committee which was passed by the standing committee to eliminate those portions of the budget would have also included the Zoo admission fees, which they did not because we clearly did not we were not informed that that was part of the budget and when we asked the question we were told it was not.

Mr. Speaker I rise today to ask Council to reject this, to have the standing committee really in my mind should take a clear look at the Zoo and the future of the Zoo and come forward to this Council with recommendations that would include zoo admission fee increases or maybe adjustments. That would be part of an overall package of addressing what the future of the Zoo is going to be and what the plan for the Zoo will be.

The costs that have been put forward in the past year alone we're talking upwards of $200 million to renovate and re-equip our zoo. It's a huge and daunting task if this is the direction we're heading in. Clearly this should be part of that and not be a stand alone just a quick cash grab for the current operating budget.

(11:05)

I rise as a supporter of the Zoo Mr. Speaker and I encourage all members who are also supporters of the Zoo to defeat this and to allow the Standing Committee to do the business that belongs to the Standing Committee. At the end of the day Mr. Speaker, if this the pattern that will happen and if business such as this which is clearly in the jurisdiction of a Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services, if this clearly does not come before the Standing Committee we must start to question the existence of the standing committees. What is the reason we have standing committees. Why don't we simply abolish all standing committees and let EPC run the show of Council and just let Council finally decide on everything that they want to do.

Clearly this is the direction we're heading in Mr. Speaker, and I must question that, we can save on administrative staff when it comes to, not that I don't like our administrators, but when it comes to the standing committees…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt I'll stop you're clock. Was that a motion that we abolish standing committees?

Councillor Wyatt: No I didn't make a motion Mr. Speaker. I'm just taking this issue to its logical ends an issue which I do not support.

Mr. Speaker thank you for the extension and I will not be supporting this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to put a little bit of perspective on this.

I'd first just like to clarify regarding the process. The Director of Community Services did advise the Committee that there were two reports, one was arenas and one was zoo fees that were not yet through the system that did impact on the budget. I disagree with the comments and I'd like to put that on the record that that's what I was advised by the Director of Community Services.

I think this argument we've heard this morning is not really about affordability, it's really more about frustration with the process and I respect that feeling and it was not an ideal process and I have the job of standing up and defending it and it's all a lot of fun, it's not a lot of fun standing up and defending any kind of fee increase for the Zoo, I don't think anybody wants to do that.

But to put it in perspective I don't think this is really about affordability. There hasn't actually been a fee increase at the Zoo in 10 years. We do have the second largest animal collection in Canada. I'd like to share this with some of the councillors here.

Even with the new increase the adult fare is $3.75. Well the Children's Museum is $5.50 for adults and $6 for children. The Fort Whyte Centre is $5, and all the other zoos are ranging from $6 to $18 to $40 to get in for one person. Our fees are so massively lower than everywhere in Canada and most of the world for a zoo for the calibre of our zoo. That I really don't think this is realistically about affordability. I understand the process has been frustrating and not ideal, and

I've tried to explain as best I can the unfortunate order of reports coming and going. I think we've had an opportunity to look at the facts and here they are. It's really a modest increase. It's not an increase we would like to see.

The other thing is that in 2002 there were 8,750 free admissions, 4,000 during special events. The free and reduced admissions are provided to economically disadvantaged individuals and that's not just people as Councillor Wyatt hinted there, that it was just people on social assistance, it's everybody that's economically disadvantaged has the opportunity for free or reduced admissions.

We're trying to be sensitive, it's difficult, its revenue goes back to the Community Services Department. I don't know where we'd find that kind of revenue to provide the programs we provide. I think we have to keep these things in perspective. We do have a zoo master plan that we obviously will be looking at as we go into the next three and four years in determining how to move ahead and make our zoo better.

Let's be honest, this is really a modest increase, it's not exorbitant, nobody likes to do it, nobody's having fun, but come on, $3.75, a movie is $7 or $8 for one person. If everything was free I'd be a lot happier too but reality is and Councillors raising this has supported the other fee increases in recreation and supported the whole budget. There's a bit of inconsistency here. It's not fun for any of us and I urge Council to continue on, let's put the 2003 budget behind us and move on with the big decisions, the important decisions we're going to have to make so we continue to fund our programs over the next three and four years. I urge Council to support this clause and let's get on with our work. Thank you.

(Councillor Eadie in the Chair)

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko on the clause.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak and also I will be voting against this clause.

During the budget process when we're dealing with the subject of our finances, the Administration said they put this into the budget but the figures were not given to us specifically to know exactly what we were doing.

The process was wrong. This is not the way the budgets are presented. We cannot put the year 2003 budget behind us because it's before us here today this morning.

Since 1997, five years, no increase at the Zoo. Why not? Since 1993, 10 years, inflation has increased by 18.3%. Why wasn't something dealt with from that time on? All the funding that's to go to the Zoo should be dealt with the three levels of government. The Federal, Provincial and the City. The Federal and the Province get the most taxation out of people that go to the Zoo. I've been saying this off and on so many times I'm like a broken record. We don't get those concessions. But still they are not part of the funding they may provide some but not to the point of saying that we have to have this increase of zoo fees because of what it's costing us.

Before May 26, 1993, the Park and Zoo were free. We were proud, we're such a proud city saying, we don't charge for people to visit our zoo and to go to the Park. We had said at that time there will be no changes, we're going to continue having this. It was an icon, it was set in the City of Winnipeg, no fees. But then in 1997 free Tuesdays were eliminated. At the same time May 26, 1993 we introduced fees to the Zoo. This is part of it Councillors let me tell you. Mr. Speaker user fees, this is just a part, a beginning of an introduction that the City is going to proceed to go further. User fees. Garbage will be one of them. I believe it will be coming back to the floor of Council. It's been haunting us for some time now. We just can't seem to leave it alone.

When you're preparing a budget, and my message is to the Administration also on this. Please give us those numbers that we have to deal with it, we can deal with them at the specific time when the budget is being presented to be voted on and to be discussed before we vote on that.

(11:15)

To have this come back with such a heavy increase, 60% for children. I know that the Assiniboine Park Zoo compared to the Canadian average we are way below. Before 1993 we were one of the top because we had no fees. And we weren't concerned because the fees were being charged in Edmonton, charged in Calgary. We survived. Then someone comes up with this brainwave idea to say look, to get additional funding, let's start user fees at the Zoo. This is not the end.

When you have the Canadian average of an adult admission is $3, the Canadian average is $9.37, let me remind you, we'll be going and tapping into this until we get into the Canadian average. What will it mean, a child now is $1, the increase after this is passed will be $1.60, a 60% increase. The Canadian average is $5.67 for a child admission.

We will not stop here. Next year's budget I'm sure it will come before Council when the process is being dealt with with the budget, these increases will be there, visible so everyone can see and it will be dealt with properly by each standing committee so they can make a recommendation to the Executive Policy Committee then Executive Policy Committee will make that recommendation to the floor of Council. Let me rest assure you that this will not happen again that will be a massive confusion where members of Council have to stand and debate an issue that was dealt with through the budget process. But the numbers were not there. These huge numbers.

I can tell you right now I don't think Council of last month when we dealt with the special meeting of the budget would have proceeded to go along with what the Administration have recommended as a lump number but the breakdown was not there.

Mr. Speaker, I know for fact that we need the funding, but why do we seem to be caught in this turmoil of confusion and the process. This should have been dealt with also by Fiscal Issues. We would have known what we were doing before. Now it's coming back again.

If you want to have the attendance increase in any facility that we operate you don't hit the general public by user fees and to the extent what it is. It is going to discourage people of coming to use the facility to go to the Zoo. What do you do with a school that wants to send their children especially from the area that a family who send their children are just on the poverty line. You have to find ways to subsidize them through the taxation system, they'll be able to go and enjoy their time at the Zoo. What do you do with seniors who live in complexes such as the senior housing that want to go and some of them are on a fixed income? Is this going to discourage them for even thinking of going to the Zoo by bus? We increased the bus fares, now we're increasing the fees to the Zoo. Is it going to discourage them or the organizers to say look, we have to ask you for an additional cost of what you were paying before because of what Council has done. No one in Council heard a delegation pertaining to the Zoo or any other user fees that we had introduced. Even today there hasn't been anyone here to voice their objections because the way this was done was done through the backdoor.

My advice to the Chairs of the standing committees who all sit on Executive Policy Committee, please stop doing this. Don't allow that to even be put on the agenda unless it's gone through the proper process. When you have the Administration preparing a budget for us make sure that the process is dealt with properly. In such a fashion that each and every member of Council will be able to go to the standing committee and voice their objections or whether they were in favour. The clause before 5% increase, I voted for it because I know we dealt with

it once before. Five percent was not as high as to the services and what we said about recreation fee increases. I voted for it. But when it comes to something like this, and I know some members especially Chairs of various standing committees will say look, you don't have to tell me, who do you think you are, you're going to tell me that I must do this. But you will find out that gradually you will be forced to do that because you will not get the cooperation from all members of Council if each one of them try to be a bully. To say that look, I have dealt with this at the standing committee, you had an opportunity to be there, but not through the process where we went backwards. Council dealt with the numbers and then this comes in in this fashion.

This is why council members can't seem to get along, we just can't seem to think or be on the same wavelength because of the confusion that is before us.

I could tell you right now, after last October's election I represent an area now that I've taken over has a lot of the lower family incomes to schools, recreations, senior centres, community centres, also various organizations that try to bring their groups together for a day out or anything that they want to do. I represent them. They've been coming to us for grants, per capita grants, community centre grants to please help us because we cannot proceed we cannot succeed. We're coming to a point that we have to give up. This is wrong Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith on clause 6.

Councillor Smith: My immediate reaction because the Zoo is really very shabby. I thought increased revenue would help. But at the same time look at the increase. They've had the power to increase the fees every year and they haven't done so. It's too gigantic, I agree with Councillor Lazarenko, it's too much of an increase at one time. It's still a user fee, and I oppose user fees. Don't forget originally as Councillor Lazarenko has mentioned was free we had in the year 1992, we had 552,758 admittance. Now it's down to 321,489 in the year 2001. In other words we've lost over 200,000 people going to the Zoo. Obviously it is a matter in my mind it's more affordability than it is anything else. It used to be free, it used to be something that we considered part of the City services. Then we tacked on the conservative user fee. Now we want to increase it in a big lump sum.

(11:25)

To compare it to other things in the community is not how I decide what should be done at the Zoo. The Zoo is something that we used to think for everyone in the City of Winnipeg could visit, now we do not obviously agree on that. We say they have to pay.

We did away with the free admission on Tuesdays. And the idea of going ahead and asking people to say that they're hard up and so forth, many people will not do that.

The whole idea of user fees to me is repugnant, it is conservative. I understand this is a conservative council and I'm a minority here. You know, think of the families and the children think of it as a civic service that is slowly being destroyed not only by increasing the user fees but by not maintaining the Zoo in a proper and fit manner.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steek on the clause.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. With all due respect to the Chair of Protection I heard on three occasions, this is not about affordability. Of course it's about affordability. Read the report.

The most stunning statistic comes on page 1078, since '98 zoo attendance has decreased an average of 7.8% per year. In the late '90s this was a zoo that attracted in excess of 425,000 people. This past year the attendance was 338,000. Increase it another 25% and watch it continue to fall. If you're offering something that is world class people will pay accordingly.

The fact remains is that you are asking for a 25% increase that's staggering, that's unconscionable and it's not warranted. Why is it not warranted Mr. Speaker? Well simply once again read the critical element in the report. It says, if a probable scenario occurs this increase will result in a $190,000 of additional revenue. Not the entire $699,000 that's the revenue period. This is just $190,000 in additional revenue.

Now, I noted that the Deputy Mayor in speaking to the clause relative to Manitoba Harvest referred to $50,000 as a minor amount. So using that kind of wanted thinking, surely $190,000 is not that significant. Why isn't that significant? Well let's roll the tape back for a minute to what happened during the current budget year. Miraculously when we came to the floor we discovered that there was an additional $4 million in revenue because of an expanded assessment base. And the response from the Mayor was, well you know those things always come in late. But they always come in.

Last year in December 2002, EPC carved up $7.5 million for favourite projects. And here we are asking those that are least able to afford it to come up with a 25% increase for adult fare to the Zoo. What's the message that it sends? The message is this. It's easy to raise a fare like this because of the fact that people cannot come out and object with any strenuous opportunity. In fact we know that it's going to walk through with ease here today. But it should send off an important warning shot.

I have a lot of problem with this report Mr. Speaker that talks about the fact that we're way way below the national average. Well let's compare apples with apples. You'll be seeing in the newspaper very very shortly that the average cost of a resale of a home across this country is now touching $200,000 because of what's happening in large urban centres. In Winnipeg we've yet to hit $100,000. The message is, this is a community that doesn't have the kind of spending capabilities that there are in other large jurisdictions. So don't compare us to world class zoos in other jurisdictions.

The fact remains, is that for another $190,000 we don't have to being coming back in this fashion. This could have been built into this budget without a fee increase and we know that full well. Just remember that. $4 million in additional revenues rolled into this budget sight unseen. We had people here lobbying for monies for museums for paltry amounts. And what were they told? Budget's frozen, no additional appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, it will be fascinating to come back in this chamber in a year and see what the attendance at the Zoo is after you increase it another 25%. 338,000 last year, will it hit 300,000? Maybe.

The answer to it Mr. Speaker, is a number of people here have alluded to is the fact that what you should be doing is looking at this in the capital budget. What's the long term going to happen? What's the long term vision for the Zoo? To bring forward a world class zoo you could probably bring forward some increase in admission Mr. Speaker and have the public as a whole accept that. But to blithe put through a 25% increase is fundamentally wrong because like the bus increase that drives down rider ship every year, it's simply the avenue of the least resort and it shows very frankly cavalier attitude to those who can least afford it. Think about the irony of this Mr. Speaker. We moved $50,000 to Winnipeg Harvest which we all supported this morning because of the fact those are folks who need assistance and that's laudable and it's right. So what do we do in return? We jack up the fees to the Zoo which is one of the premier offerings for people by 25%. We're giving with one hand and we're taking with the other. It's wrong. I won't support the clause.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Everybody is attacking us from a lot of different angles. I guess I won't be quite as consolatory as I felt a little while ago. Particularly from the shot I

took from the king of the flamingos over here. I know he has a hard time getting out of Transcona every once and a while but he might like to come over to the Zoo, and I think they might have one or two flamingos over there.

This is all about numbers Mr. Speaker. You can do a lot of different things with numbers. This Council in a collective fashion has reduced taxes by 6% in the last few years. We've had some other zero budgets. While we've been doing that while people don't want to count it all the time we've had increases, the increases for our protection services this year were increased by approximately $20 million. The year before by about $17 million, I'm talking about police, fire and ambulance as an example. Where did the money come from? Well certainly some of it came from growth. Some of it came from the Provincial Government with some special grants and things like that. The bottom line is there's been a lot of change. To create that change we give envelopes to staff. They have to make changes within their own documents to try and find a) the revenue, and b) the savings that are required for these types of things.

You don't have to go any further than going to the next set of clauses, number five is going to talk about an agreement with our largest union Mr. Speaker. It may be modest to some folks and you can go back over the last few years, you don't have to go back very far.

(11:30)

When you add up all those modest changes to their agreement you're about 15% in a very few number of years.

Guess which employees it is that work in the Zoo. They want to be paid and they want to be paid a reasonable salary. We're doing that. We negotiate those kinds of things and we do it with everybody Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is, is we have to be able to make things balance. One of the speakers made a comment well $50,000 wasn't a lot of money, so maybe $190,000 isn't. Well $190,000 is to me. There's another clause here today with the Junos, that's $275,000, it's nothing too right? There's a few others. There isn't a meeting that goes by where somebody doesn't come up with an idea, a recommendation some kind of a review of change of what we're doing, how we're doing it, and whether we should be doing it without charging somebody. The bottom line is, things aren't free Mr. Speaker. We actually heard that from a fairly senior member of our community here today. Nothing's free. Well really there isn't anything free.

The fact of the matter is, you can look at these rates and yeah, 25% sounds like a big jump because that's what it is, $3 to $3.75. Well 3% a year on a $15 hour salary doesn't sound like much but when you figure out what 3% of $15 an hour is times 40 hours a week times 52 weeks a year, and you take what the net is versus what this big increase is over here, you'll find that little 3% costing you a hell of lot more than 25% bumps getting you on the other side. You just have to do all of the math Mr. Speaker to make all those things work for you.

The reality is and I'm glad that Councillor Steek raised that one issue about the cost of homes in this town because every time we pass a budget we get challenged because we're being compared to Calgary or Edmonton and why are our taxes so high in comparison on an average house that's so many square feet. The fact of the matter is an average house in this town is about 880 square feet. It's not a 1,240 square foot bungalow that the average house is in Calgary. And we all know that. So people use these numbers to suit their purposes when it works for them. The bottom line is, if you want to talk about real dollars last year our zoo was $3 for an adult. Calgary's zoo was $12.84. Edmonton was $5.75, it's not much more but it's double in terms of actual dollars. Vancouver, $12. Kamloops, I don't know why we're thinking of going to Kamloops but it was $7.40 and maybe everybody doesn't have a zoo. That's the reality folks. Some of the major cities in Canada don't even have one. In fact there's an actor in town right now doing a play at

MTC who has been going to our zoo a fair bit and he said it's the best value he could find for the dollar in our city. It was just on the front page of the paper about 10 days ago. William Hurt is his name.

I don't like dealing with this after the fact. We've been there, we already dealt with that part earlier today. When you look at the actual numbers Mr. Speaker, in comparison to what other people are paying in other jurisdictions this isn't a huge amount of money. Will it change who goes there? Maybe it will.

It's not just the number of people who are going through turnstiles that change things Mr. Speaker. The demographics are changing all the time. Everybody knows that we have an aging community. Why is health care so expensive all of a sudden. All kinds of new diseases come in? I don't think so. The bottom line is we have an aging population, that's what the reality is. We have to change with those things and try and develop ways around all of that. What we really need to be really honest with you Mr. Speaker to solve most of the problems in Winnipeg, is about 50,000 people to move here, that would help a lot. Trouble is we don't control that. And we don't control when they let people build on postage stamp lots in the capital regions all around this city. All you have to do is take a drive out there and have a look at some of those homes. That's what's happening. What we need is a little bit more control from the Provincial Government to stop that kind of nonsense from happening and we would have a little bit more revenue because we'd have a higher population here instead of it being in the periphery of our city.

In any case, we can all stand here and make eloquent speeches. We can all stand here and we could throw different numbers around and we could all sound great. Fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, that we have a budget and while there's no question there is no contingency in our current budget, we all know that as time goes on, the numbers change. We get to the end of the year and yeah we spent $7 million in December, $7.7 million. Some of it went for tires for buses, some of it went to Handi-transit, I think a couple of hundred thousand dollars went to Handi-transit. There were a number of issues like that Mr. Speaker where we did spend some of that money towards the end of year. We also used some of that money to go into commitment reserves so that when we did things like a short time ago the decontamination unit was created in the Fire Department for $380,000 that the money was already sitting in the commitment reserve as part of that $7.7 million. So we do things like that too.

Everything is not perfect. We all know that. That's why we all try and get elected to try and make them better. And collectively hopefully we'll do that over time. This is not a fun issue to deal with but I think that we should pass it Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves on the clause.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to start off by acknowledging the comments of Councillor Lazarenko when he spoke to the fact that this fee increase will actively discourage people from going to the Zoo. Well any fee increase I suppose does to a certain extent discourage some people from using the facility. This is not why people are not going to the Zoo.

The reason people aren't going to the Zoo is simply a case of been there, done that. The Zoo is playing to two primary markets. The first market of course is the residents of the City of Winnipeg. The second market are people not from Winnipeg who are here visiting who choose to exercise to see the Zoo as something they want to do while they're here. With the second market, I do not believe if a tourist comes into Winnipeg I don't believe that this increase will appreciably affect that market at all.

With respect to the ongoing demand of residents in the City of Winnipeg, I think we have to acknowledge that although everybody in this forum has probably been to the Zoo on one occasion or another, the fact of the matter is, once

you go, once, twice even three times, you have to start asking yourself, if we are in fact the primary market and we are, residents of the City of Winnipeg, if we are the primary market for the Zoo, what is going to get us to come back. New programming is going to get us to come back with our kids.

The ways zoos prosper and the way zoos make money in this day and age, is by bringing in special events. By changing things, by doing new stuff. I don't have to tell you that that costs money. If you don't believe me look at the report. The report says, 1993 when we brought the Koalas in we had 110,000 adults who came in. The next year, no Koalas it dropped 9,000 people. 1995 attendance was at 96,000 people. The next year in 1996 we brought in Boo At the Zoo.

(11:40)

It jumped 10,000 people to 106,000.

It worked its way back down in 1997, it was 97,000 or 98,000 people. The next year we brought in the elephant. It went from 97,000 to 124,000.

I don't run the Zoo, I'm not one of those people who has that responsibility, but I'd be willing to wager if I was, if I was the person that ran the Zoo I'd probably feel obliged to tell everybody in this room that the way you make money at a zoo and the way you increase your revenue is by paying money to bring in these things, these new events and these new attractions for people to see. It seems fairly obvious to me because the fact of the matter is, if the Zoo is not constantly evolving, constantly changing, constantly bringing in new attractions people are going to stop going. You're just not going to keep going.

Councillor Clement talked about some of the cities that were charging things. Well it's worth repeating quickly. Toronto, $15. Calgary, $13. Edmonton, $6. Vancouver, $12. These are huge centres. Everything costs more. Saskatoon, $4.50. Moncton, $8. They're doing the same thing that we're trying to do. If we're going to make this a facility worth having, we're going to have to invest in it. It doesn't have to break the bank nor should we expect the users to carry the entire freight. The information I have is that we're asking the users to pay for under 15%. Under 15% of the total costs of operating this venue. I don't think that's unreasonable. I think it should be supported by Council. We talked about the arenas, we talked about the pools and the recreational facilities, now we're talking about the Zoo.

We have to look at these things people in a larger context of what we're trying to accomplish as a city. We as a city are going to be hosting the Creative Cities Summit which is taking place late May, just before we host the FCM Annual Meeting. Part of what is going to be talked about at that summit is ways of financing. One of the first things they're going to talk about, one of the first things that is going to be accepted by the new thinkers in terms of how to run civic administrations, is that you cannot expect people to just keep showing up without doing anything for them. If you're going to do something for them like enhance your zoo, it is perfectly reasonable and perfectly acceptable in this day and age to ask them to pay for it because they will. People in our society will pay for things that they want to see.

There's plenty of examples in our demographic and if we watch the attendance of the Zoo and it's spelled right out in Exhibit 4.1. Whenever we do something new it attracts new people. If we were to do two or three new things per year if we could pay for them but we can't pay for them. This Council cannot pay for them. We don't have the money. The only way we're going to get that additional revenue is by enticing people to come, and yes, charging a modest amount more.

If we were way beyond what other jurisdictions were charging I would be the first one not to support this. A cursory glance at all other jurisdictions in Canada tells us that we are way below what other zoos are charging and we have to acknowledge, if we continue to do that at

some stage we might run the risk of providing an inferior product. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Any further debate on the clause? Deputy Mayor Thomas do you wish to close debate?
Deputy Mayor Thomas: I believe there has been some confusion in the debate and I believe some people are trying to confuse themselves Mr. Speaker.

On the one hand you can't criticize the poor maintenance of the Zoo and then on the other hand say you're not willing to give them the additional revenue that they need in order to properly maintain it. On the one hand you can't compare the dollars that we gave to Winnipeg Harvest for bus fares and then on the other hand say that this is going to somehow the Zoo increase is somehow going to counterman that because as has been made clear, if they can't afford it they don't pay.

What we have to do is get the money to properly maintain our Zoo. We're running as fast as we can to actually stay in the same place. This doesn't have anything to do with our ideas or our concepts or our strategies for the new zoo. That is another discussion. What we're trying to do is maintain what we have here. I think we need to do that in context. Let's examine the attached report.

I'd like to call your attention to the discussion in which the Administration gave us a very good report. They analysed he following market factors. The Canadian Zoo Market, the primary local market, the secondary local market. The elasticity of demand the recovery rate. Inflation. In comparing with other Canadian zoos the Canadian average for an adult to get into the Zoo was $9.37. We are at a third of that. Seniors average was $7.40. We're at a third of that. Youth, the average across Canada is $6.25. We're at a quarter of that. And it goes on and on. The average for a family is $22.25. We're at less than a third of that. In looking at a primary local competitors which is Oak Hammock Marsh, Fort Whyte Environmental Centre, Manitoba Museum, Children's Museum, all of which I'm a member of by the way because I think these are great things to take your children to and family when they're visiting.

The average in this local market for an adult is over $5. For a senior is over $4. For a youth is over $4, and for a child is over $4. For a family is over $16, and we are way below that. Even if you look at the secondary local markets, theatres, amusement parks, the Zoo fees are less than half.

We can't say we feist ourselves out of the market. We can't say that we're not doing a good job of reaching our constituents because we are. As a matter of fact we continue to subsidize the Zoo at a very hefty rate. We need to increase the Zoo admission and we have to do it realistically. The revenues support the Zoo and when you look at Calgary, Saskatoon, other places, you know it's just amazing that we're talking about something that's increasing from $3 to $3.75 when we look around us and we find that for a similar attraction that we're talking about three and sometimes four times the price.

(11:48)

We have to be able to maintain our zoo properly. We know it's starting to look rough around the edges. We know that sidewalks need to be maintained, curbs need to be maintained. We need to increase the trees. We also need to increase the exhibits as well. But for the basic maintenance of the Zoo we need to maintain it. I would ask Council to support this. It was in the budget. Thank you very much.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Debate is closed on clause 6. We'll take a recorded vote on this just so that we're clear. All in favour of Item No. 6 please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor Eadie.

Nays

Councillors Smith, Steek, Wyatt, Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 4.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Clause 6 is carried.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated April 23, 2003.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 23, 2003

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'll move Clauses 1 through 5 as consent items.

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

By-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'll move that By-law No. 86/2003 be read a first time.

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

Additional By-laws.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'll move that the by-laws be read a first time. By-laws numbered 80/2003, 81/2003, 89/2003.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 80/2003, 81/2003 and 89/2003.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'll move that by-laws numbered 80/2003, 81/2003 and 89/2003 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws 80/2003, 81/2003 and 89/2003.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'll move that the rules be suspended and by-laws numbered 80/2003, 81/2003 and 89/2003 be read a third time, and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Addendum By-law.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 92/2003 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 92/2003.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'll move that By-law No. 92/2003 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 92/2003.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 92/2003 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question Period. It might be an appropriate time if there's going to be questions pass the call of 12:00 o'clock. I'm in your hands.

Councillor Steek you have a question.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Deputy Mayor. A number of members of Council have been contacted by members of the medical community as well as concerned

citizens groups. There seems to be a reoccurring theme that the Mayor and potentially members of Executive Policy Committee are not in agreement with the introduction of a July 1 date, for a city-wide smoking by-law.

Will the Deputy Mayor like to address that head on? Will there be support from the Mayor and EPC to introduce the smoking by-law as passed July 1?

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: That question really is out of order. The by-law will be dealt with later on this afternoon, and it's on the agenda. We don't need to participate debate on the by-law that's already on the agenda for debate Councillor.

Do you have a supplementary question on a different matter?

Councillor Steek: Although I think a simple yes or no would have sufficed Mr. Speaker, I respect that.

My other question then is this. In view of the fact that in both clauses 5 and 6 this morning of Executive Policy Committee, additional appropriations of $50,000, an additional $100,000. Can the Deputy Mayor tell us when the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee will begin to start convening meetings relative to the '04, '05 and '06 current budgets?

Deputy Mayor Thomas: As soon as possible but we do not have a time at this point.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Steek: Clearly all we heard throughout the course of the current budget was, let's expedite this and get it done and over with quickly so we can move into the other. Is there an anticipated timeframe? 30 days, 60 days, does the Deputy Mayor know anything?

Deputy Mayor Thomas: As soon as possible but we do not have a timeframe at this point.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Any more questions? Seeing none, question period is over. We'll call it 12 o'clock and we'll resume at 1:30 p.m.

Council recess at 12:00 p.m.

After recess

Council resumed at 1:35 p.m.

(Councillor O'Shaughnessy in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: Moving onto the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, the Report of April 14, 2003, Councillor Gerbasi.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED APRIL 14, 2003

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the Report of April 14, 2003, clauses 1 to 3 as consent.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, there's a special meeting report.

Mr. Speaker: The Report of April 24, 2003.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED APRIL 24, 2003

Item No. 1 - Mosquito Control Strategy - Blueprint for Action File PA (Vol. 11)

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm pleased to move this item which is the announcement, which is the Mosquito Control Strategy for the consideration of Council.

Mr. Speaker: If I could interrupt. We'll need a motion to suspend the rules to consider the report. Moved by Councillor Gerbasi. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: I would like to make a few comments introducing this clause. I'm very pleased to introduce the City of Winnipeg's Blueprint for Action - Mosquito Control Strategy.

This very proactive strategy deals with nuisance mosquitoes as well as West Nile, the West Nile Virus issue and has both short term and long term initiatives included in it.

This is an Intergovernmental Strategy with significant financial contributions from the Provincial Government. We are fortunate to have obtained joint funding of up to 75%, 25% ratio on some of the programs.

It's significant that such a positive partnership happened in such a timely fashion between two levels of government.

I'd like to briefly highlight some of the key elements of the strategy. It includes enhanced larviciding for West Nile Virus within the City limits. It includes improved public education and communication. A pilot project entitled targeted environmental action against mosquitoes for this year will start in the neighbourhoods of Wolseley and Garden City. There will be community conversations which will provide an opportunity for education and public discussion at community meetings. The education will focus on reducing sources of mosquito breeding in neighourhoods as well as personal protection from mosquitoes. And the other purpose is to get feedback and views of the public on mosquito control and reduction efforts. I'm just giving you the high level highlights, there's actually more to it than that but I thought I would just focus on some of the more interesting and new elements of it.

In terms of the longer term initiatives just to briefly mention, there will be a blue ribbon research panel set up to investigate and study the most effective and environmentally sensitive mosquito control methods. There will be ongoing financial commitment, we will try to obtain that in an ongoing fashion for expanded larviciding in the capital region the six to ten kilometer radius around the City. We're looking at developing a source reduction water management plan for the City in collaboration with the Province, private industry and businesses.

We had a special meeting of the Standing Policy Committee, and we heard from delegations on the matter. This report was described by them as a giant leap and a huge step forward. Although of course there's always further that we could go and there were issues raised and there is a lot further we can go in an environmental way. I think people were very pleased when they saw the content of this report and what we're doing today.

I'd like to thank the Standing Policy Committee who supported this unanimously and in particular Harvey Smith who has been advocating for more environmentally sensitive measures of mosquito control for many years. So I'd like to thank Councillor Smith for that.

The Department of Community Services has been, really deserves credit for meeting with the Province and bringing this issue forward so quickly and creatively and listening to the concerns of the public, I think the Department did an excellent job on this report as well.

I urge all of you to support this blueprint for action and I truly believe it is a very important step in the right direction for our city's mosquito control. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, I support this clause wholeheartedly. I moved the clause at the Standing Committee because it deals with some of the things that really matter in controlling mosquitoes.

First of all, it seems to me it's important to go ahead and attack the breeding

grounds of mosquitoes in the City of Winnipeg. So therefore the neighbourhood idea of the pilot project in Wolseley and Garden City is worthwhile because you'll have people in effect looking at eavestroughs, looking at pools of water in backyards, I think it's a very very solid step.

But, I don't think this strategy goes far enough. Mosquitoes can travel a fair distance. If you have mosquitoes for example heavy they like River Heights, they can leave River Heights and come into my ward. Let me tell you this. The way to attack mosquitoes is to destroy the breeding grounds of mosquitoes throughout the City of Winnipeg. I appeared before Works and Operations just a short time ago asking them to fill in the low parts of Vimy Ridge, it's the start of a program. They said, of course we don't deal with fighting mosquitoes. The fact is you have to go before that committee, they deal with drainage and parks.

It's stymied, there's no cutting of breeding grounds within the City.

Let me tell you this. It wouldn't be that expensive to go ahead and have through green team members throughout the City checking the yards and so forth and in effect really making a gigantic step to cutting the source of the mosquitoes.

Now there's a lot of good things about this clause. Research. There's many many things. There's the larviciding what we passed last year, it's again this year. If we really tackled mosquitoes to control mosquitoes, we really do it seriously, we'll do far more than this. But this is a start and this is a departure from what we've been doing other years. I think it's a good start.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker I'd like to rise and say, I think this is an excellent initiative being brought forward. I'd like to commend the Chair of the Standing Committee Councillor Gerbasi for her hard work on this, along with the Provincial Government. Clearly they identify a need. I know that we've recently been kind of very much concentrating on what's happened with SARS, but the reality is many of us don't forget just last summer the urgency and the nature of the West Nile Virus and the fact that we're not sure of what will be the impact here in the City of Winnipeg. Therefore I think the fact that this is an infusion of new dollars into a program that we are very serious about is a very strong step in the right direction.

I was proud and happy to be part of the Committee that supported this unanimously when it came forward. I'd also like to pick up on Councillor Smith's comments that I think we all have different parts of the City in different wards that have different parks like Vimy Ridge where water does allow to stagnate. I know I have one in my ward, and clearly although it does cost more this is something we must continually work at to drain those types of parks and those areas to prevent the type of mosquito breeding that we know will cause problems. I think the citizens of the City are clearly aware and become more and more educated and there's an education part of this element of this proposal that a lot of the mosquitoes that breed West Nile Virus breeds in flower parts and breeds inside the old tires. This is where they tend to gather and breed and the clearing up of these sorts of things will do a lot to prevent that and this program talks about that.

(1:43)

I rise here supporting it and thank the Chair for her work.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker, I've never been one opposed you know to the fog and larviciding of mosquitoes. But what is before us here today, I'd like to know, 8 hours. What 8 hours are you talking about? Is it evening/morning or when? We used to have longer than 8 hours. We used to give notification, 24 hours then it went into 12 hours to give ample time for people that may be allergic or are allergic to give them time to either

leave that area they live in for the time being until after the fogging has taken place, or some of them might even go out of the City for a day.

My second concern I have is what about the retention ponds that we have in the subdivisions? I know they are pretty well all corners of the City. Huge retention ponds that you've got the willows, you've got all kind of tall grass growing all around it, what happens, will that take place also for larviciding? I'm sure the Chair will be able to respond to that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just quickly and looking through the report. I rise in support of the report as well. I just want to speak to the issue of the blueprint for action, and to the blue ribbon research panel that is going to be established to provide research advice. I don't know who I should be sending the message to, perhaps Councillor Gerbasi or any related administration.

As you may or may not be aware, we'll be going to public consultations on the environmental strategy probably in late May, I'm not sure of the exact dates as yet. One of the categories one of our eight categories will be covering will of course be pesticide use in the City of Winnipeg.

Just to let the Chair know and to make sure we're not duplicating consultations. If there's a joint role that we can play we'd be happy to do that. A valid exchange of information certainly. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi summing up.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Just to respond to a few of the points that have been raised.

I agree with Councillor Smith that the source reduction and larviciding as opposed to fogging, fogging is being looked at as a last resort. These are the methods, this is the direction we're going in, we need to keep going in that direction. I think the pilot projects describe exactly what Councillor Smith was saying. They are going to be using Green Team students going out in neighbourhoods.

We're starting with two neighbourhoods. It would be ideal if we could just immediately do it everywhere. We're starting with the pilot project. We are also including broader public education city-wide. Hopefully that information will get to people as well in terms of reducing as Councillor Wyatt pointed out, the West Nile Mosquito seems to thrive in small backyard pools and bird baths and things that people in their yard can do something about it, it's preventable.

The Province will also being doing public education on this as well. There should be a lot more information out there.

Councillor Lazarenko raised the issue of within the City limits expanses of water where mosquitoes might be breeding. Part of this is expanding larviciding within the City, and there's funding for that as part of the program. If there are any sites that Councillors are aware of, they should let the Department know and they can look into that.

Also longer term again mapping all of the sources of mosquito breeding is being looked at there.

The other thing is, in terms of the fogging and the issues we all know that last year there was some frustration expressed some members of the community about the communication process and having adequate warning. A big part of this is improving the communication being really clear about that. Also between the Province and the City. All the communication will be improved and we really are trying to be proactive about that, we don't want people to feel concern that they're going to be surprised by anything, and there's a definite emphasis on improving communication and dealing with the concerns of people with chemical sensitivities and so on. We are even looking at alternative accommodations for when there's fogging for those who wish to have that option.

The support I think is really responsive to the concerns that were raised last year by Councillors and by the public.

There was a time I think of 8 hours that was amended onto there in terms of the minimum time that there could be notification. I think there was the intention to give people a lot more notification than that, that was something that the Committee added on.

I think the intention was to have as much notification as possible. We can get back, I know Councillor Lazarenko might have a more specific question on that, I could talk to you after to Councillor Lazarenko after about that to give you a more accurate answer.

The intention is to have improved communication over what we've done in the past and to make sure there's no confusion about notification.

In terms of the research. What we're really looking at, there is public consultation which is in the form of a community conversations which as I said would be both public education part but also hearing what people's issues are and concerns and where they think we should go with our mosquito strategy. But the research panel is more bringing in an expert panel not just from the City but from the University, the Province, a broad range of expertise on mosquito methods and looking at those on an intergovernmental and broader way than just what the City can do.

The Province has actually hired an entomologist now. It used to be just Randy seems for the whole Province doing everything. Now the Province actually has a lot more capacity to deal with these issues with us. They are responsible for licensing new products and all that stuff. It's really important that we work together with them.

I appreciate everyone's support today and I think this is a really great step forward in our mosquito control and thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Question on the clause. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions, none. By-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that By-law No. 88/2003 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 88/2003.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that By-law No. 88/2003 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko speaking to second reading.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak to this because it's a forgone conclusion we did this in March. I just want to be recorded in opposition to reading of number two and number three.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 88/2003 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions. Councillor Steek.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steek: It may seem redundant Mr. Speaker but in view of the by-law that has just been passed, I would just like to direct a question then to the Chair of the Committee which I did earlier to the Deputy Mayor, namely the fact that a lot of us continue to hear that there isn't

100% commitment to the introduction of this by-law on July 1, and that in fact there are ongoing discussions with the Province.

I would just like to hear from the Chair of the Committee that indeed we will be proceeding on July 1. Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: We have just passed a by-law that starts July 1, 2003. I don't see where the ambiguity would be. I can't really comment on, I'm not sure what discussions Councillor Steek is referring to. There has been no backtracking from this Council. We have all just voted for this. I can't really speak to whatever conversations may or may not have gone on.

The fact of the matter is we voted here today for a by-law that is going to start July 1, 2003. I don't think there's any question about that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Not to cause confusion. A question to the Chair of the Standing Committee. My understanding is that the Provincial Government was going to concur once our by-law is put into place, that they were going to proceed and ban smoking in their casinos. I'd like to ask you the question, have you talked with the Premier or the Minister of Health on this?

Councillor Gerbasi: We've certainly all heard a verbal commitment that the Province will comply with the by-law including the Casinos. As to exactly when they'll do that, I don't know that everything has been completely confirmed. But we do expect that they will absolutely comply with it. I don't know if that will be July 1 in terms of the Casinos or what. We haven't had that finalized. We certainly have had a verbal commitment that they will be complying with that. There is an all party committee that's been established, and as we know there's probably going to be an election called very soon. Everything will probably be in limbo for the next month or so while they do that.

But administratively there was a commitment that we certainly expect to enforce the by-law. As for the Casinos I guess we have to finalize the exact date that that will happen. But other than that I think the commitment is there.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: This is a very crucial issue, very important to everyone. Will you be meeting with the Premier or Minister of Health and get confirmation when they will enforce and ban smoking in the Casinos?

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes we certainly hope to get clarification on that as soon as possible. As I said when we debated this originally and before this by-law came forward at the last meeting when we approved this we did hear a verbal commitment from the Premier to comply with it in Casinos but we will be seeking clarification on that as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplemental.

Councillor Lazarenko: To the Chair, will you on behalf of Council make it very clear to the Premier not to wait until after the election to use some enforcement to do it before the election and have this as part of an election platform?

Councillor Gerbasi: We will certainly be speaking strongly as I have all along to them that we're committed to this by-law and we hope them to be very cooperative with it. I'll certainly be sending that message.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I just want a clarification on a motion that was passed by the Standing Committee I believe it was in February regarding the public hearings for the four district model.

One of the clauses in the motion that therefore be it resolved clauses specifically called for advertising, that the Winnipeg Police Service would advertise their public meetings. So far from what I gather the Police Service has just indicated that they simply sent out news releases to the media hoping to cover it.

There's been no specific paid bought for advertisements placed in the newspapers. I'm wondering if you don't have the answer for that I know I didn't give you notice Councillor Gerbasi, but if that was specifically clearly the intention of the motion was that there would be some budgeting for paid advertising of public meetings. So far I don't know if my CRA allowance could carry the advertising around this city. I'm just wondering if the Police Service could follow up on that with the intent of the motion being that?

Councillor Gerbasi: I think Councillor Wyatt himself has probably advertised these meetings quite adequately just with his own political arguments.

I will endeavour to find out for you. I don't have the answer for you today but I'll get it to you as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions. We'll move to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, Report of April 15, 2003.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED APRIL 15, 2003

Councillor Angus: Thank you. I'm pleased to move the Report of April 15, 2003, and move that clauses 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

Mr. Speaker: Adopted by consent. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions, none. By-laws second and third reading only.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Angus: I'll move that By-law No. 31/2003, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 31/2003.

Councillor Angus: I'll move that By-law No. 31/2003 be read a third time, and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Continuing with by-laws.

Councillor Angus: I'll move that By-law No. 87/2003 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 87/2003.

Councillor Angus: I'll move that By-law No. 87/2003 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 87/2003.

Councillor Angus: I'll move that the rules be suspended and that By-law No. 87/2003 be read a third time, and the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions. Councillor Steek.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steek: Through you to Councillor Angus. Clause 4 was laid over at EPC, and in view of the very substantive document that was brought forward, I'm just wondering if the Chair can tell us in view of the fact that that clause being passed unanimously at Public Works why it would have been laid over in view of the myriad of documentation that was there?

Councillor Angus: Thank you. First of all it wasn't unanimous at Public Works. The Chair did not support the issue.

Mr. Speaker, but just to answer his question more specifically, Executive Policy Committee wanted some more

information, more specifically on how many times we have issued insurance policies without any deductible clause attached to it. As Councillor Steek is aware because we discussed this at committee it was to be considered to be implemented for 2004, the beginning of 2004, so there's plenty of time to sort of deal with some of the specifics of the question and get the information back and proceed it to Council. I hope that satisfies you.

Mr. Speaker: Fiscal Issues, the Report of April 15, 2003, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED APRIL 15, 2003

Councillor Clement: I'm pleased to move Clause 1 of the consent agenda.

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

Motions, none. By-laws.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 90/2003 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 90/2003.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 90/2003 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 90/2003.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rules be suspended and that By-law No. 90/2003 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions, none.

Property and Development, Report of April 8, 2003. Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED APRIL 8, 2003

Councillor Vandal: I will move Items 1 through 6 as consent items.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? There's been a request to stand down Item No. 1.

Items 2 through 6, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 1.

Item No. 1 - Government of Canada's Historic Places Initiative File G-3.1.5 (Vol. 3)

Councillor Vandal: Item No. 1 is self-explanatory. Basically it states the City of Winnipeg urge the Federal Government to adopt a tax credit incentive program similar to the American model. I will wait to hear the questions from Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Mr. Speaker, it's a fairly nebulous motion in view of the fact that it simply says to support the American model. I would expect that the Chair could speak to what the American model is. I'm guesstimating that one of the elements would be in enhanced depreciation for buildings of this nature but I don't know. So I'd like to hear if we're passing a motion of endorsation what is that we're endorsing here?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I just want to chime in. Although it didn't come through the last budget I am aware that one of the things that was on the table and almost smack through as part of Minister Copp's Ministry was such a program. I could only assume that this recommendation is built

to support that motion that never actually made it through this past budget. If it is not, I would strongly urge the Chair of Property and Development to look to the support of that I guess initiative that is very very close to being passed. I don't know anything more about it than that but it just struck me as very very similar. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak briefly to this. This motion came from the Historic Buildings Committee which I Chair. The thinking behind it is that the new program from the Feds originally was thought to be a tax credit program similar in that to our program that we have our tax credit programs. Instead it's more of a granting mechanism that they're using. So what we're saying is, that ends up becoming a different kind of funding mechanism that really isn't as effective as we know how affective tax credits are in preserving heritage buildings. Sort of handing out a few grants here and there to a few big projects is not really the same kind of effectiveness of levering more preservation of buildings. The other element of it is the amount of money is not as significant as was thought or is needed certainly.

This is really coming the motion came through the Historic Buildings Committee. The American model is focused more on tax credits as our model is in Winnipeg as opposed to just handing out some grants which don't necessarily lever the same kind of development that might not happen otherwise. The mechanism is simply tax credit mechanism as opposed to granting mechanism. Those were the reasons why the Historic Buildings Committee moved the motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: What I can say is that the Federal Government has adopted put a cap of $10 million on their investment in Canada's historic buildings throughout the country and this is woefully inadequate. We know that the City of Winnipeg through its own heritage tax credit program, the Gail Parvin Hammerquist Program have invested approximately half of that amount in historical buildings in the City of Winnipeg. We know that the Federal Government in the United States have clearly demonstrated more significant contribution or commitment to the restoration of American historical buildings, the actual form and substance of how that is administered was described by Councillor Gerbasi and I will endeavor to share with this Council more detailed information on that.

Nevertheless, the principle of the motion is that the Federal Government needs to be coming to the table with a lot more money, a significant amount of money if we are to preserve our historical treasures, not only in the City of Winnipeg but throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question on Item No. 1, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of April 10, 2003.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED APRIL 10, 2003

Councillor Vandal: I will move Items No. 1 through 5 as consent items.

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

Motions, none. By-laws.

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

Councillor Vandal: I'll move by-laws numbered 76/2003, 77/2003, 78/2003, 79/2003, 82/2003, 83/2003, 84/2003, and 85/2003, be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 76/2003, 77/2003, 78/2003, 79/2003, 82/2003, 83/2003, 84/2003, and 85/2003.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that by-laws numbered 76/2003 to 79/2003, both inclusive, and 82/2003 to 85/2003, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 76/2003 to 79/2003, both inclusive, and 82/2003 to 85/2003, both inclusive.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the rules be suspended and by-laws numbered 76/2003 to 79/2003, both inclusive, 82/2003 to 85/2003, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Addendum by-law.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 91/2003 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 91/2003.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that By-law No. 91/2003 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 91/2003.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 91/2003 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions, none. Councillor Steek moves adjournment. Roll Call.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Councillors O'Shaughnessy, Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt and Lazarenko.

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 2:10 P.M.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday April 30, 2003
CONTENTS

ROLL CALL.....357

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS....357

MINUTES.....357

DELEGATIONS.....357
Mr. John Gillis.....357
Mr. Ray Schmidt.....361
Mr. Gordon Anderson.....361
Mr. Murray Gibson.....362
Ms Lynne Billings.....364

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 9, 2003.....364

Item No. 6 - Additional Appropriation - Winnipeg Harvest and Addition of Winnipeg Harvest as an Ongoing Line Item to the Operating Budget - File FE-1 (Vol. 31).....364

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 16, 2003.....366

Item No. 3 - Arena Rental Rate Increases - File PR-2.1 (Vol. 23).....367

Item No. 5 - Recreation Fee Increases - File PR-2.10 (Vol. 11).....371

Item No. 6 - Increase of Zoo Admission Fees - File PR-7.1.1 (Vol. 17).....373

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 23, 2003.....385

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS.....385

By-law No. 86/2003.....385
By-laws Numbered 80/2003, 81/2003 and 89/2003.....385

By-law No. 92/2003.....385

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD.....385

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED APRIL 14, 2003..... 386

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED APRIL 24, 2003..... 386

Item No. 1 - Mosquito Control Strategy - Blueprint for Action - File PA (Vol. 11)..... 386

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS..... 390

By-law No. 88/2003..... 390

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD..... 390

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED APRIL 15, 2003..... 392

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS..... 392

By-law No. 31/2003..... 392
By-law No. 87/2003..... 392

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD..... 392

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED APRIL 15, 2003..... 393

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS..... 393

By-law No. 90/2003..... 393

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday April 30, 2003
CONTENTS

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED APRIL 8, 2003.....393

Item No. 1 - Government of Canada's Historic Places Initiative - File G-3.1.5 (Vol. 3).....393

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED APRIL 10, 2003.....394

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS.....394

By-laws numbered 76/2003, 77/2003, 78/2003, 79/2003, 82/2003, 83/2003, 84/2003 and 85/2003.....394

By-law No. 91/2003 395

ROLL CALL.....395